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## Transcript of Proceedings

(Reconvened at 9:00 a.m.)
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Good morning.
ALL COUNSEL: Good morning.

## MURRAY BROWN, continued:

## BY MR. HODSON:

Q

Good morning, Mr. Brown. I just want to clear up a matter yesterday. Just call up a couple documents. The first is 026935. And this was the letter of April 20 th, 1992 from Mr. Wolch to Mr. Mitchell, and in the course of my questioning yesterday, if we can call up 164797, I had asked you a bit about a letter back.

And, Mr. Commissioner, I'll
just identify these for the record. This was the document that, if we can go to the second page, has the April 30th, 1992, and I think you advised that that may be a function of the word processing system, the dates?

Well, it -- given that these are prepared on a template and that there's only -- the date entry is automated, it should have been the same date throughout. I have no idea how you could end up with a - one date on the front page and a different one on the second page. That's just
strange.
If we can go to 33 -- and I asked you about this letter and you had some, $I$ think your answers were some of this language was not yours. And if we can go to 334791 , what $I$ am trying to do is to identify what $I$ think is the letter that actually went back to Mr. Wolch, and this is your fax to Mr. Fainstein of May 8th, 1992 and it says:
"Ron - this just went out to H.w. this afternoon."
"Re: Milgaard
This went by mail to Wolch today, May 8 . . ."

And if we can go to the next page, next page, this is a May 8th letter, and you will see it starts off saying:
"I have reviewed and
considered the issues raised in your letter of April 20, 1992 and the material you have provided to me. In your letter you requested two things: first that $I$ order ...", etcetera. And then the next page you'll see -scroll down please -- there the letter without the prepared by and a blind carbon copy, and can
we -- and $I$ have had a chance to review this with you this morning briefly, Mr. Brown. But can you confirm, it appears that the May 8 th letter, this document here is the actual reply that went out and the other documents would have been drafts, internal drafts; is that a fair inference for that?

Yes, that's the case, if $I$ sent it out to Ron Fainstein it would have been because $I$ was aware that the minister's office had just sent that out. If we can go back to the previous page, please. And presumably, if there had been a letter that went out to Mr. Wolch on April 22 nd or April 30th, can we assume that that would have been referred to in this letter, and that the opening remarks responding to that letter would indicate that this is the first and only reply back?

That's the only reply, yes.
Yes. If we can go to 033150. And this is a letter March 9th, 1993 to a Mr. Samir Kulkarni, and if we can just go to the last page, this letter is signed by you as director of appeals, or on your behalf; is that correct?

Yes.
Go back to the first page. And it appears on the
file that, or at least on the documents we have, that from time to time you would be writing to members of the public who wrote in relating to the Supreme Court decision or the David Milgaard matter; is that fair?

Well I prepared responses for the minister, for the deputy minister, and if somebody wrote directly to me then $I$ would prepare the response --

Okay.
-- and send it out in my own name.
And just generally can you -- I don't have copies, and I'm not sure that we need to get them, of the letters that came in from members of the public -but, generally, what were the types of issues that were being raised in letters being sent in that you saw? This is 1993, '94 and '95, that time frame?

Well, they generally reflected the concerns being raised by the Milgaard people and reported in the newspapers that were still reporting on that matter, and they would, you know, typically contain things like, well, the Court hadn't done a complete review or had limited what they would look at, and things like that.

And if we can go to page 152, please. You note here, you say:
"As a personal aside, I suspect the Court's decision was much influenced by sympathy for Mr. Milgaard as a person; a sympathy which I share. If a sixteen year old committed a similar crime today, he would be subject to prosecution under the Young Offender's Act. The maximum penalty for murder, if tried as a young offender, is three years in jail and two years of intensive probation supervision. If raised to adult court, the maximum penalty is ten years. When the Supreme Court sat to hear this reference, Mr. Milgaard had already been in jail for almost twenty-three years. What's more, because of continuing mental health and behaviour problems, the chance of the Parole Board taking a chance and releasing him on parole, was not great. In short, he had already served two to four times what someone convicted of a similar crime today would serve and the
prospect of parole was not good. In my opinion this consideration was very much
in the minds of the judges. Indeed, it became clear even before the hearing started that whatever David Milgaard was or was not able to prove, he would likely be freed from jail unless we could prove there was a very good reason to keep him locked up. That's why a new trial was ordered when the Court knew very well no new trial was possible. That's why they effectively directed the Attorney General of Saskatchewan not to even try to run a new trial. And that's why they direct the federal Minister to pardon Mr. Milgaard if we ignored their broad hint, ran a new trial and got a conviction. The court knew that with all this there is no way the province would run a new trial. I am satisfied that in the final analysis, the Supreme Court judges were satisfied he was guilty of Gail Miller's murder. Reading between the lines of the judgement, that's the only conclusion $I$ can come
to. On the other hand, I'm sure Mr.
Asper will give you a different interpretation of the judgement and I urge you to seek his views."

Would that fairly reflect your views at the time, Mr. Brown, that part that $I$ read to you? Yes.

And is there anything there that you wish to elaborate on?

Umm, no, it -- as I said, once we saw the -- or once we met with the Court there was some indication that there was some sympathy for David Milgaard. The test or the options set out at the end of February, I think, made it clear that they had considerable sympathy for him, otherwise you wouldn't have had that last option put out there, and $I$ can certainly understand that and, as $I$ said in the letter, I share that view. Whatever the public interest is in obtaining justice, or whatever they choose to call locking someone up like that, going into jail at the age of 16 , a good-looking boy like David Milgaard, boy, that's -- that's more than punishment enough after 22 years in there.

If we can go to 033051. And, again, this is a
letter May 20th, 1993. The last page, we don't need to go to it, but prepared -- it says the minister's letter prepared by Murray Brown. If we can go to page 053, and just this comment, and I wanted to ask you to elaborate on it. The letter states:
"Sixth, I should caution you with respect to what the Court meant when it said there is new evidence that 'could reasonably be expected to have affected the verdict'. This should not be read as meaning the Supreme Court thought the inevitable result of considering that new evidence would be a finding of not guilty. Had they meant that, they would have suggested a verdict of acquittal be entered. All they mean in this instance is that the jury would have to consider this new evidence when deliberating on their verdict. In this regard, however, I again note the court also concludes there is still enough evidence to warrant a guilty verdict."

And would this have been your words or your
sentiment at the time?
Well, that's my reflection of what the Supreme Court thought. I personally, for what it was worth, wasn't sure that you had much -- or that we would have been able to prove a case at that point.

Just as far as this question, though, about when the Court says:
"... that 'could reasonably be expected
to have affected the verdict' ...",
I take it what you are saying is that if the Court was of the view that -- what they viewed was it would affect the verdict and that the new evidence would result in an acquittal, they would have said so?

Well, if they were of the view that the only result that you could get out of a new trial was a verdict of not guilty, they would have suggested the minister set aside the conviction and enter an acquittal.

And so the fact that they ordered a new trial, even in light of the fact that there was this new evidence, suggested that it was still open for -Their view was it was still a contest, yes.

033451 . And, again, this is a letter from the
minister, the back page shows it's prepared by Murray Brown, and this is a letter responding to a letter to Dwayne Lingenfelter from a, someone from Ontario, and the letter starts out:
"At the outset, let me point out that the 'facts' disclosed by the television program you've referred to have very little resemblance to the evidence produced before the Supreme Court. You may have noticed that there was no attempt made to present any other point of view. There was a good reason for that. When the other evidence was presented and the hard questions asked during the Supreme Court hearing, Mr. Milgaard's arguments were shown to be baseless and his claim to innocence could not stand up to careful examination."

And do you recall, was there some -- we've heard evidence that $I$ think in late, or at some point in 1993 I think there was a documentary produced by Global, if I'm not mistaken, about the matter; is that what you are referring to there or do you recall? There was also a reference, $I$ think, to an earlier CBC television program, as well, in one of the letters?

A

A
$Q$

Go to 289661 . And $I$ want to turn to the DNA matters, and $I$ think you've told us that after the reference it was your understanding that the Federal Justice officials, and in particular Mr. Fainstein, was -- had taken control of the Gail Miller clothing and exhibits with a view to conducting further DNA testing when science would allow it?
Well I believe the Fifth Estate, prior to the reference, had done something. I don't recall anything after, though they may have, $I$ don't know. In the minds of the news media, it was still very much an issue, but the only place that seemed to be getting a lot of traction was Ontario, the minister was getting a fair amount of correspondence from people in Ontario.

That's correct, yes.
And then in, $I$ believe the record reflects that in early 1995 he was contacted by counsel for David Milgaard, around the time of the Guy Paul Morin DNA results, with a request to look at the issue again; does that -- do you recall being made aware of that or --

Umm, yes, that sounds -- ' 95 sounds about right, when it started, and $I$ think it took some time
after that to resolve.
Right. And so here, I think, is the January 27 letter from Mr. Fainstein to you sending a copy of the lab report from April 6 th of '92. And then if we can go to 289652 , so the doc. ID is 651, go to page 652. And this is a March 30, 1995 letter from Ron Fainstein to counsel for Mr. Milgaard, counsel for Mr. Fisher, and to you, and it's got a copy of a letter from Dr. Fourney of the RCMP Lab which I'll go to in a moment, and it says:
"We are prepared to proceed with STR testing as Dr. Fourney suggests, provided that we, Saskatchewan, and David Milgaard can all agree with this proposition, and to any necessary details."

And is it fair to say that starting in early 1995, March, that the Federal Justice officials were prepared to proceed with DNA testing provided there was agreement from David Milgaard's counsel and from Saskatchewan and from the Federal Justice officials as far as how to go about doing it?

A
Yes.
And, in your view, why was that agreement

A
necessary? wanted to proceed, they could have, but I think they were being cautious about the -- trying to get the Milgaard group on side so that they, whatever the results, they wouldn't be critical. Obviously, they wouldn't be critical if it showed Larry Fisher, but if it was inconclusive or showed David Milgaard I suspect they were probably concerned that there would be criticisms, "well, you didn't ask us about how to do this".

And so that was your understanding as to why the consent of Mr. Milgaard was being sought for the testing process?

Yes.
And what about Mr. Fisher; do you recall whether -- sort of where he fit in as far as what was needed from him?

Well I mean, again, I'm assuming that they were going to them so that there would be no criticism of what they did. Certainly, my view at that time was the samples were properly in the possession of the Federal Government, they already had the authority to test them for the purpose of determining whether the DNA on the clothing could
be matched to either Larry Fisher or David Milgaard, they didn't need that consent.

If we assume that in March of 1995, Mr. Brown, that DNA science, DNA testing procedures, was at the point where proper and valid DNA testing could have been done on Gail Miller's clothing in March of 1995, if Gail Miller's exhibits had been with the Court of Queen's Bench, and if Saskatchewan Justice had been made aware, in March of 1995, that DNA testing, science had advanced and that testing could be done, can you tell us what steps you would have taken and, in particular, whether you would have sought consent of parties or simply proceeded?

I expect that -- well, if we had access to those samples, and those were not part of the Milgaard prosecution exhibits, the samples of Larry Fisher and David Milgaard's blood, I think it was -those weren't part of it so we would have to get that in order to do any comparisons. But $I$ would have been prepared simply to ask the Regina crime lab if they could do a DNA workup on the clothing, check it all for any potential analysable material, and then do an analysis of that material.

And do you think you would have had any difficulty getting a warrant, or seizing, or somehow getting the blood that Mr. Milgaard had -- and Mr. Fisher provided to the Supreme Court?

No, I don't think so.
And, assuming you would have had that material, would you have gone out and sought consent of Mr. Milgaard or Mr. Fisher to the process, or would you simply have received it?

I would simply have informed them that this was going on. Even at that point, I would have done them the courtesy of asking if they had any comments they wished to make, but it would have been a courtesy, I would have proceeded with that one way or another.

Now I am going to go through some correspondence here, but from March of 1995, we know it wasn't until almost $21 / 2$ years later that the testing was done. What's your understanding, generally, of why the testing took until July of 1997?

Well, it's my understanding that Dr. Ron Fourney of the Regina -- of the RCMP crime service, crime lab service, was suggesting testing by one method, I believe the Milgaards were proposing testing by another method. It was my view that, given what

A
had gone on in the past, I wasn't prepared to accept anything that came from the Milgaard camp, and if Dr. Fourney said that $S T R$ was the way to go, that was what $I$ was going to consent to. And why would you not accept anything coming from the Milgaard camp?

I just didn't trust them any more on anything. And why?

Well, because of the Breckenridge stunt and the lies and half truths that they had been spreading since the Supreme Court decision had come out, and even $I$ suppose the, what went on before that.

What is your understanding as to whether, what
type of testing was ultimately done in England, was it the type that Mr . Fourney had suggested in March of 1995?

I believe that was the case, yes. I don't know for sure, but $I$ know $I$ was prepared to trust what Ron Fourney said, I wasn't prepared to trust anything coming from the Milgaard group.

If we can go to page 654, please, and this is the Ron Fourney memo to Mr. Fainstein, March 16th, 1995, and this is what Mr. Fainstein sent to counsel for Mr. Milgaard, counsel for Mr. Fisher and the province, and I'll just go through parts
of this. And what did you know of Mr. Fourney at the time? He was the section head, biology, research and development, with the Central Forensic Laboratory of the RCMP in Ottawa.

Q
Q It says here:
"The majority of exhibit material has been consumed by the original serological analysis and the failed DNA analysis conducted by Dr. Rex Ferris. To my knowledge no biological extracted samples were returned by Rex Ferris. The original exhibit materials were, however, returned to the court. As was the practice of the day, no swabs were
retained during the original autopsy." What was your understanding of the manner in which Dr. Ferris' DNA efforts in the late 80 s affected the work that was being pursued in 1995? finding a patch of human tissue material on the panties $I$ believe it was and then he cut that patch out so that he could do his analysis on it and whatever he did by way of analysis, it's my understanding that that sample was destroyed, and that, based on -- I'm guessing -- he's going on the basis of what Pat Alain had discovered or thought she had discovered, that there was no other material available other than one tiny spot left.

Do you recollect having any understanding as to whether Dr. Ferris had checked any of the other Gail Miller articles for human tissue? Well, no, $I$ don't specifically recall reading anything like that, but $I$ would assume that if he found a spot, he probably did a fair amount of checking, that would be the -- what would ordinarily be done, you wouldn't usually just sort of stop the first time you found something to look at.

And so as far as Gail Miller's dress, what was your understanding in 1995 as to whether he had checked that for semen?

I would have presumed that he would have checked all of the clothing exhibits that he was given and found something only on the panties.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: That's Ferris?
A
BY MR. HODSON:
And the next paragraph says:
"After Mrs. Pat Alain of the RCMP CFL
examined the exhibits in 1992, it was apparent that one semen stain of
approximately $1 \mathrm{~cm} \times 1 \mathrm{~cm}$ was still
present on Gail Miller's panties."
Let me pause there. What was your understanding of what Pat Alain did in 1992 as far as examining Gail Miller's garments and the exhibits for possible human tissue?

Well, again, we trusted her to do a thorough examination of all the exhibits, that's why she was given everything, and when she came back and reported that there was only one tiny stain left, I made the assumption, and I think the rest of us made the assumption, that she had checked

A
Q
everything.
And so that would have included Gail Miller's dress?

The dress, the coat, the stockings, everything.
And then Mr. Fourney writes:
"Essentially, a portion of the contaminated DNA extract and half of the remaining unextracted semen stain on Gail Miller's panties are the only potentially significant items among the exhibits in the possession of Mrs. Pat Alain."

And again, is that information then that Saskatchewan Justice would have relied upon? Yes.

And we know in July of 1997 that when the garments were tested, you are aware that a rather large semen stain was located on Gail Miller's dress by the English scientist?

Yes. When the exhibits were returned there was -oh, on the dress, yes. He basically was asked to examine all of the clothing for the presence of any analysable material and he did that.

And $I$ believe his report reflects that he found a semen stain on the dress that allowed him to
extract DNA to match Larry Fisher's profile? Well, ultimately the evidence that he returned for the purpose of the Fisher prosecution indicated that he found numerous sites of material that could be analysed for --

And did you -- did that surprise you?
Yes, it certainly did.
And did you make any inquiries to determine how that happened or could have happened?

Well, $I$ know $I$ recall speaking to Ron Fainstein about it and $I$ think at that time both the federal government and the RCMP were a little up in the air as to how that happened.

Did you ever find out how it happened?
Well, other than obviously whatever process of investigation Pat Alain used, it was not appropriate, and $I$ know in speaking to two serologists who headed up sections of crime labs in different parts of the country, they indicated that they were very surprised when the RCMP picked Pat Alain to do the analysis because she had been an administrator at that point for a number of years and been an administrator during the time that the DNA technology had started to surface and started to develop, so that she really had no
hands-on experience in dealing with it. If we can go to the next page, I'll try not to get into these various DNA testing techniques, Mr. Brown, because I'm afraid $I$ will be lost rather quickly, but --

Well, you'll find me wandering behind you.
I'm afraid you might be slightly ahead of me, but here they are talking about the Polymarker or $D Q$ Alpha PCR DNA test used in the Jessop case, and Dr. Fourney is talking about:
"...the power of discrimination afforded by the DQ alpha or Polymarker tests is poor, and may in fact result in shared patterns between the victim and the assailant. These tests are not used by the RCMP forensic laboratories.

My recommendation would be to use $P C R-b a s e d$ short tandem repeat analysis (STRs). This is the approach taken by both the RCMP and Forensic Science Service (United Kingdom) for future PCR analysis. This test allows for better interpretation of mixed biological samples and works extremely well on old and/or badly degraded
biological exhibits. The power of discrimination using STRs is much greater, enabling a more forensically significant interpretation of the DNA pattern existing in the general population.

I would recommend that both the victim and David Milgaard's

PCR-based DNA pattern be established from the outset, using the known samples which are not limiting in the amount of DNA available. This would permit a more informed and prudent choice of the best set of STRs that could identify differences in their respective DNA patterns."

And it's my understanding, at least from reviewing the documents, that the RCMP were recommending a $P C R-b a s e d$ short tandem repeat analysis as the type of DNA testing to undertake and David Milgaard, through his counsel, and an expert that they had retained, were suggesting a different type of test, either the Polymarker or the DQ Alpha PCR test, the test that had been used in the Guy Paul Morin case. Is that
generally correct?

A
Q

A

Q

A
Q

A

Q

That's correct, yes.
And the RCMP had issues with the type of DNA
testing suggested by counsel and the expert for Mr. Milgaard; is that fair, about whether or not, given the limited quantity, it would be the best type of test to use, and that was the debate that carried on for a while?

Yes.
And it was ultimately the PCR-based short tandem repeat analysis that was conducted in England; is that correct?

That's my understanding, yes.
That gave rise to the results. And here -COMMISSIONER MaCCALLUM: The same one that
was recommended by Fourney; right?
Yes, that's correct.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yeah.
BY MR. HODSON:
And they talk here:
"Currently, few laboratories are
proficient in $S T R$ DNA analysis since it
is such a new procedure. Although our
laboratory is now conducting its first
STR casework on a pilot project basis,
the most experienced forensic laboratory in this field would be the Forensic Science Services in the United Kingdom. To date they have completed several hundred cases using the STR approach which has become their routine method of choice for forensic DNA analysis. As a special operating agency of the British Government, they conduct casework analysis for both the defence and the prosecution on a fee-for-service basis. They have investigated and used the STR approach in such high profile cases as the conclusive DNA identification of the Czar Nicholas and Russian royal family and the identification of victims of the Waco incident..."

And is it fair to conclude from this that at least in 1995, the English lab, the Forensic Science Services, was the -- if not the top, one of the top labs in the world that was conducting this DNA type, this STR DNA analysis?

A
Well, I expect there were probably competent labs in the United States too, but that -- I'm guessing Ron Fourney had contacts with the people in the

Forensic Service in England and that was where he chose to recommend we send the materials, and yes, there's no question that they had been doing a fair amount of that work by that time.

If $I$ could call up 033297, just to go
chronologically. So that letter is March 30th, and actually this is a bit earlier, this is March 14th, so at the same time the DNA discussions are in place. This is a letter from Mr. Wolch to Ned Shillington who was the Attorney General and minister at the time stating:
"A public inquiry is needed not only because a miscarriage of justice has occurred (as found by the Supreme Court of Canada) but also because there is a strong body of credible evidence indicating that this miscarriage of justice was caused by the wrongful acts and omissions of certain crown attorneys and police officers involved in the prosecution of Mr. Milgaard."

And there's handwriting on the side, "wrong wrong". Is that your writing?

Yes, that would be mine.
And I take it that means that you disagree with
what was suggested there?

A
Q
Yes.
Go to the next page, it says:
"In light of all the information and
evidence in the hands of the prosecution
at the time of Mr. Milgaard's appeals,
there can be no doubt that the
prosecutors breached the duty of
disclosure which they owed to Mr.
Milgaard."
In your view, sir, was that an issue that was
canvassed and determined by the supreme court in
the reference?
Well, the Supreme Court decision deals with it, it
was put before them, it was argued before them,
yes.
033293 , this would be the letter back to Mr.
Wolch:
"First, the Supreme Court did not find there had been a miscarriage of justice. Nor did it find that either the police or prosecution had acted improperly.

Second, the evidence you
allege points dramatically to wrong
doing on the part of two Crown attorneys does no such thing. The Supreme Court heard that evidence and could not come to the conclusion you argue.

Third, there has now been three inquiries into this case: one conducted by the Federal Department of Justice; a second conducted by the Supreme Court, and a third conducted by the R.C.M. Police. None of these inquiries - all of which your client participated in - produced any evidence to support your theory that David Milgaard was wrongly convicted. A further inquiry is not warranted and will not be ordered."

And again, that would have been the position of Saskatchewan Justice at the time?

A
Oh, yes, and it had been the position for some time. What prompted this exchange was Robert Mitchell, $I$ believe, had to step down from the Attorney General's position because during a radio interview he named a young offender and so there had to be an investigation into that because on its face that's a violation of the act. Ned

Shillington, who was a member of the government, was appointed the Attorney General and I'm guessing that the Wolch and Asper and Milgaard group thought that new minister, another try wouldn't hurt.

You mention Mr. Asper. I think his evidence was at this time he had left the practice of law, I think in '92. Do you recall --

I know he left sometime after the second -- or the reference, but $I$ don't recall exactly when.

And $I$ think his evidence was that after $I$ think the reference, pretty much in the fall of '92, he was no longer with the law firm of Wolch Pinx Tapper and no longer directly involved in the efforts. Would you agree with that? Would you take issue with that?

Yeah, I wouldn't take issue with that. As $I$ say, I know he left. I don't know when. Just to talk for a moment about the RCMP investigation, we've heard extensive evidence about that, and $I$ think in 1994 the RCMP reported back to the Alberta deputy and then to the province that they uncovered no evidence of a criminal wrongdoing and no information to suggest that a further -- or the wording was no
information to suggest that David Milgaard was innocent and no information to suggest that someone else committed the crime, including Larry Fisher, and I'm paraphrasing a bit, but once that report was received back, did you, Saskatchewan Justice, consider re-opening the investigation into the death of Gail Miller or was it a case of a non-decision?

It was a non-decision, there had just been a new investigation into the death of Gail Miller.

And if the RCMP had come back in 1994 and in the course of their investigation of criminal wrongdoing and obstruction of justice had come back to the province and said in the course of our investigation we've uncovered facts or evidence that would suggest Larry Fisher may be the perpetrator or would suggest that the investigation into the death of Gail Miller should be re-opened, is that something that Saskatchewan Justice would have acted upon favourably?

Oh, yes. When you send something out for advice, you are pretty much bound to follow the advice that comes in, and we respected the RCMP's investigative capacity and certainly respected the capacity of the Alberta lawyers to provide sound
advice. If they had suggested there was something to look at, yes, that would certainly have set the fox lose amongst the chickens.

289651, back on the DNA issue, this is an April 7, 1995 letter to Mr. Fainstein getting back, you write:
"In the interest of exhausting any
reasonable avenue of inquiry that may settle this matter one way or the other, we will of course agree to having the DNA analysis recommended by Dr. Fourney

- the PCR based STR analysis - done at this time. For the reasons contained in his letter of the $16 t h$ of March to you, we will not agree to the analysis being done using either the Polymarker or $D Q$ Alpha PCR analysis. It seems to us that if we are going to use up what little sample material is left, we should use a test method most likely to produce results capable of the clearest possible interpretation."

And that would have been Saskatchewan Justice's position at the time?

A Yes.

Q

A

A

A

And was that one of the concerns, and I think it was identified in Mr. Fourney's letter, that the DQ Alpha or the Polymarker analysis might have at least in his view used up material, limited material?

It would have likely taken all of the material.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Is there any difference between Mr. Fourney and Dr. Fournier or is somebody spelling it different?

I think it's being spelled differently. I think his name is Fourney, Ronald Fourney.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.
MR. HODSON: Actually, $I$ can just -- yeah, he's got a Ph.D. It's spelled $\mathrm{F}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{U}-\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{Y}$, and is it pronounced Fournier?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: No.
That's my understanding of how it was pronounced, Fournier.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Fourney, E-Y, is pronounced Fourney. Fournier is a different name. I was concerned it was two different people.

> MR. HODSON: It's the same person.

It's the same person, yes, however his name is pronounced.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.
BY MR. HODSON:
And at this point, then, are you relying on the RCMP and, in particular, Dr. Fourney's advice? Yes, principally his, but $I$ seem to recall we had a prosecution colleague in Canada at that time who had done some work with DNA and may even have run a prosecution by that point using DNA and $I$ recall discussing with him what he thought basically of the letter that we received from Ron Fainstein with Dr. Fourney's advice, and he agreed with Dr. Fourney that the best way to go was $P C R$, or the STR rather.

Q Go to 033291 --

A

Q

A
A Yes. Well, I certainly told them that it was our view that the clothing should be re-examined from the get-go to make sure there was nothing else there.

Q  back to Mr. Shillington. I'll get your comment on a couple of points here. He writes:
"At the commencement of the Supreme Court hearing, the court indicated that they will not hear evidence of police or prosecutorial misconduct and it was not their mandate to do so."

Do you agree with that statement?
No, that's false.
"They made the same point regarding Larry Fisher when they said that regardless of what the evidence is, they would make no findings as to his guilt or innocence." Do you agree with that?

I frankly don't recall anything being said in that respect, and certainly they were open to point the finger at Larry Fisher if they thought that's where it properly pointed.

It says:
"Because prosecutorial misconduct would not be looked into, the prosecutors were not even called to testify in the Supreme Court."

And is that your understanding of the reason that
the prosecutors were not called to testify before the Supreme Court?

No. I suspect the reason they weren't called was because Mr. Wolch and Mr. Asper knew very well they weren't going to get anything out of them. And it says:
"It is the factual finding by the Supreme Court that the prosecutors had the crucial evidence prior to David Milgaard's appeal in 1970 which gave rise to the conclusion that maintaining the conviction would be miscarriage of justice. It does by implication lead to no other conclusion but misconduct."

Do you agree with that?
No.
Go to 230505. This is April 22nd, 1996, again on the DNA issue, a letter from Mr. Fainstein, and I believe Mr. Lockyer at this time became counsel for David Milgaard with respect to the DNA issues; is that correct?

I believe so, yes.
And if we can go to the next page, Dr. Fourney goes through some of the earlier correspondence, refers to your letter, and says:
"In December, 1995 Mr. Milgaard's counsel secured a submission from Dr. Ed Blake, advocating, inter alia, the consumption --"

Actually, let me just pause for a minute. So this is April 22, 1996, so it appears from your April 7th letter, 1995, that the next contact would be a year later. Does that sound right? Well, there was a substantial amount of sort of telephone calls going back and forth at that point between Ron Fainstein and myself, so while there may not have been letters, there was certainly contact.

So just for the time line, if we can scroll up, it appears at least in Dr. Fourney's summary, April 7th, your letter says yes, we'll agree to go PCR based STR, but not Polymarker or DQ Alpha. Then:
"In December, 1995 Mr .
Milgaard's counsel secured a submission from Dr. Ed Blake, advocating, inter alia, the consumption of a portion of the remaining questioned material in screening for spermatozoa followed by quantitation of DNA, and, if only one test is possible, that it should employ
the combined DQ-Alpha/Polymarker system.

The report $I$ enclose from

Dr. Fourney questions the necessity of sacrificing part of the very limited sample to screening for spermatozoa and substantiates his view that if there is sufficient DNA, the test of choice is STRs. As I understand it, STR multiplex testing is: More highly discriminatory than $D Q / P M ;$ better with mixed samples; and excellent with old and degraded material."

So does that fairly set out, at least at this time, the two views, one by David Milgaard's counsel and expert and the other by the RCMP, as to the competing methods?

A
I believe so, yes.
And then the Federal Justice, Mr. Fainstein says:
"In accordance with Dr. Fourney's recommendations, this Department is prepared to proceed as follows:

1) To have DNA testing done by the

Forensic Science Service..."

British government,
2) To pay the fees of the Forensic

Science Service, and also to cover the reasonable fees and expenses of an expert representing Mr. Milgaard to attend and observe the process;
3) To have what remains of Gail

Miller's clothing examined once again, to determine whether any area apart from the "presumptive semen stain" described by Dr. Fourney, or Gail Miller's blood stains, should also be the subject of DNA testing.
4) To test: the so-far unextracted half of the presumptive semen stain on the panties...

And then:
5) First, DNA from the "questioned" samples is to be quantified. If no quantifiable DNA is found, that ends the matter. If there is at least one nanogram of material, STR testing is to be done. If more material remains after STR multiplex testing is completed, DQ-Alpha might also be tried. If there is . 2 nanograms or more of DNA, but not enough for multiplex STRs, DQ-Alpha can
be done."
And then it goes on. It would appear that this is what was put forward by the feds, that we will send everything to the lab in England, we will pay for Mr. Milgaard to have an expert there to observe, but we will do STR method first and only if there's enough left will we do the DQ Alpha. Is that a fair reading of that? Is that your understanding?

A
$Q$
That's correct.
And at the bottom he says:
"I understand that DQ/PM..."
Which is DQ-Alpha/Polymarker,
"...is a specialty of Dr. Blake's, and
that he has no experience with STRs. If
Mr. Lockyer feels he requires someone else to advise him on the circumstances, Dr. Fourney can give him the names of half a dozen or more experts in the field."

And was that your understanding, that different scientists had different views about the types of methods based on what they had used?

A
Well, yes, apparently Dr. Blake had one view and Dr. Fourney had another.

Q

230498, you write to Mr. Fainstein:
"As before, we remain very interested in having this testing done. If there is a realistic chance of settling this issue one way or the other, we are anxious to see this proceed. However, given the difficulties encountered with earlier testing done by Dr. Ferris, we are now rather cautious about how such testing proceeds. I restate our position as being in favour of using the most discriminating test process available.

The letter of Dr. Fourney and the attachments thereto, clearly indicate that the STR process is the desirable one. While the DQ-Alpha test may provide results with less DNA material, the results won't mean much if they are not sufficiently discriminatory to
answer the questions we want answered.
While confusing results may be
satisfactory to the Milgaards, they are not to us. Again, in my view and based on what $I$ have read in the materials you've sent, the STR process is the only
one that is reasonably likely to produce useful results if the same are available at all."

I want you to comment on a couple of things. What were you referring to about the difficulties encountered with the earlier testing done by Dr. Ferris?

Well, certainly at the point of the reference in the Supreme Court, not only was Dr. Ferris not exactly being forthcoming about what he had done or how he had done it, but he wasn't even prepared to provide the federal investigators with whatever product the testing produced. The DNA testing at that time produced something called an autorad and he was not prepared to provide any of that material and, as a result, $I$ was very suspicious of the process -- the people and the processes used by the Milgaard people to get this work done. And what were you referring to here about saying: "While confusing results may be satisfactory to the Milgaards, they are not to us."

A
Well when you look at the way they were interpreting the Supreme Court decision, which on its face $I$ thought was pretty clear with respect
to what they said, and totally misinterpreting those words, if the tests did not come back clearly suggesting that David Milgaard was absolutely not involved in this incident, I expected that you would get the same kind of spin and misinformation generated by the Milgaard camp, and this time they would be waving what they claimed was a scientific report that exonerated David when it had no such effect. If we can scroll down to the bottom, please, you also, you say:
"Reluctantly, we are agreeable to having these tests done at the Forensic Science Services, British Home Office."

And then go on to say:
"In 20 years of experience with the RCMP laboratory services, $I$ have never known them to be anything about scrupulously fair and neutral in their scientific work and Court presentations.

Additionally, if these tests must be done outside the RCMP facilities, given the problems that resulted from having the exhibits examined by a private
laboratory in British Columbia, I do not want to see them turned over to another private laboratory working only in the Milgaard's interests."

Again, was that referring to Dr. Ferris?
Yes.
And the concerns you just stated?
Yes.
And you say:
"A re-examination of Gail

Miller's clothing is probably not a bad idea. However, I would prefer to see that re-examination done by a government laboratory. I do not want to see the exhibits sent outside of Canada nor do I want to see the examination done without the scrutiny of someone we trust. If they must go outside this country to be re-examined then $I$ would prefer if an RCMP scientist went with them to observe the testing. Again, my caution relates to the problems encountered with the initial testing done in British Columbia."

Can you elaborate on what your -- what were your
concerns about letting the clothing go to an outside third party?

Well, again, $I$ mean when the clothing went to Rex Ferris, at that point $I$ had no concern about it, but after the difficulty the federal investigators encountered getting any information back from Rex Ferris as to what he had done, and what the results had looked like, I simply didn't trust the notion that we were going to put these back into the hands of someone who may be a partisan for the Milgaard family.

If we can go to 026014. And this is a letter of May 29th, 1996 from Mr. Lockyer back to

Mr. Fainstein, and this is the letter responding to what Mr. Fainstein has put forward -- and we'll
certainly hear from Mr. Fainstein on these matters -- but Mr. Lockyer makes a comment here about your letter and says:
"May I say that $I$ found parts of Mr. Brown's letter to be disturbing.
'Confusing results' are not, as he suggests, satisfactory to Mr. Milgaard. To date, $I$ have refrained from questioning the motives of the Department of Justice or Saskatchewan

Justice, and have assumed that we all share a common goal of obtaining a DNA result in this case. It is a shame that Mr. Brown does not do Mr. Milgaard the same courtesy, bearing in mind that it is Mr. Milgaard who has instigated this latest attempt at securing a DNA result."

And your comment to those -- to that statement? Well Mr. Lockyer, at that point, was a bit of a Johnny-come-lately to this campaign, and $I$ suggest he probably didn't know them as well as I did. Based on what we had seen coming out of the Milgaard camp since prior to the turn-down of the first application, what followed that and what had followed the Supreme Court's decision, there was no reason for me to trust anything coming from Mr. Milgaard's camp or to believe that, if the results from the DNA testing were in any way disappointing to them, that they would not misrepresent those results to the best of their ability.

Q If you can go to 268750. Actually, sir, let me just pause there. I think, again $I$ don't want to get into this in too much detail, but it appears from this letter that Mr. Lockyer is going back
with a different -- if we can go to page 019 and the introduction, here, of a Dr. Waye acting as arbitrator -- and $I$ think he was involved in the Morin case -- but in other words a different -- I think, down at the bottom, I think the general statement is that once it's determined then the scientists will decide which of the two methods, and Dr. Waye will have the ultimate decision about whether it's DQ Polymarker or STR, and then is that -- and then the next page -- and if there is a disagreement then it can go to the Chief Justice of the Ontario Court of Appeal, and so that was generally what was put back to the Federal Government by Mr. Milgaard's counsel?

Yes.
And so I take it that they did not agree to the procedure recommended by Mr. Fainstein?

A Yes.
268750. And this is an October 24, '96 fax from Mr. Fainstein, it says:
"Here is the draft agreement that I'm proposing to send to Mr. Lockyer."

And that:
"Mr. Dehm should contact Jean Roney
...",
to get the exhibits. If we can go to the next page, it looks like now the framework has been agreed that the work will be done by Dr. Jack Ballantyne and $a \operatorname{lab}$ in Long Island, New York, and that Dr. Ed Blake will attend. Who and how did Dr. Ballantyne and the Long Island lab come into the picture; do you know?

And it appears that the $S T R$ versus DQ Alpha was still a live issue as to how these things would be done?

A

Q

A

Q

Go to 289563. Now we're into March of '97, I think the record reflects that they did not go to Long Island; do you know why?

I -- I don't know. I might have known then, I don't recall now.

And --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: We're now into

March of which year?

MR. HODSON: March of '97.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.
BY MR. HODSON:

And there's an agreement here, if we can go to the next page, it now looks like we're back to

England, and it says here from Mr. Fainstein that Dr. Blake is going to attend and the testing is going to be done in conjunction with the joint meeting of the California Association of Criminologists. And:
"Dr. Werrett of the ...",

English lab:
"... has advised me that it shouldn't be
a problem for the work in this case to be done in conjunction with Dr. Blake's
trip to that conference.",
and Federal Justice would pay the cost. Go to
the next page. It appears the proposed agreement, we'll hear more from doctor (sic) Fainstein, but essentially this is the new agreement that now is going to see materials go to England; is that correct?

That's correct.
And if we can go to 289554, go to the next page, next page, this appears to be the agreement, the Agreed Procedure For Examination and DNA Testing with respect to the Murder of Gail Miller, and it's a four-page agreement. If we can go to the last page, signed by Murray Brown on behalf of Saskatchewan Justice, April 28th, 1997; is that correct?

A Yes.
Now, as far as what transpired, I've gone through at least some of the correspondence from January 1995 until April 1997. It appears Saskatchewan Justice's position was, $I$ think what you have told us, a couple things; one, whoever is going to look at the clothing, you wanted to make sure that there was -- that your concerns were addressed; and two, as far as how the DNA testing would be done, you were relying upon Dr. Fourney and his advice as to that; is that fair?

A That's correct.
Q

A

Q

A
Q

A
$Q$

And did you have any concerns with sending the clothing to the lab in England, where it ultimately went, to have them do the testing that they did?

No.
Go to 032431. I think this is a -- and the next page, just go to the next page, May 14th, '97. No, $032431 A . A c t u a l l y, ~ j u s t ~ g o ~ b a c k ~ t o ~ t h e ~ f i r s t ~$ page then, and here -- I will need to go to the second page, so if you can still find it. This is a May 14th, 1997, and it appears to be a briefing note that you would have prepared?

I --
When I get to the second page I'll show your name on it, but --

Yes, likely.
And it says:
"Why has it taken so long to
get the DNA testing underway in this matter?"

And you indicate that:
"Further, after extensive and time
consuming negotiations with Mr.
Milgaard's lawyers, the parties involved
have finally reached an agreement to test the remaining sample at one of the Forensic Science Service laboratories in England and on the process to be followed."

And scroll down. You state:
"After approximately two and a half years of prolonged negotiations with Mr. Milgaard's lawyers, agreements have been reached on how and where to test the last known biological sample connected to the 1969 murder of Gail Miller in Saskatoon. These negotiations dragged on because Mr. Milgaard's lawyers had insisted on a process for testing that RCMP scientists feared would more likely result in the destruction of the sample without any meaningful testing being done. They also could not agree where the testing would be done and kept changing their minds on which laboratory was or was not acceptable."

And, again, is that an accurate statement of your understanding of what transpired in those
negotiations?
A
Yes, that would have summed up my knowledge at the time.

And it says:
"It has now been agreed that the testing will be done in England at one of the Home Office Forensic Science Service Laboratories. Further, scientists from that laboratory will be the ones to determine the best way to proceed. Dr. Edward Blake, on behalf of the Milgaards and Dr. Ronald Fourney, on behalf of the RCMP, will be in attendance when the testing is done to observe the process used and the results produced, if any.

At this point it is not sure that any results will be produced by this process. Previous testing done when the exhibits were released to the Milgaards prior to the Supreme Court Reference, destroyed all the known biological samples without producing any results that we know of. The scientist who did the testing, Dr. Rex Ferris,
claimed nothing came of those tests but has refused to produce any of the results he obtained to the RCMP for review. When the exhibits were returned, the $R C M P$ had one of their laboratories check them to see if there was any human tissue material left on any of the items. Those tests produced a positive reading on one very, very small stain. All this test means however, is that the stain is of human origin. We do not yet know if there is any DNA material in it."

And, again, would that be an accurate summary of you knowledge at the time?

Yes.
And then:
"Finally, the Milgaards are going to give an exclusive interview to the Globe and Mail and Toronto Star newspapers on Monday morning. This will be followed by a general press conference on Tuesday morning. I fully expect all blame for the delay in doing these tests will be cast on the Crown.

They will no doubt as well, make it clear that the reason we delayed things was to further our obstruction of justice in the case. They will also re-iterate their claim that the Supreme Court found David to be innocent, which of course, is not true."

And can you comment on that last statement?
Which, the --
Sorry, just the last, about the being blamed for the delay. What is your --

Oh, they were already blaming, $I$ think, the provincial justice agency for delay, saying that we didn't want -- the testing hadn't happened because we didn't want to have it done.

And was it your view, based on your dealings in this matter, that testing could have been done in 1995 at the lab in England?

That's -- that was what Dr. Fourney suggested was possible, yes.

And what was your understanding, then, of the reason it wasn't done in 1995?

A
Well --
And let me back up. We know what testing was done in July of 1997 in the England lab; was there any
reason that testing could not have been done in 1995 when proposed by Dr. Fourney?

Well $I$-- you know, again, I'm not a scientist in that area, but it's my understanding that it could have been done in 1995.

Putting aside any issues relating to the advancement of science, if you assume in 1995 the science was at the same --

Yes, it could have been done.
-- was capable -- putting aside the science issue,
are you aware of any reason why the testing that was done in July of 1997 at the English lab could not have been done in 1995?

No.
Did you have any desire to -- did Saskatchewan
Justice have any desire to delay the testing?
No, I wasn't interested in delaying it, but I wasn't interested in having it done in a way that would either destroy the sample and produce no usable results or give us less than the best opportunity to come up with something from it, and that's -- based on Dr. Fourney's advice, it seemed to me that the method being proposed by the Milgaards was the wrong way to go.

Go to 032417. And this is a May 22 nd, 1997 news
story from the Toronto Daily Star, just read parts
of it. It's got your name on it, looks like
someone sent it to you, it says:
"Ottawa's decision to test David
Milgaard's guilt or innocence with new
DNA tests doesn't mean the federal
government is backing the Vancouver
man's quest for vindication, Justice
Minister Allan Rock says.
Rock said yesterday he did
not believe Milgaard's mother, Joyce,
accurately conveyed the tone of a
meeting she had with him and Jean
Chrétien in the Prime Minister's office
last summer.

Joyce Milgaard has said Chrétien told her he believed her son was innocent, but that Rock needed convincing.
'My opinion on this matter
has been totally irrelevant,' Rock said while campaigning here with Chrétien.
'I don't think I've ever
expressed an opinion about his
innocence.
what happened in private meetings'." And do you recall, Mr. Brown, the circumstances of this, or why a copy was sent to you, or what this related to?

A

Q

A
$Q$ If we can go to 329957. This is, I'm not sure this document is on CaseVault, Mr. Commissioner, it's reported in various media outlets, but I think this is a statement of the minister. Can
you tell us when and how you became aware of the -- this is July 18th at 2:00 in the afternoon and I think the DNA results came out that morning. Can you recall, Mr. Brown, how you became aware of the DNA results and what steps Saskatchewan Justice and the minister took on that day? Umm, yes. I received a call from Ron Fainstein that morning indicating what the results were from England. John White, who I believe was the deputy minister at the time, and $I$ immediately met with the Attorney General, who was John Nilson by then.

I discussed the results and my interpretation of that with John Nilson. We had a call from the Premier and his deputy minister and I spoke to the Premier with respect to my views on what these meant.

And what were your views?
Well notwithstanding -- I know that -- I knew that there were some people that had a two-offender, two-assault theory. It was my view that whoever raped Gail Miller was the most likely person to have killed her as well. That once you put Larry Fisher into the mix, in my view, you take David Milgaard out of it. At the very, very least, had Larry Fisher been known as the assailant who raped

Gail Miller in 1969, the police would have had no interest in David Milgaard. Any investigation of Mr. Cadrain's allegations that he had blood on him would likely have led nowhere. Had he been, for some reason, charged with that kind of information there is no possible way you could convince a jury that he was guilty beyond a reasonable -- David Milgaard was guilty beyond a reasonable doubt of the murder of Gail Miller, and any -- any conviction would -- a Court of Appeal, I'm absolutely confident, would overturn it as being unsafe.

And so what was your --
And that was the advice $I$ gave to the Premier. My advice was this establishes David Milgaard is innocent, not just that we can't prove the case, but that he is innocent, he did not kill Gail Miller.

And was that advice, then, taken by the Attorney General?

Well, yes. The Attorney General, I don't think, really needed to have it explained to him that much because he was fairly familiar with the case. The Premier, on the other hand, had not been doing much in the way of following that, he had other
things on his mind, but $I$ explained that to him and all he said was "and you're satisfied that's the case", I said "yes", and then he said, "well then $I$ 'm satisfied too".

And so it appears that afternoon -- do you know if you would have had a fax copy of the DNA results, or was it simply Mr. Fainstein's --

Umm, we got something faxed to us from the lab, I believe, within a couple of days. It was -- at that point we were simply operating on the basis of what we'd been told by Mr. Fainstein, and I believe I actually spoke to the scientist who did the results and -- or did the tests in England. And here, at least, and this is reported widely in the media, based on the DNA testing report: "... that the semen, the subject matter of the test, could not have originated from David Milgaard.

Based on this report, it
appears that a wrong of the most serious kind has been done to Mr. Milgaard by our Justice System.

For this we owe him and his
family the most heartfelt apology -- and
that is the main thing $I$ want to say
today.

There is no doubt that this wrongful conviction will require compensation. We are immediately beginning a process to provide that compensation.

The police investigation into
this case was reopened this morning."
And can you comment on that, do you know, what is your recollection? This was a Friday, I believe, July 18th?

Yes, could be.
Do you know what --
MR. ELSON: Yes, it was a Friday.
BY MR. HODSON:
Q
It was a Friday. Do you know what the statement was referring to about the police investigation? Well, $I$ believe that statement was produced in the minister's office, it -- I had nothing to do with it.

Perhaps I can call up 032991 , and this might assist. This is your letter of July 18 th to the Chief of Police in Saskatoon, to Deputy Chief Doell. It says:

```
                            "After considering the
```

matter, it is my opinion that there exists reasonable and probably grounds to believe that Larry Fisher committed the murder of Gail Miller. On the basis of this there appears to be reason to arrest him and charge him with non-capital murder."

What, is it possible that that was the reference about the re-opening in the sense of your request to the Saskatoon City Police?

A
$Q$
A

Well, no. What $I$ was going to say is that memo was, the previous memo was prepared in the minister's office, and when $I$ left him that
morning $I$ told him that the first thing $I$ was going to do was call the Saskatoon City Police and tell them that the investigation had to be re-opened, that there now was evidence upon which Larry Fisher could be charged and convicted. And did that happen?

I did. I called the chief of police in Saskatoon, he -- my recollection is that that was Dave Scott at the time, and he was away at some meeting, and Norm Doell, who was the deputy, was the one I actually spoke to.

And what was the nature of that discussion; what
do you recall?
A
Well, $I$ think it's fair to say that the Saskatoon Police Service was in shock, they were just having a hard time dealing with those results and they wanted to see the documents from England that established what $I$ had told them, and I followed the conversation up with the letter expecting that on Monday Chief Scott would be getting back into the office and would call me.

If we can call up 077486. This is a letter back, or a letter to the minister July 21 , 1997, which 1 think is the Monday following. It says:
"In light of the developments surrounding this file, we are requesting that the Department of Justice appoint another agency to investigate the death of Gail Miller.

This Police Service is in favour of such an agency being appointed and will co-operate and provide assistance to every extent possible, including providing access to the original file."

And do you recall what gave rise to this request or how this came about?

A
Well $I$ don't know whether, at that point, there was any pressure applied to them by anyone in the Attorney General's office, but it was very quickly becoming apparent that the Saskatoon Police Service might have some difficulty reinvestigating this since there seemed to be considerable reluctance to accepting the results, so the RCMP were the logical choice at that point.

And I, as well $I$ think at that
point the media interest in Larry Fisher, who I think was living in Saskatoon at the time, became intense and he indicated that he was likely going to be leaving town and doing what many Saskatchewan residents do, move to Alberta, where, I don't know, he thought he would have a better chance of avoiding the news media.

I think we did see some media articles that he did, that weekend, move or leave to Calgary. I stand to be corrected on that, but --

That could be. And the RCMP were the only ones that were then in a position to sort of follow him around.

Q If we can call up 077486. I'm sorry, go to the next page, sorry, 487. And this looks to be a letter of the same date from the Minister of

Justice and Attorney General to the Assistant Commissioner of the RCMP asking that:
"... I request the services of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police to investigate the allegations that Larry Fisher may be responsible for the death of Gail Miller.

I can understand why the Saskatoon City Police Service would want to distance itself from this investigation. Their request for the services of your force is a reasonable one.

Therefore, $I$ ask that you
authorize the RCMP to take on this
investigation. Public Prosecutions will
very soon name a prosecution team to provide legal advice to your officers.

They will be in direct contact with Inspector Murray Sawatsky in this regard."

And $I$ think it was later changed from Inspector Sawatsky to another member. So is it fair to say, from this, that on Monday, July 21, 1997, the RCMP effectively re-opened the investigation
into the death of Gail Miller?

A Yes.

MR. HODSON: Mr. Commissioner, I see it's almost 10:30. I believe $I$ am finished, but maybe if we could break now and $I$ will just double-check and canvass parties for further examination.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes, sure.
(Adjourned at 10:26 a.m.)
(Reconvened at 10:47 a.m.)
MR. HODSON: Mr. Commissioner, I think the parties who have identified they wish to examine Mr. Brown are Ms. McLean will be first, followed by Mr. Wolch and then I believe Mr. Gibson has some questions, Ms. Cox has some questions, Ms. Knox, I'm not sure which order, and Mr. Elson says no, or likely no, Mr. Boychuk no, Mr. Watson no. So I think we'll proceed on that basis. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Mr. Marshall, no? Sorry, Mr. Hopkins. Mr. Hopkins, no?

MR. HODSON: I'm sorry, Mr. Hopkins, do you have any questions?

MR. HOPKINS: No.
MS. McLEAN: Mr. Commissioner, when I
agreed to go first, $I$ was accepting Mr. Hodson's
estimate that he would be finished at about 9:30
this morning. I have a flight at 2:15, I need to be at the airport at $1: 15$, so $I$ can't be back
this afternoon. I'm going to ask if I'm not finished, if we can perhaps sit a little later than 12 o'clock so that $I$ can get done?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: We'll sit until
12: 30 .
MS. McLEAN: I'm hoping it won't take that long, but it may.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: All right.

## BY MS. McLEAN:

$Q$
Mr. Brown, my name is Joanne McLean, I represent Joyce Milgaard and I'm also here on behalf of

AIDWYC, AIDWYC is the Association in Defence of the Wrongly Convicted.

A
Yes.
Some of the questions that $I$ will ask you are factual in nature, but primarily my goals here are to talk about systemic type of issues, so it may seem directed to the facts of this case, but it's more a systemic approach that $I$ want to take to it. Okay?

Yes, that's fine.
One thing I want to talk about first is what's

5
been called the Mackie summary, and you know the document that I'm talking about there?

A

Q Yes.

And you've described it as something that, it's a summary of the evidence that the police had to date and that it caused you no concern at all, you thought it was just a summary of the evidence?

Yes. I just took it to be the kind of summary that you occasionally see on a police file made during the course of longish investigation when they are trying to figure out where they go next, what they do next.

And had you ever compared that document and the contents of that document to what the police actually had on file at that time?

You mean go back to the page references that they mentioned?

Yes.
No, I don't believe $I$ ever did that.
And I take it then you also did not go back to other pages that may not have been referenced in the document; is that fair?

That's right, yes.
Okay. So your --
Well, except to the extent that $I$ did, as $I$
$Q$
recall, read the police report that was on Bobs Caldwell's file when we got that in 1990 I believe.

And by that are you referring to the Ullrich report prior to the preliminary hearing?

No, no, in those days, generally speaking, what we got was the continuation report.

You are speaking of the report that Mr. Caldwell prepared at the conclusion of proceedings; is that --

No, no. No, no. There were something like five or six binders of materials that were a police report, a continuation report that starts sort of with the finding of the body and ends with the arrest of David Milgaard.

Uh-huh.
That was on the file. Now, that -- generally speaking, that is the continuation report. It wouldn't normally be the entire police file. Uh-huh.

But that -- in those days that's what we got.
All right. So at some time you would have read all or some of that document?

Oh, I would have read all of that, yes.
And did you do any comparison of the things in
that document to the Mackie summary document?
No. In going through the Mackie summary, it seemed to me to reasonably track the case. Nothing sort of jumped out at me as being wrong or false.

Okay. I want to look at that document in respect of a number of examples. One of them is about the toque. Now, do you remember that there was a blue toque found in the vicinity of the Cadrain residence sometime in April?

Yes, in somebody's yard I think, somebody's back yard, wasn't that it?

Yes.
Yes.
A neighbour --
Yeah, sometime around there.
A neighbour of the Cadrain family had found it in the winter, had kept it and had given it to the police in April.

Yes.
You recall that? And Mr. Karst wrote a report about that when he picked it up in April. Could I have 009254 , please. If you could blow up this section. This is a report written on April 18th by Mr. Karst and he's speaking of an interview
that he had with Nichol John on the 14 th of April of 1969, and I should tell you that as far as I'm aware, there is absolutely no further record of this interview with Ms. John, there was no statement taken from her and there's nothing further in writing about it. Okay?

A

Q

A
Q

A

Q Okay.

And what he's got down here is a description of David's clothing on January the 31st of 1969? Yes.

And in about the middle of that paragraph that's blown up, right here, it says:
"She also stated he was wearing a dark colored toque when in Regina."

Yes.
"However she did not recall seeing this toque again. This being of interest as a toque had been found by myself in the yard directly north on..."

Well, it says on, but,
"...of Cadrain residence which had red substance on it..."

Which has been sent to the lab for testing. Now if we can go to 006799 , please, at page -- sorry, at page 803 of that document, under the heading

Summary it's written:
"Nichol John says Milgaard wore a dark touque which she has not seen since Jan. 31 st."

And just above that it says:
"Wallet and touque are in car and when
Milgaard gets keys from Wilson at
Cadrains ... he disposes of the touque and the wallet at this time."

Now, you understood that to be an allegation that it's the toque that was found near the Cadrain house?

A
$Q$

A
Q

A

Q

A
Q
Yes, I suspect that's the case.
All right. And that the wallet is Gail Miller's
wallet which was also found in the vicinity of the Cadrain house?

That would be the theory, yes.
Do you see any mention in there that Nichol John says that he wore a dark toque which she has not seen since Regina in there?

That's correct.
It creates the impression that he had been wearing it on January the 31 st in Saskatoon?

That's correct, yes.
And if you go to page 006800 of the same document,

A
$Q$

A
Q
we have what purports to be an account of Nichol

John's statement of March the 1st of 1969:
"Came to Saskatoon January 31 with Ron Wilson, David Milgaard, in Wilson's..." Car. She certainly says that.
"- Milgaard wore brown suede jacket with lighter color knit cuffs, collar and stripes on front."

And the next line is:
"Dark color touque - which she has not seen since."
We have what purports tobe an account of

Yes.
Again, that's creating the impression that Mr. Milgaard was wearing a dark coloured toque in Saskatoon which hadn't been seen since that day? That's right.

Now, in fact, sir, if you look at -- I'm not going to ask for it up, but if anybody wants it, it's document 178559 at page 178560, the Nichol John statement of March the 11th of '69, which this purports to be a summary of here, does contain a clothing description of David Milgaard's clothes. It does not mention a toque at all. All right? Okay.

So that -- the information about the toque seems
to have only been able to have come from this interview that $I$ showed you at the beginning from April the $14 t h$ where she talks about the Regina toque. Yes?

A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A

A

A
都

The suggestion that the toque ended up in Saskatoon may be a misinterpretation of what This part here.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes.

Well, and perhaps a misunderstanding of what she said. I mean, I don't know, I didn't write the summary.

Uh-huh.
It could be that whoever took that took it to mean that she hasn't seen it since that day, not that she hadn't seen it since leaving Regina.

Even though that's what Mr. Karst has recorded? Well, she said that he was wearing it in Regina and she hasn't seen it since.

Yeah.
As $I$ say, I mean, that may be a misinterpretation of, or this might be a misinterpretation of what Mr. Karst required, the notion that the toque somehow got up to Saskatoon.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Just touch the screen where you are looking.

Nichol John said or it may -- I mean, maybe that's what she meant, $I$ don't know.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Where does it say -- oh, hasn't seen it since January the 31 st, that's the -That's correct.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yeah.
But I think came to Saskatoon with Wilson, I would suggest that that summary would suggest she was implying that he had the toque, or they are implying she said he had the toque in Saskatoon. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.

BY MS. McLEAN:
For what it's worth, on May the 24 th Nichol John gave a statement to the police, certainly false in respect of seeing David Milgaard commit the offence, but at that time she said that David was wearing the clothing as she has previously described:
"...black snow boots, long green tooke
with other colors possible Red and blue.
I think I would know this tooke if I saw
it again. Ron's Brother has mitts like
it, the mitts matched the tooke."
's at page 065359 , the document is

And that's at page 065359 , the document is

A
$Q$

065356 .
Another thing that's in the
Mackie summary is -- sorry, I just want to pull the summary -- in respect of Simon Doell. Do you remember that name, sir?

Not particularly, no.
Page number -- it's the Mackie summary, the page number is 006799 . Simon Doell was somebody who worked at the same hospital as Gail Miller. He was spoken to by the police on February the 4 th of 1969 and what's been written in the summary in respect of him is down at the bottom here.

Yes.
He:
"- Rides the bus to work and is certain Gail Miller caught bus at Avenue $N$ and $20 t h$ Street.

- Miller told him she was getting ride to work when asked about not being on bus."

That's all that's in there in respect of the bus that Gail Miller caught and that's all that's in there in respect of Simon Doell.
the -- sorry, 075900 , and then move to the second page of that, 901, please. This is the report prepared by Constable H.M. Dimmitt in respect of his conversations with -- his conversation, rather, with Simon Doell. It took place on February the 4 th of 1969 and it starts right here. It says that he and another constable attended and interviewed Simon Doell. It says:
"He moved out previous to the murder." There's no mention of that in the Mackie summary is there?

A

Q
Not that I'm aware of, no. He states that on occasions he had been riding the bus:
"...and when Miss Miller got on the bus she always on corner of Ave. N and 20 th St. directly across from the Funeral Home. He states that he missed her on the bus a couple of times and upon asking her how she was getting to work she stated that she was getting a ride to work, however she did not elaborate on this remark."

No formal statement is taken from Mr. Doell and this information that he had been, he had moved
out sometime prior to the murder never makes its way into the file, does it, into this summary rather?

A
No.

The first time that Simon Doell actually gives a formal statement is on March the 21 st of 1992 and that's after, $I$ think it's after all of the evidence called at the reference. The document is 044252 , and keep going please, I want paragraph 2 of this document. Yup. Simon Doell says that he lived at one time on Avenue $R$, he may have lived there for six months or so in 1968, and at some time during the fall of 1968 he moved. The last line:
"I had not been living on the west side
of Saskatoon for at least a couple of months prior to the murder of a Saskatoon nurse in 1969."

Move to the next page, please, paragraph 3:
"While living on Avenue $R$ I would occasionally take the bus to work ... would normally leave for work around 7:00 a.m. although my recollection is vague on this point."

Paragraph 4 :
"I did not know Gail Miller by name, but would see a nurse from time to time on the bus, several months earlier and would recognize the face as being someone who $I$ would see at my place of work, being the City Hospital."

Paragraph 5:
"I can only say it was a nurse in general sense that took the bus, but not specifically Gail Miller."

Paragraph 6:
"If there was more than one nurse who took the bus along $20 t h$ Street, $I$ would not be able to have identified which one of them would have been Gail Miller." The next paragraph simply says that he was never asked to provide a written statement or testify at the preliminary inquiry or the trial. That puts a slightly different cast on Simon Doell as he is in the Mackie summary; does it not?

Well, I'm -- he said she took -- that the woman took the bus at Avenue $N$. What's the date of this affidavit? It's 1992 isn't it?

Yes.

20 some years later he's not sure of what he was
thinking. I mean, it is what it is and its value is whatever its value is. I don't think it was hugely important to us whether she caught it at o or N. It's a block apart.

I'm not really interested in whether it was hugely important to you, sir, I'm talking about at the time that this Mackie summary was prepared. Well, at the time the summary was prepared, I assume they had what he told them back then. Uh-huh.

And if I recall correctly, that was she took the bus at Avenue N.

And that he hadn't lived there for months? Yes.

So any information he was giving about busses would have to go back into the fall of 1968?

It would have been fairly stale, yes.
And that information doesn't make its way into the summary does it?

No.
Could we have document 218223, please, and then within that $I$ want 218228. Now, Mr. Doell's evidence or his sighting of a nurse on the bus that got on at Avenue $N$, that was important to the theory that the Wilson vehicle had been traveling
down Avenue $N$ and they had encountered Gail Miller wasn't it?

That was the Crown's theory, yes.
Yeah.
And then the alley by the funeral home on $N$ and so on.

And are you aware that that evidence wasn't in fact called at the trial, any evidence that she took Avenue $N$ ?

That they were traveling down Avenue $N$ ? COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Sorry, wait a second, you're talking over one another. What was the question, please?

BY MS. McLEAN:
Are you aware that there was no evidence called at the trial that Ms. Miller took Avenue $N$ ?

Well, again, Ms. McLean, it has been a long time since $I$ read that transcript.

Uh-huh.
I can't honestly say whether $I$ was aware of that or not.

Q
Okay. These are some items that -- this document actually is the submissions on behalf of David Milgaard at the Supreme Court and there is a list of items that were not disclosed to defence
counsel at trial. Just running through them quickly, item (a), Miss Gallucci is somebody that said she saw a nurse coming from the direction of Gail Miller's house and taking the bus at Avenue O and 20 th street at 10 to seven, that would be the time that Gail Miller normally takes the bus to get to work. The next one, Anne Friesen gave a police statement that Gail Miller walked south on Avenue O to the 20 th Street bus stop. (c), Betty Hundt, another of Gail Miller's roommates -- over to the next page, please -- gave a statement to the police that she believes that Gail Miller walked south, O to 20 th Street and the bus stop, and none of those things made their way into the Mackie summary either did they?

A
$Q$ No.

Okay. The next paragraph talks about the Crown's theory that the car was stuck on Avenue $N$, again, a complaint on behalf of Mr. Milgaard that these numerous items were not disclosed to defence counsel at trial and it's essentially a chronological list of people who had dealings in the vicinity of Avenue $N$ or Avenue $O$ and saw nothing unusual, nothing to suggest that there was a car stuck in the vicinity of where the murder of

Gail Miller took place. Just moving down here, please -- next page -- one of the most important ones of course is item (h), between 6:50 to 6:55 a.m. Mr. and Mrs. Merriman, who lived directly opposite the funeral parlour, were looking out the window watching for a cab, they saw nothing. Continue down, please, and the next. So we use letters (a) through (x) and over a time period that ends at 7:05 a.m., none of those items were disclosed to defence counsel at David Milgaard's trial, and can you confirm that those items also do not appear in the Mackie summary?

Well, yes, as far as $I$ can tell they don't appear in the Mackie summary.

Mackie summary again, please, page -- well, the first page, 006800 . Sorry, it's the second page of the document. Again, purports to be from the statement of Nichol John on March the 11th of 1969, it says:
"- Admits seeing nurse (looked like nurse) near funeral home. Asked directions."

And $I$ can advise you, sir, that that does not appear in any way, shape or form in the March 11th statement of Nichol John and I have not been
able to find it in any other interview of Nichol John prior to May $23 r d$, 24 th.

A
All right. Okay, what is -- my screen cuts off the top of that.

I'm sorry.
Can you just kind of scroll up?
Push it back.
No, no. Okay, Nichol John. Okay. I was wondering whose statement it was. It didn't show on the screen.

We've been wondering too because it's not in her statement.

I didn't say the summary was accurate.
Okay. And page --
And, you know, I should point out that since we had the police report, the summary was really of no interest to me other than there it is.

Uh-huh. And page 803 of the same document, and this is under the heading Summary, but it's more theory $I$ guess:
"- On seeing nurse (Miller) she was
approached on pretence of getting directions with a view to stealing her purse."

And prior to this, the creation of this document,
we're not aware of anybody involved in this case saying that they had seen a nurse in the vicinity of Avenue $N$.

On the same document we have
a mention of -- sorry. Yeah. We have on this document also, in addition to some evidence that is not accurately reported, evidence which is missing and, $I$ would suggest, has a great deal of significance to the case, but on the first page we have the (V1)- rape, its location, a
description, a comparison of the (V1)- rape to the Miller file, that Miss (V1) - had been shown a photo spread and had picked Milgaard and another. Without going back to the document, she actually says in there that she isn't sure where she had seen either of the two gentlemen that she had picked out, but she thought they looked familiar, and then again we've got the blood group of her and that the attacker is an A group secretor. Now, this offence is one that Larry Fisher pled guilty to and it's one of a group of offences he pled guilty to. There's no mention of the other sex offences that were committed by Mr. Fisher in and around this same time period and which the police were originally investigating as linked to
the Miller murder is there?

A

Q

A

Q
A

Q

A
If -- well, in terms of misleading anybody, they wouldn't be produced for investigation purposes, they are produced as part of the brief for the Crown, and if they are handed to defence counsel who takes a quick look at them to try and assess the strength of the Crown's case, say, for a bail hearing application or something like that, they
are going to be dang misleading.
I don't mean to interrupt you, sir. Are you speaking of will-says or might-says? I'm talking about this document.

Yeah, we call them can-says.
Yeah. I'm talking about this document, not about can-says?

No, no, I appreciate that. But you are suggesting that, because this is inaccurate, that has some sinister meaning. I'm saying, well, you are going to have to do a little more than show inaccuracies to prove that this was somehow a sinister plan for the conviction of David Milgaard.

My suggestion, sir, was that this document, if relied upon to decide who would be the best suspect in the case, might be misleading?

Oh, no, no question about that.
No question that it might be misleading; right?
Yes.
Okay. And you don't know this, but this document -- well, you may know it now but you certainly didn't know it -- 061373. This is a letter that you wrote to Mr. Sawatsky on September the 9 th of '93 and you turned over, at that time,

Oh yes.
-- a portion of the department's file that had been found in the office. You indicated you have no idea:

> "Why it was there ...",
you:
"... personally disclaim any knowledge
of it as the file contains material I have never seen before."

And:
"... please pass this on to your
investigators for their consideration."
And it's my understanding that, in amongst those documents that you turned over to Mr. Sawatsky in 1993, were reports prepared by the RCMP who were assisting with the investigation in 1969?

Umm, yes, I -- Inspector Riddell, I think? Riddell is one of them, yeah, Rasmussen. Yes.

And in those reports, we've only heard about them in the Inquiry because they were therefore not available for David's lawyers on the preparation of their application, they weren't available to the Department of Justice in their investigation, they weren't available at the Supreme Court of

Canada, they were available at this Inquiry, and we've heard evidence that the police, including a number of members of Saskatoon fairly high up the food chain, if $I$ can call it that, and some of the senior officers that were involved from the RCMP in the investigation, had a meeting on May the 16th of 1969, and that this document was used in that meeting to decide on who would be a good suspect to concentrate on in the case; are you aware of that?

Umm, I was aware that they had talked to some RCMP members and I believe, actually, Regina City Police members had something to do with the file as well. I don't recall specifically what the discussions were about, but there had been discussions, $I$ know that.

And that, at the conclusion of that meeting, it was decided that David Milgaard was the best suspect and that he'd be the one that they focused on. So at that time of that meeting, on May the 16th, 1969, Nichol John and Ron Wilson had been saying essentially the same thing for all of March, all of April, and about two weeks or so in May.

In respect of Ron Wilson, he
said he arrived in town at 5:00 or 6:00 a.m., went looking for the Cadrain house, had the incident that could -- at the Danchuks, went to the cadrain house, David was never out of his sight, never saw a knife, never knew anything about the murder until questioned on March the 2nd.

And Nichol John, as of March -- as of May the $16 t h$, was saying that they arrived in town about 6:30 to 7:30 a.m., they went looking for the Cadrain house, she remembered going to the motel looking for a map of how to get to Pleasant Hill, she remembered the Danchuks, and that they were never separated.

And, at the time, David was saying essentially the same thing that he's said for the last 40 years, that they had come to Saskatoon, been various places, left, no murder, nothing funny.

Yes.

Right? Now, within eight days of this document being used at the meeting, Mr. Wilson has changed his story. Could we have 065360?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: "This document", you mean the Mackie summary, not the Riddell report?

MS. McLEAN: Yes, sorry, I do mean that.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yeah.

MS. McLEAN: The Mackie summary referred to at the meeting, referred to in the Riddell reports.

BY MS. McLEAN:
$Q$
Okay. This is a typed version of the May 24 th statement and the May $23 r d$ statement of Ron Wilson. Can we go to the next page, please? It's in reverse order. Mr. Wilson says that they spoke:
"... to a young lady in a dark coat about directions ...", that's new:
"... in the area where the police showed me the all night cafe."

That's new, the police showed him something.
"She said she didn't know where Piece

Hill was and when we left Milgaard said she was a stupid bitch."

He, David:
"... was the only one that had spoke to her."

And then we have:
"I should also mention that on the way
to Saskatoon we discussed pulling B. \& E's, rolling someone or purse snatching for money. I don't really remember if this girl was carrying a purse."

Do you see the juxtaposition of talking to the woman and purse snatching there?

A

Q 24 th:
"The next thing I recall is seeing Dave in the alley on the right side of the car. He had a hold of the same girl we spoke to a minute before.

I saw him grab her purse. I saw her grab for her purse again."

It says "her", but $I$ presume she means 'him', maybe it doesn't.

No, she:
"... saw her grab for her purse again."
Someone -- saw her reach again:
"... her purse again. Dave reached into
one of his pockets and pulled out the knife."

And if we go to the Mackie summary, on the last
page of it please:
"- On seeing the nurse (Miller) she was approached on pretence of getting directions with a view to stealing her purse."

And then, further down, we have the:
"- Purse thrown in garbage ...", and that's in fact where it had been found, we have Milgaard removing the wallet and that he may have put the purse in the garbage after wilson had looked in it, or maybe most -- both of them had been involved in the theft of the purse, and that:
"... Milgaard intent on rape assaults and murders Gail Miller.", or that:
"Wilson has purse, goes through it and puts it in the garbage can while waiting on Milgaard who he is aware is raping Miller."

So the statements of Nichol John and Ronald

Wilson obtained on May 23 rd and 24 th, 1969 quite closely parallel what Mr. Mackie has theorized?

A Some of it does, yes.

Okay.

A

Q

I mean there's nothing about the last part you were reading there, bottom line, Mr. Wilson didn't put himself in it.

No he didn't, but he has given evidence that the police were telling him it was either him or David, so --

Well --
-- there may be some support for that?
That's -- that's his evidence.

Yes. 065356 , Nichol John's statement:
"After we got to Saskatoon we drove around for about 10 or 15 minutes. Then we talked to this girl. This was in the area where Sgt. Mackie drove me around."
"We started to drive away and only went about half a block when we got stuck. We ended up stuck at the entrance to the alley behind the funeral home."

And we can see that Mr. Mackie wrote about that at page 006803 of the Mackie summary. We have: "- On seeing the nurse ... she was approached on pretence of getting directions ...",
"- This would be around funeral home which would coincide with statements of Nichol John - Diewold seeing lights in alley - Doell saying Miller took bus at Avenue N."

Is this of some concern, given that we now know that Nichol John did not see David Milgaard attack anybody?

Well, what do you mean "of some concern?" Obviously, the statements of Wilson and John are of some concern once the DNA -- which in my view, again, exonerates David --

Uh-huh?
So, yeah, I mean obviously Nichol John and Ron Wilson -- well, Ron Wilson certainly was lying. Nichol John was lying when she said she saw David Milgaard doing something. I'm still of two minds, frankly, whether she saw anything or whether she saw somebody attacking Gail Miller. I don't know.

I am sure it wasn't David Milgaard she saw attacking him -- or her.

Q Nichol's statement as well -- sorry, maybe I'll do the prediction first:
"- Wilson appears to be driver of car,
therefore, Milgaard would leave car to
get purse - having seen Miller closer his sex drive takes over and he forces her down alley to where she is found. - Nichol John knows or suspects results and leaves car. Runs west ... and is the girl seen by Indyh at St. Mary Church. At this point she changes her mind about saying anything and goes north on Avenue 'O' where she meets car again."

I don't think there's another reference but. If you could scroll down, that seems to be all there is there about that.

And then if we go to Nichol John's statement, 065356 , at 357:
"The next $I$ recall is him taking her around the corner of the alley. I think I ran after that. I think $I$ ran in the direction Ron had gone. I recall running down the street. I don't recall seeing anyone. The next thing $I$ knew $I$ was sitting in the car again. I don't know how $I$ got back to the car."

You see how closely that follows what Mr. Mackie
suggested might have happened?
A
Yes.
Following along from where we were, Nichol John says:
"I seem to recall seeing Dave putting a purse into a garbage can. I don't remember which time it was or where I was when I saw this.

I recall there were two garbage cans. The one on the left had the lid tipped. I don't recall which one he put it in.

The next I remember is
sitting in the car. I don't remember
Ron being in the car or coming back."
And Mr. Wilson's statement -- sorry, I'm missing one page here, oh, you've got it, perfect. Umm, next page, next page, it's page 2 of the May $23 r d$ statement. Ronald Wilson says:
"At Calgary we went to the
bus depot, that is Dave and I."
Scrolling down a little bit:
"This is when Dave told me he hit a girl
in Saskatoon, or maybe he said he did a
girl in in Saskatoon. I don't remember

A
Q
A

Q
A

Q

A
$Q$

A
Q
A 25
for sure which. He told me he grabbed her purse and she fought and he said he jabbed her with a knife a few times, and said he put her purse in a trash can. He said he thought she'd be alright." And that, again, is something that had appeared in the Mackie summary and cannot possibly be true; can it?

Umm, which, the discussions in Calgary?
Yeah?
Well, no, I would assume that's not the case.
Well, it can't possibly --
If Ron Wilson made this up then, no, those
conversations couldn't have occurred.
Now these statements are really recantations of the first statements; are they not?

Oh, yes.
And these were taken during a period of time that the -- Nichol John was 16 years old, Ron Wilson was 17, I believe, and they'd been taken from their homes in Regina --

Something like that, yes.
-- to Saskatoon --
Oh yes.
-- without parental involvement; are you aware of
that?
A
Yes, $I$ would assume that was -- well, certainly
the parents didn't -- there was nobody
accompanying them, $I$ don't know whether their parents were aware that they had gone to Regina (sic) or not.

They'd been held overnight in police cells?
That's correct.
In respect of Nichol John, more than one night, driven around the murder scene?

That, to my knowledge that's the case, yes.
There is no accounting in any records we have been able to establish as to how long they were questioned, or what they were specifically asked, or how long they were in the individual company of police officers?

A
Q

They had sessions with Mr. Roberts on the $23 r d$ of May that lasted for hours, according to the evidence of Mr . Roberts at the Supreme Court?

A Yes.

Q
And that Ms. John and Mr. Wilson had been put together by Mr. Roberts, and evidence discussed with both of them, on the admission of

Mr. Roberts?

Well, I don't specifically recall that, -Okay.
-- but if that's in his transcript of evidence I wouldn't deny that, no.

Okay. And that there had been another, another session after that for Mr. Wilson with the police on May the $23 r d$ which results in taking a statement from him, the May $23 r d$ statement, and then he is taken over to swear to the statement that he had just given.

Ms. John apparently is put
back in the police cells with no accounting for why she wasn't questioned or why a statement would not be taken from her, given that she is supposed to have told Mr. Roberts that she remembered seeing a murder, and she's then taken --

Well, yeah, I'm -- you know, you are giving me details. I don't recall this from the Court, but if that's what's on the record, then $I$ accept that as what the evidence was.

Q

Q

Okay. And then the next morning of May $24 t h, \mathrm{Mr}$. Wilson gives an amended statement where he remembers now that he had left the car and come back to the car after the murder, and then Nichol John gives her statement and swears to it. And, for all of that, we've got police reports that are prepared some days after, there is no transcript of the tape recordings that were made of the conversations that took place with these people on May the 21 st, 22 nd, $23 r d$, or 24 th, no records of the encounters with Mr. Roberts, no availability of the tape recordings that were made, no memory on behalf of the police officers that may or may not have been listening to that, we've heard evidence at the Inquiry about what was done in that respect. In those circumstances, do you see some reason to be very, very concerned about how the recantations took place?

Well, yes, we were interested in the way those statements were produced but, at the end of the day, Mr. Wolch had the opportunity to produce what evidence there was, and to argue that, --Uh-huh?
-- and our job was to test the evidence that was put forward and make whatever arguments we thought
were applicable to it.

Q
Uh-huh. Now you've said several times that Mr. Wolch, or counsel for Mr. Milgaard had the opportunity to present evidence, present allegations -- or present evidence to support allegations of wrongdoing and didn't do so. Like, what evidence would you expect somebody in David Milgaard's position to be able to produce, given the circumstances that -Well, $I$ mean, he had the prospect of calling other police officers and the two prosecutors and he didn't do that.

Okay. What evidence --
He was making allegations that they had misconducted themselves during the investigation, and that the prosecutors had covered up when they obviously knew David Milgaard was innocent and Larry Fisher was guilty, he didn't call evidence on that.

Yeah. As I indicated to you, I'm trying to stay in a -- in more of a systemic framework. What evidence, if we have statements of people like Nichol John and Ron Wilson that underwent this transformative process that went from being "we came, we saw, nothing happened" to being
statements of "I saw him commit the murder, I heard him confess to the murder, $I$ know where things were put that nobody else but the murderer would know"; if a person in David Milgaard's position, not David Milgaard, what would you expect them to be able to call as evidence when there are no reports, no notes, no tape recordings, and no memories?

Oh, I --

What could they bring to Court?
Ms. McLean, you are absolutely right, after a certain number of years it's going to be very -the task David Milgaard faced --

Yeah.
-- was a difficult one. Now he claimed he had some evidence, some new evidence, but set that aside for a moment.

Uh-huh?

If all he is saying is, you know, "things weren't fair, people were -- the witnesses lied, the jury got it wrong" --

Q
Uh-huh?

A
-- the short answer is it's going to be very difficult for him to convince anybody, on the basis of that, that there's been a miscarriage
and, frankly, it's not likely going to happen. I mean if the witnesses, like for example Mr. Karst was called as a witness at the Supreme Court, he was asked by the Attorney General, counsel for the Attorney General of Saskatchewan or for the Province of Saskatchewan, if he had done anything improper in the questioning of the witnesses and he denied it, there's really -- and I'm not suggesting, for the purposes of this question, that Mr. Karst personally did anything in taking those statements necessarily -- but in the absence of anything that could support it aren't you just stuck with Mr. Karst's answer? Umm --

And, again, I'm talking systemically, I'm not talking --

Well actually, Ms. McLean, systemically there is other evidence you can bring, and the evidence would be "this is what happened then", call a police officer from today and say "okay, now how would you deal with these witnesses today".

Q Uh-huh?

A
And the answer is going to be "a whole lot different than they were dealt with then". Uh-huh?

A

Q
A
Q
A
$Q$

A
Q
A
Q
A
$Q$

A
$Q$

You could not grab a pair of 16 -year-olds out of Regina, jerk them up here, hold them in police cells and interrogate them the way that was done in 1969, that simply wouldn't be permitted today. What's more, there would be some expectation that a record of that conversation -- those conversations would exist, whether it's a tape, --Uh-huh?
-- like video tape or video disk --
Uh-huh?
-- or a transcript, or something, --
Uh-huh?
-- or, at the very least, detailed notes. Uh-huh?

I mean --
And how -- sorry?
The problem is David Milgaard was stuck with dealing with what happened back then.

Yeah.
They might have called evidence to suggest "well, this would be done different now" and "why would you do it different", "well, because it may produce skewed results".

Yeah. But how would that help in proving or establishing that, in this particular case, it did

produce a wrongful conviction or a miscarriage of justice?

A
Well, because it then gives you some basis to argue that look, even though the police officers were following the practice at the time, everybody knows that nowadays that just wouldn't be an appropriate way to go about getting these interviews, and while they may not have known that then, it provides a basis to argue that the information obtained was not reliable.

And would you expect that the prosecution side, or the people that have been tasked with upholding the conviction, would argue that that is no evidence, that it was, in fact, a correct and -Well, I mean, that's a submission we would make. But the point is, if you are trying to get the best case you can --

Uh-huh?
-- for David Milgaard before the Supreme Court, why wouldn't you want to put that kind of evidence in? It seems to be -- it's certainly something that's solid and reliable in the sense that everything else they seemed to be calling was exploding on them.

Q Uh-huh?

A

Q

A
$Q$
in the Supreme Court, I mean we were interested to hear how his recantations came about. He just, I mean his -- you've no doubt read the transcript and, to put it bluntly, he was a mess, and we were sort of curious as to what Paul Henderson did to produce what appears to be a fairly coherent recantation.

Uh-huh. Did you wonder the same way about the -what may have been done with Nichol John and Ron

Wilson in 1969 to stand their statements on their heads?

A

Q

A

Q

A
Q
A
Q
A
$Q$

A
Q

A
Well, that, I mean, there may have been
cross-examination with respect to that if he was produced as a witness or the tapes were brought
in, yes.
Q
Uh-huh. And what could Mr. Henderson have done to Mr. Wilson to cause him to recount falsely in your view?

Well, Ms. McLean, if you saw Ron Wilson's performance in the Supreme Court, if Paul Henderson had followed him around often, long enough making the suggestion long enough, he would have admitted he killed John Kennedy. Ron Wilson was just the kind of person that could be led around fairly easily and influenced very easily. And in part you got that evidence from talk -- you got that information from talking to police officers that had known him in 1969 in Regina? Well, yes. When he was fairly young he was -- I mean, their view was that he would be somebody that would be easily influenced by someone he liked or he thought highly of like David Milgaard. Uh-huh.

Although again, when you look at the preliminary hearing and the trial transcripts, my recollection is he wasn't anywhere near as problematic as a witness in terms of being able to stick to what he was saying in '69 and ' 70 as he was in '92, which isn't surprising.

Uh-huh. But the opinions came from officers that had known him in 1969 and ' 70 in Regina; correct? Yes. Well -- and $I$ don't know exactly when he left, but it was sometime $I$ think in the 1970s, so they had known him for some time. He used to hang around with one of the motorcycle groups there. So Mr. Henderson couldn't put him in jail and couldn't, you know, really beat him up or give him any kind of rewards. He could offer him a charge of perjury if he recanted $I$ suppose, and that's something that was certainly considered with respect to Mr. Wilson wasn't it? Well, after the Supreme Court's observations, yes. Uh-huh.

Although we didn't consider that. I mean, that occurred in Ontario, so that was their problem. He can't put him in custody and, according to Mr. Henderson's interviews with the media, he said he spent about eight hours of gentle prodding before Mr. Wilson recanted. Mr. Wilson has given evidence that his conscience was bothering him. Do you think that's realistic, that his conscience would be bothering him?

It took a long time for it to happen.
Uh-huh.

A

A long, long time for it to happen.
And yet Mr. Wilson did in fact and in law in reality testify falsely at David Milgaard's trial?

Yes, that appears obvious.
And that evidence that he gave was effectively a recantation of his earlier statements; yes? The March or whenever they were, yes.

Yeah. And you told us the other day that there's numerous reasons why a witness recants, only one of which is that they didn't tell the truth the first time. Do you remember saying that?

Yes.
And from a systemic point of view, one of the problems that we have with wrongful convictions is when somebody is recanting evidence that was favourable to the prosecution?

Yes.
That's the sort of attitude, if $I$ can call it that, that we get back, that they are not recanting because they didn't tell the truth the first time, they are recanting because of some pressure or some reward or some benefit that they are going to get, and what $I$ want to ask you is if the same sort of thinking applies or should apply to recantation $s$ that are of the order of Ron

Wilson's and Nichol John's in 1969 where they recant an exculpatory statement and turn it into an inculpatory --

Well, Ms. McLean --
If $I$ could finish the question, please. One of the responses that we get is that they didn't tell the truth to the police, their recanting is the truth. Do you see how the way you look at what they say changes depending on what they are recanting?

Well, the way $I$ look at recantations is they raise a question. The first question is why has the person changed their mind.

Uh-huh.
Now, I'm not prepared to accept the notion that we always accept that the person has now decided to tell the truth or that if they recant something favourable to Crown they are now lying, I mean, those are possibilities, but if a witness recants what they've said, $I$ want to know why, and on a number of occasions when I've dealt with that as an appeal lawyer, the first thing $I$ did when $I$ got a recantation was send the police out to discover if there is any evidence of why this has happened, because, $I$ mean, it may well be true, but I'm also
aware of the fact that the people we deal with on a day-to-day basis, it's very often difficult to sort out what's true and what isn't, let me put it that way.

Okay. With respect to this case and Ron Wilson and Nichol John, we actually can do pretty well on what they said that was untrue, at least with certain specifics. In the face of absolute innocence on the DNA, is it troubling that Nichol John and Ron Wilson managed to insert into their statements on May $23 r d$ and May 24 th things that they could not possibly know?

Well --

In general?

I mean, if you are suggesting that the police discussed the evidence with them or their theories with them, $I$ suspect that's right and that's where a lot of that -- I mean, even assuming that they had got stuck by the funeral home or in that area as even Wilson still maintained, there was detail in there that had to have come from the police investigation up to that point. I mean, they wouldn't know, for example, about things in garbage cans.

Yeah. And this was used at trial really to
support the theory that David Milgaard did it and that Nichol John witnessed it?

Oh, absolutely. Those little pieces of evidence were seen as corroboration.

So we've got Mr. Roberts showing Nichol John Gail Miller's coat and then --

I think he did more than that, didn't he throw it at her?

He did a number of things, but I'm referring only to her statement which doesn't contain the actual interactions with Mr. Roberts, but her statement says "on May $23 r d$ Mr. Roberts showed me a coat. This coat, as $I$ recall, is identical to one worn by the girl we spoke to and Dave attacked." Can't possibly be true, she couldn't have identified a coat like that, she didn't see Gail Miller, she didn't see Dave attack anybody. Well, exactly.

And then we have David Milgaard is -- you probably don't remember, but Nichol John certainly would at that time -- David Milgaard was left handed, still
is. Dr. Emson did the autopsy report on Gail
Miller and wrote a report that said that the attacker is right handed, as is Larry Fisher, and as is the attacker on all the related rapes, and
then we have Nichol John saying I don't know which pocket he got the knife from, the knife was in his right hand. Does that suggest somebody told her to say that he used his right hand?

Well, $I$ would assume that she would have to get that from somewhere, although it's curious that the police would be that specific.

Uh-huh. Nichol John and Ron Wilson both, the knife that David is alleged to have had in the car, according to Nichol, "this knife was a kitchen knife used to peel potatoes and things like that, it had a maroon handle. This knife was the same as one of a group of knives that $I$ was shown by Mr. Roberts," and then Mr. Wilson says in his statement, this is his May $23 r d$ statement: "Also today Mr. Roberts showed me 5 small knives at the Cavalier Hotel and I picked out a brown bone handled one which I had seen Milgaard with somewhere between Regina and Saskatoon. He may have got this knife from the Champs Hotel where we ate that day. I don't know just where $I$ had seen this knife on him but $I$ remember it or one like it." Now, given that these two did not see David

Milgaard kill Gail Miller, given that Gail Miller was killed with a paring knife that exactly matches the descriptions given and exactly matches what was picked out in this knife lineup with Mr. Roberts, they had to have been given that information too didn't they?

And there's no question, but that the police took them on a tour of the scene, --

Uh-huh.
-- would likely have pointed out the various things to them. We knew a long time ago that they showed them the knives --Uh-huh.
-- so yes, there's no question the police gave them that information, and that's -- I go back to what $I$ said before, if you were going to ask a current police officer, current investigator would you do these kinds of things, I sure as heck hope the answer is no.

Uh-huh. Or approve of it being done?
Yes.
So essentially what has happened in this case is somebody who is completely innocent, that these witnesses have somehow given statements that incorporate information that they were given by
police?

A
Yes.
And there is absolutely no explanation as to why they did that?

Well, there's no -- well, as to why they did it?
No. As to how they got the information, I think that is on the file.

It was obviously said to them?
Well, there's references to being driven around and stuff like that.

I mean, the information had to have been fed to them, but why did they incorporate it?

Well, I mean, that's a good question, why did they decide to put David into it.

Uh-huh.
I mean, was it as, what's his name, Mr. Wilson said, that the police were giving him you or him, or was it just that they found the pressure being put on them by the police too much to bear, I don't know, but there's something there that would have tripped them over into doing it. Unless somebody can point me at some evidence that establishes that the police deliberately framed David Milgaard when they knew he was innocent, I'm not prepared to accept that.

Q
A

Q

A

Q

A

Q 25

What about if they --
I am prepared to accept, however, that their actions led these witnesses to getting information that they could use to come up with statements that put David Milgaard into it as the guilty party. Why I don't know.

I'm not suggesting that anybody framed David Milgaard believing him to be innocent on May the 23 rd and 24 th, 1969.

Well, your client has, that's an allegation Joyce Milgaard had made on a number of occasions.

Believing him to be innocent is the part I take issue with, sir. What's your response to a suggestion that the police manipulated these witnesses and this evidence because they thought David Milgaard was the person, because -- in other words, because they thought he was guilty.

No, I don't accept the notion that they attempted to get witnesses to give false evidence against David Milgaard.

That they attempted to get the witnesses to give evidence that was false but that the police believed to be true.

Well, okay, there's no question the police -- as 1 say, there's no question the police showed these
witnesses what they had and they may well have directed their questioning in such a way that they were asking, well, how do you explain this, how do you explain that.

Uh-huh.

And that would certainly end up, I suppose, if you have sort of weak-minded witnesses who are prepared to lie and have decided that that's the only way to get out of this, you may well have a situation where doing that is going to give them the opportunity to incorporate that extra information into their statements.
$Q$

A
$Q$ A couple of things just briefly. You testified on September the 12 th about Mr. Caldwell's note about Nichol John saying something at the preliminary hearing. Do you remember that?

It was during the preliminary hearing. I believe she was waiting in a witness room or something with another witness.

Okay. Could I have document 003847, please, and this was the note Mr. Caldwell had, it says:
"Mrs. Miller, Mary Marcoux, Albert Cadrain all heard N. John say, "I don't know why he didn't kill me too - I was right there \& ..."

Seen it all?
Saw it all.
"...but I'm not going to say nothing."
And Mr. Caldwell testified here October the 4 th of 2005, and the page number is 16098 , please, Mr. Caldwell's evidence after he reads the note allowed, he says that there was, in the waiting room --
"...there was, I believe, a witness waiting room involved in this and $I$ believe possibly Peggy Miller was also present, but that isn't revealed in this note. I went by this room and one or other of those three told me this indicating that all three of them heard it and $I$ wrote it down as promptly as possible on whatever $I$ had available." So he doesn't know who said this to him; right? Oh, who reported it, right. He doesn't know for sure who is there; right? Right.

Now, what were you going to ask Mr. Caldwell at the Supreme Court about this if he testified? I was just going to put the note to him and say where did this come from, how did it come about.
Well, $I$ would have asked him if, you know, if he
recognized the note and that would go in for
whatever good it did in evaluating whatever Nichol
John had left with the Supreme Court.
Was Nichol John asked about it?
I don't recall.
The answer is no.
Okay.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: When?

MS. McLEAN: In the Supreme Court, sir.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.
A If you say no, then $I$ take that as right.

MS. McLEAN:
Do you think if you wanted to put that evidence before the court, that the most appropriate way to start with is to ask Nichol John if she said that? Well, at that point $I$ don't know that we were
thinking about that note in particular. It was something that was written by Bobs Caldwell and if it was going to go in, it would go in through him. Okay. Or that any of those people should be interviewed to find out whether or not they supported that claim?

No, I didn't consider that at that point.
Okay. The other thing that you said a number of times in your evidence, and this is about the chicken soup and the heater thing, you said a number of times that this was an absolute alibi for the time of the murder if true?

If true.
Because it would put David at a time and a location when he couldn't possibly have done it? Well, it would have put him well on the other side of the river at around seven o'clock when the murder occurred, you know, within five or 10 minutes thereof.

Yeah.
It wouldn't have been possible for them to drive from there to where the murder occurred.

If seven o'clock is accurate?
Well, if the seven o'clock or 10 to seven sort of time frame is accurate, yes.

Q

So if you rely on David's timing as given in 1992 about the uneventful day in 1969, you come up with seven or 10 to seven, but if you use Ron Wilson's evidence and his statements, they arrived in town about 5:30, 6:30?

Yes.
Nichol John's evidence, they arrived in town about 6:30?

Okay.
The police theories in 1969, that the kids had this huge amount of unaccounted for time on their original stories because they had arrived so early. If they had actually arrived early in town, this would be no alibi at all would it? Well, except that -- I mean, I lived in Saskatoon at that time and $I$ was familiar with the area that they are talking about and there wouldn't have been a garage open at 6:30. The earliest anything opened would be just before the sort of business traffic started at around seven. Or maybe someplace might have been just opening or your memory may not be complete of 1969? Well, that could be, but $I$ have to say that the places $I$ was aware of wouldn't have been open. Yeah.

A
$Q$

A
Q

A

Q

A
$Q$ So the argument that's made, and we don't need to bring it up, it's document 206801 , it's page 29 of that document, and it's actually number 206833, this is the argument put forward by Saskatchewan at the end of the reference, that Mr. Rasmussen was first asked to recall the events on June 12th and he opened up at seven and they came in shortly
after, and the argument here is what shortly after means is open to considerable interpretation given the passage of some four and a half months. "...it is open to the reasonable interpretation that this was the first event of the day after opening..."

That stood out in his mind; therefore, he puts it happening early in the workday. That's the same kind of thing that would have happened if this had been offered -- if the chicken soup had been offered as an alibi isn't it?

A

Q Now, this casting of the chicken soup as an alibi is something that's being done by Saskatchewan, it's not done by Mr. Milgaard. Do you realize that?

A

Q
A

Well, why did he bring it up?
He brought it up because it was -- well, as to why he brought it up who knows, but his evidence was that his concern was about the garage, the chicken soup guy, because it would clarify where they came in.

Well, his evidence was that he gave that information to Justice Tallis so he could check it out and produce it at trial and Justice Tallis didn't do that.

Not as an alibi, sir, that's my point.
Well, what else would you call it?
Well, he called it giving an explanation, a correct explanation as to what part of the city they came in, that they came in at a place that was not near the murder scene, they came in where there was --

If that's put before the court, doesn't that amount to an alibi?

Q It amounts to a way they came into the city that contradicts the theories that were being put forward and the places that they were, it has nothing to do with the timing.
Well --
If he could --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Excuse me, I'm just wondering where that evidence comes from.

MS. McLEAN: David Milgaard at the Supreme Court, 013092 .

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes.
MS. McLEAN: And it starts at approximately 013258 and runs through to 261.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh, just a minute now, it starts at where? So the document is 031092 ?

MS. McLEAN: Yes.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: And the testimony is at?

MS. MCLEAN: 013258 and runs through to 261. I may be out a little bit on that, I had some CaseVault problems last night. And then also this is --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I would like to see it pulled up, please.

MR. HODSON: We're going to try. The number again, Joanne?

MS McLEAN: The main document number is 013092 .

MR. HODSON: Which page?
MS. McLEAN: 013258. This was really -the answer here.

MR. HODSON: Are you waiting for us?
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Have you read
that?
I've read that portion, yes.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Scroll down,
please. Next page? Well, Mr. Brown, if you want to see more, just ask for it.

A
No, I'll accept that David Milgaard thought that that may contradict the witnesses, but I'm still of the view that that provided him with a pretty substantial alibi and he would have to know that. BY MS. McLEAN:

Okay. Moving on, you've also indicated, and this is not something that you, I would expect you to know, sir, because it wasn't available to you, but you've made a suggestion that this was a recent fabrication at the time of the Supreme Court, and given your views on it being an alibi and given the evidence that you knew, I'm not challenging you saying that, but factually January the 22 nd of 1981, the document is 155260 at pages, I don't need to bring it up, but just for reference, pages

155261, 262, 264 and 270, and that's a taped conversation that the participants are Joyce Milgaard, Peter Carlyle-Gordge, David Milgaard and Gary Young, his lawyer, in 1981, and there is also 048235 and that is a --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: When was this conversation, please?

MS. McLEAN: January 22 nd of '81.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.
BY MS. McLEAN:
And there is a letter to Ron Wilson, perhaps we should bring this one up, it's 048235. I can't give a date on it, it's a letter from David to Ron Wilson indicating that he was before the parole board last June, he's got two more years before full parole, so perhaps this document could be dated that way. But he says:
"I want you to go to a lawyer
of your choice and put this thing right.
You can do so without getting yourself
in trouble. You will also probably end
up with the 10,000 , still up for grabs,
I do not give a shit about the money."
And that is a reference to the $\$ 10,000$ reward offered by the Milgaard family, which was at the
end of 1980 , so we can say this letter was written after that, but I'd have to go back through the evidence to find out when the reward money was used up. So it's sometime after 1980 and before 1990 , which is when Ron Wilson did recant?

Well, yeah, I would assume he would have been eligible to apply for parole after ten years -Yeah?
-- so you are looking '79-'80, something, earliest.

Yeah. I mean it's after ' 80 and before '90. And then he goes down here, asking Mr. Wilson to put things right:
"Think back to early morning Saskatoon, the boulivarded road that we really came in on... remember an old lady we saw probably headed for a bus, we turned around in the intersection and cruised by... I am not sure if we stopped or not... we then kept on until we had some soup at a garage before we crosses ...", should be 'crossed':
"... a bridge and went downtown and then on to Cadrains. We never killed anyone,

I never killed anyone. It is all in your mind just like it is in mine; $I$ want you to tell it like it was." Okay. So that's just, just for your information, so that it isn't a fabrication in 1982; okay? Okay.

Systemically, this entire proceeding -- that can go now -- this entire procedure for David Milgaard did not work terribly well, if you think about the end result or the desirous result to be completely cleared, the Court process didn't work that well; did it?

That's an understatement, yes.
Okay. And do you think there might be some merit in having a board or a body that's completely independent of the adversarial and the court process to have a look at cases in their entirety rather than this --

Well, certainly, referring it to the courts, in my view, probably is a difficult process because the only model we have for working in the courts is an adversarial one, --

Uh-huh?
-- and that necessarily assumes that one person is going to argue "yes", the other person is going to
argue "no", and that --
Q
Uh-huh?
I mean, aside from this case, there have been other cases I've looked at where that's probably not a particularly good model to use. Now, you know, past that what you use for a test for re-opening cases, you know, we can argue about that for a long time, but $I$ think you are right, the adversarial model is not a particularly good one.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: But the first part of the process didn't involve an adversarial model, supposedly, --

Well --
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: -- it involved
a -- under 690 it involved a department of the government investigating? Is that what you are referring to, or are you referring to both stages?

MS. McLEAN: Both stages. I'm certainly not taking the position that the section 690 process is not adversarial.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well what was the purpose of your suggestion, then, to suggest that a board do the investigating --

MS. McLEAN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: -- or a board do the remedy part of it?

MS. McLEAN: The investigation, as in the Criminal Cases Review Commission, an independent board.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: But you seem to be talking about the Court?

Yeah, I'm talking about a Court process, for example what's going on in the Truscott case now, or what happened in this case.

Or even -- you know, we say
the 690 process wasn't an adversarial one, well with the greatest of respect, when you start calling people incompetent and stupid and all the rest of it, you do turn it into an adversarial process. That kind of response just, in my view, is not helpful, it doesn't help an applicant get their thing through.

But if you're suggesting that there should be a body that does investigations, or that the minister's group should have more investigatory resources, $I$ think you are absolutely right.

One of the concerns we had
when we went to Ottawa and looked at this was it had taken a long time to get to this point, and the reason for that became pretty clear when -the first time we stepped into Eugene Williams' office. He literally had boxes of files stacked around the periphery of his office, and it seemed to -- seemed to us that the resources just weren't there to be doing a timely job.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: He had too much to do on other things, you mean?

Yes. Well he was, it's my understanding that he was the principal investigator for this group and for the 690 references.

BY MS. McLEAN:
So what we had in 1991 at the end of the first application, by February 27 th of 191, by the first dismissal, we've got that -- we've got recantations that are made in 1969 in the circumstances we have been through earlier with the police, and then we've got a recantation of one of those statements, we've got all of the Fisher stuff including that he favours nurses that ride on busses in his neighbourhood, we've got a failure to act on Linda Fisher, a failure to act in any way -- and $I$ mean her statement in 1980 to
the police -- a failure to act in any way to his confessions to similar rapes in the neighbourhood, non-disclosure of evidence that was fatal to the Crown's theory, and at the end of that it's not enough to get Mr. Milgaard into Court for a hearing.
Do you -- my suggestion would
be, if you have an independent body that is divorced from the prosecutorial arm of the government, it could look at all of the case and come to a conclusion that perhaps we have had the wrong person in jail for 23 years and the real killer is walking around?

Oh, I --
Isn't that more likely to happen?
-- I don't sort of object to the notion that it's probably better to have some -- I mean, you know, federal Department of Justice/provincial Department of Justice, I said before that at the end of the day the public really doesn't separate the two departments, it's 'the administration of justice', and what was going on was causing concerns for both our operations.

Uh-huh?

Yeah, I -- and, I mean, we're dealing here with a
murder, but suppose you are dealing with somebody convicted of some drug operation, how does the Federal Government look at that, because they are the very people being investigated? And that was part of my concern as well, with us being involved in the Supreme Court, we were being investigated, --

Q
A
$Q$

A

Q
A think.

Or a review body that will go and get the evidence?

A

Oh, oh no, absolutely.
Yeah.
Your review body is useless if it doesn't have the ability to investigate.

Briefly, you asked about the -- you asked the other day about the Linda Fisher statement in 1980 that did not come to the attention of the authorities, other than the police in Saskatoon?

It -- I -- our information was that --
Yup?
-- it was received and put on a file.
Yup. And that's information you found out long afterwards, it's not information you received in 1980, is it?

No, that's right, --
Yeah.
-- it was brought out later.
So you would at least, I imagine, support a recommendation that the police, at the very, very least, advise the Crown attorney of the new developments in the case?

Well, advise us or --
Somebody?
-- routinely look into that kind of thing, because
I think the failure there was nobody did anything
with it, it just lay there.
And then you have also told us --
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Now just a minute. MS. McLEAN: Sorry.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Now we've heard other evidence, admittedly hearsay evidence, that the file was assigned by Inspector Wagner, who took the statement to constable -- or Detective Parker, who was involved in the investigation, and that that person, by reason of the fact that the description of the knife did not fit the murder weapon, dismissed it at that stage as being a complaint worthy of following up. That's the best sort of conclusion one can draw from the available evidence, although $I$ concede that the available evidence is anything but direct.

A

BY MS. McLEAN:
And you've told us the difficulties that the Saskatoon police had in 1997, even after DNA they had a very difficult time because there had been so much time and belief invested in this case; right?

Yes.
Do you think that the investigating police force
is the appropriate force to be looking into new developments, or should it be another --

No, for the very same reason that $I$ don't think the Department of Justice that's being investigated should be involved in looking into it. Either you get a neutral, fresh set of eyes on it, or you run into problems where people are going to, as happened with the knife, say "well, in my view this amounts to nothing because the description doesn't matter".

Uh-huh.
I, with respect Mr. Commissioner, I still take that as meaning they did nothing about it. At the very least, someone should have inquired as to who Larry Fisher was, where he was at the time, and I mean there is a number of things that could have been done to follow that up. Did they know, for example, that when Linda Fisher came in, did they know that they were living in the very same place that the Cadrains had lived? That should have raised some suspicion, because one of the key pieces of evidence against David Milgaard was finding her wallet nearby.

In the last little bit you were asked, towards the end of your examination-in-chief today you were
asked about the letters that you wrote to the police -- well, the letters that you wrote to the chief of police about the DNA results, and that's the one you said there's reasonable and probable grounds to believe Larry Fisher committed the murder, and then you've told us about the difficulty that Saskatoon police had in dealing with the new reality, --

A
$Q$

A

Q

A

Q
A

Q

A

Q
A

Yes.
-- if $I$ can call it that?
Yes.
And these would be police officers in 1997, some 28 years after the offence?

28 years after the offence, and after three or more years -- well, no, three years, what am I saying --

Yeah?
-- of being told by the Milgaard people that they were corrupt, that they had conspired. That publicity campaign at that point, I think, came back to bite them because --

Okay. My question --
-- because --
Sorry?
-- because the police at that point, I think,
didn't just have sort of an intellectual investment, they had an emotional one.

And my question really was not going to have anything to do with that, it was going to be that, in that 28 years, these aren't the same police officers that were involved in the case in 1969 and '70?

Oh, I don't think there were any of them that were still there.

And the response is coming from people that weren't involved in the case and it's almost like an institutional protection of reputation or of the institution itself; right?

Well, possibly. They were people who would have known the folks involved --

Uh-huh.
-- and who would take considerable umbrage at the kind of personal attacks that were being leveled against them.

If we can go to 077503. This is the newspaper
account of Mr. Fisher leaving Saskatchewan,
leaving Saskatoon, it's dated July the 25 th, has packed up and left late Wednesday night, so that would be the night before, he has been implicated in the DNA testing, and then we have the line
here:
"But police did not arrest Fisher, though they spoke with him last Friday."

And then we have the RCMP involved in the new investigation in Miller's death, and Mr. Fisher is then arrested by the RCMP in Calgary, I think on the $27 t h$ but I'm not positive?

It would have been shortly after he left here. Yeah. So you've got him, you get the results on Friday morning, Friday night he's talking to the police, and I believe there's actually been media coverage that he went in to the police station, and this is somebody --

That could be, I don't know.
-- who is a serial rapist, who lived in the Cadrain house, who favours nurses, rides busses, and he matches the DNA profile?

Yes.
And the Saskatoon police sent him home?
Well, as I say, they -- they were of the view, when $I$ spoke to them that morning, that just being told what the results were wasn't adequate, that, in their view, there was no reason to believe he was guilty, which caused me considerable concern
because, as far as $I$ was concerned, --

Q
A
$Q$
A

Uh-huh?
-- we were now in a -- I didn't mistrust the information $I$ got from England or from the Federal

Government, I -- as I said, I spoke to the man that did the testing.

Uh-huh?
I anticipated the paperwork would be there momentarily, and in my view the case was there.

And indeed, when you look at what was ultimately presented at trial, there was nothing new between the 18 th and 27 th, or whenever it was, that he was arrested, although $I$ do know the RCMP did make inquiries of his neighbours and his -- and a woman he was living with and things like that, I -- I didn't know why it was taking this long.

I mean it was your view he should have been off the streets on July the 18th; was it not?

That's right.
Thank you. Those are all my questions.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: 1:30 then.
(Adjourned at 12:33 p.m.)
(Reconvened at 1:30 p.m.)

## BY MR. WOLCH:

Mr. Brown, for the record I'm Hersh Wolch, counsel
for David Milgaard.
What a surprise.
Nice to see you again. You indicated, and $I$ think
it might have even been this morning, what $I$
sensed was sympathy for what David had endured as a 16-year-old boy going into a penitentiary, I think the words you used was 'a good-looking boy going into the pen', and then during all those years in jail?

Yes, well, you read the records from the Correctional Service of Canada during the Supreme Court reference.

Okay. Well, without going through them in any detail, you realized that he had been attacked, he had been violated, he had been shot, he'd been misdiagnosed, he'd -- it's a horrific story where, at times, he declared himself not to be human so he could endure the -- what was going on in there, a terrible story?

Yes.
And when you were dealing with him at the Supreme Court level, did you have that degree of sympathy then, or has it really come from your understanding that he's innocent?

A
No. Umm, certainly when we were dealing with him
in the Supreme Court, while he -- there were certain aspects of what he did and said that didn't make him terribly sympathetic. There is no question that we knew, then, the sort of horrors that he had to deal with in jail, and no, that makes him sympathetic.

Now you referred to the fact that -- and we may disagree over time -- but you referred to the fact that he may not have been believed, or he was not credible, or matters of that nature. And $I$ take it you know even that Steven Truscott, you know, was specifically found not to be truthful. How does somebody, here a 16-year-old, there a 14 -year-old who was facing execution, how does somebody, all those years later, come into Court and have their credibility assessed? That is, what can you look at or how much do you think should be allowed, leeway, for somebody who has been through that kind of experience?

Well, Mr. Wolch, if David Milgaard had come into Court and said "you know, it's been 22 years, I have been going through hell, $I$ have no recollection of what $I$ told Justice Tallis except that $I$ told him the truth", --

Well - -

A
-- and then Justice Tallis comes in and gives a list of things that David told him, David would look far more credible than if he comes into Court and says "I told him this, I told him that, I told him the next thing, he didn't do any of these things for me", and then Justice Tallis comes in and says "well, no, that's not quite the case". Well, but could -- would not a number of items be a matter of perception; that is, whether he was visited many times in jail or not, his perception and Justice Tallis' perception might very easily differ, thinking back? By that $I$ mean Justice Tallis might be going a bit on what his normal practice is, David might not know how many times a lawyer would visit a client, they may have different perceptions on things that hardly, I think, would suggest, is very important in a credibility assessment?

Well except as I recollect, Mr. Wolch, David Milgaard's evidence essentially was that he wasn't getting to see Tallis very much at all, that Justice Tallis was largely ignoring him, $I$ think they blamed that on the notion that he was being funded by Legal Aid and therefore wasn't putting much effort into the case, that was the -- it
wasn't a matter of whether it was, you know, two times, three times, ten times, it -- the issue was whether or not there was much attention being paid to it.

Well, even a decision to testify could be a matter of perception? That is, to David, his lawyer recommending he not testify, at 16 years of age, might have looked like a direction or --

Well --
That is it could be a matter of perception? I don't know what else it might be.

Well, except that David Milgaard was perfectly clear that he told Justice Tallis he wanted to testify and he didn't get called, and that certainly wasn't Justice Tallis' perception. Do you have any comment on the notion that the wrongly convicted, at least at that time and $I$ think it still is the case, must waive privilege? Well, they don't have to waive privilege with respect to counsel unless you are making allegations of impropriety by -- against your counsel, and then $I$ think the law says you, in effect, have waived privilege.

No, I'm suggesting that David had waived it long before, for Justice, in order for --

A

In order for them to discuss --
Yes.
Yeah.
But they insisted --
Yeah.
-- that he waive his right to privilege so they could talk to Justice Tallis?

I, quite frankly, Mr. Wolch, I don't have a huge problem with that. At that stage of the game the Crown has proven beyond a reasonable doubt that the person is guilty, if they want to now come forward and say "I'm not guilty, I have never said I was guilty", I think all sources of legitimate inquiry should be open, and that includes "well, okay, we want to talk to your counsel and find out why you ran the defence you did."

Okay. So what -- so but in other words, though, would you not recognize that could erode the basic principle, because any accused would have -should be warned "lookit, if you are wrongly convicted, whatever you tell me now will not be confidential in the future"?

Well, I suppose if you care to take up that thought at that stage of the proceedings, then of course you can certainly warn the client. But
again, though, your point is do $I$ think that's right? I see nothing wrong with handing it that way.

Q
No, I'm asking you this because the Commission will be making recommendations on many things, and one of the things that $I$ find troubling is the notion that the wrongfully convicted have to waive privilege in order to put forward their 690 claim, and I just wanted to get your views on that? Well there really isn't any other way, I suppose, to determine why the matter was -- why the defence was conducted in the way it was, and in particular, in a case like David Milgaard's, why he didn't take the stand, why he wasn't called. He didn't have a significant criminal record at that time.

He had no criminal record.
I thought there was one youth conviction or something. But, I mean, it was nothing.

No, you are right. And you think the idea of why he didn't testify is a proper consideration? Yes.

And as far -- leaving aside Tallis, let us assume David Milgaard did what you recommended or suggested would be a different approach; is there
any way a Court can say "we believe you, you're innocent", realistically?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

You mean just on the basis of his statement alone? Well he walks into Court and he says "I didn't do it, I told the police the truth at the very outset, nothing is changed, I'm innocent", and you ask no questions because there isn't much to ask about that, and it's over on that portion; can a Court then say "we believe you, you're free"? Well, I suspect it's unlikely that, just on that basis, they would be inclined to make that kind of assessment.

But I'm looking at this particular case and, in many respects, I would suggest David Milgaard's evidence on a reference or a 690 is really of minimal importance?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well, I thought you were talking about the trial, Mr. Wolch? MR. WOLCH: I meant that, yes. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: You meant section $690 ?$

MR. WOLCH: Both. I will be more specific. Thank you.

BY MR. WOLCH:
Okay. Coming into the Supreme Court, okay, David

Milgaard puts on the record "I'm innocent, I'm innocent". Now, I mean, surely credibility findings cannot be made on that, there's nothing to -- you have to look at the rest of the case, that's -Well that's precisely right, Mr. Wolch, you have to look at the rest of the case plus whatever David Milgaard says.

But what $I$ am saying is it's impossible to expect an assertion of innocence, even if unchallenged by cross-examination, to have the trier of fact say "yes, we just accept you are innocent"? Well, and to that extent, Mr. Wolch, you are right. A mere bald statement that "I'm innocent" doesn't give anybody anything to go on. That's why there has to be other evidence, other examination or cross-examination of that witness, and a comparison of what that witness says with other witnesses.

Yes, but that's what $I$ am getting at, is that the witness himself, the accused himself, can't carry the day by himself, there's got to be something somewhere else, either discredit the Crown's case or bring in new evidence?

Yes, generally speaking, that would be correct.

Q

A
Q

A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A

Q

A

Okay. And now, 23 years later, he's trying to remember what happened on that morning, it's basically a fairly impossible task, isn't it? Well, and as $I$ recall, when we were pushing him, or when Eric Neufeld was pushing him on that, the Chief Justice noted for the record that while he may not remember the details of the day, he | Meyer CompuCourt Reporting |
| :--- |
| \& Saskatoon since 19 |
| Central Booking - Call Irene @ 1-800-667-6777 or go to www.compucourt.tv | change the truth though?

No.

A

2
remembers he didn't kill anyone.
Exactly.
Well --
Exactly, that's what he does remember
specifically. But doesn't it, at some point in
time, just become a memory test, like what can $I$
remember from my statement, what can $I$ remember from my other statement?

Well except, Mr. Wolch, that's -- 20 some years after an event like that, it becomes a memory test for every witness, including the accused. I don't know how you avoid that.

Right. Okay. I want to turn to a different topic, and one that you referred to quite a few times, and that is the media --

Uh-huh.
-- and the role, the role of the media. Now you are familiar with the basic principles about the freedom of the press, the Charter of Rights for the media, the importance of the media in a democratic society; I don't have to go through that at great length, do I?

No.
And it's fair to say that Crown/police use the media extensively?

A Umm, yes, that's true.
Q
I mean there are media representatives, media agents, $I$ think even some police officers are trained to be the liaison with the media?

That's correct.
So use of the media in the criminal justice system
is not really limited to one side or the other,
and it's fairly --
No.
-- fairly commonly used?
Exactly, yes.
And most people using the media prefer to have favourable spins put on what they say?

Well, most people using the media are obviously interested in getting their message out, yes.

Yeah. And now I'm a little interested in
analysing it in the sense that you seem to be saying that what occurred here in the media was wrong or unfair, or whatever adjective it is, but at the same time, without the media, there would be a horrible injustice in this particular case? Well, no, what $I$ said was some of what was going on in the media was outrageous, and clearly it was. The statements that Mrs. Milgaard and David Asper were -- and you were making with respect to
the value of some of the evidence were clearly misleading. When it became time to start making outrageous accusations against people in order to generate some public concern favourable to your cause, $I$ would consider that to be inappropriate. But with respect to the news media, since the mid-'80s, with the consolidation of the various news agencies that we've had, there's been a steady decline in the number of people in those agencies doing the reporting, and we're at a point now where news media people pretty much have to take what they are given by people like you and me, and they run with it. There is no opportunity for them to check it.

Well --
And your camp certainly took advantage of that. Well, let's analyse it a little more. The media in this case reported the case extensively; correct?

Parts of it, yes.
And the media uncovered a fair bit of the evidence. I'll be more specific if you like. Yeah. I'm not aware of how much they uncovered. Well, the Larry Fisher convictions, the CBC went out and found them, things like that?

A
Q

A

Q

A
Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A

Q

Well, okay.
And in fact it could be argued that the media coverage perhaps caused the Larry Fisher name to be brought to the Milgaard's attention?

Well, except $I$ understand Joyce Milgaard had it sometime earlier than that, in the '80s.

But not as a suspect in the case or anything like that, or the convictions?

Well, that's fine, yes.
Okay. Now, in terms of what was being put into the media by the Milgaard camp, the main assertion was that David was innocent?

Well, yes, that and the proof you raised to show that was the evidence you had obtained from what's her name, Deborah Hall.

Well, let's --
And so on, and, quite frankly, misrepresented a great deal of what was there.

Okay. Well, let's step back a bit. I'll get into that, but $I$ just want to get the broader picture and we'll get more specific. David was innocent was being put out there and a little later Fisher was guilty was being put out through the media? Yes.

And both of those assertions are true?

As it turns out, yes.
Well, they always were true.
Well, we know they are true now, yes.
Now, you chose Deborah Hall. Deborah Hall put a different interpretation on the motel room incident; correct?

Yes.
And --
But she did not say it did not happen or that -well, she didn't deny it happened.

Well, we know now if it did happen it was not a serious confession?

We know that now, yes.
So it may be that she was correct?
No, I don't -- the affidavit you filed was not correct.

Well, if she's wrong, she's wrong. An affidavit is not created by the lawyers, it's what the person says; is it not?

Well, that's true, but if you are going to put forward her statement as to what happened, you put forward a full statement, because with very little effort the federal government was able to discover
that, well, that's not quite what she had to say.
That's perfectly fine, but the job of the counsel

Q
is not to put words in the person's mouth or in their affidavit, it's their words.

No, but if you are presenting somebody as a credible witness saying these people lied, you would want to have a reasonably complete account from that person.

Well, now we know they very well may have lied. No, we don't.

Well, surely the lie is not that it was said, but a lie can be an interpretation; that is, $I$ took him seriously or $I$ didn't could be lie.

Well, if they took him seriously, they took him seriously. Why would that be a lie?

Well, because I'm suggesting to you that when you look at it now in light of David's innocence, if they took him seriously, they stayed and partied, they left him alone with a girl and they never changed in their attitude towards him, one might think they heard it and didn't take it seriously and now are saying they took it seriously. Well, I think they said they took it seriously in 1970 when they testified.

And that's the lie.
Well, $I$ don't know that you've got any evidence of that.

No, you don't have any more to go on, what you have is David Milgaard is innocent, but that doesn't mean that didn't happen and it doesn't mean that they didn't see it as inculpatory.
Okay. That's all I'm asking, they could be --
There wasn't any evidence of it, but, I mean -Well, just inference, and now we have more to go on and we have -haveis David Milgaardis innocent, but that

Q
A

Q

A

Q

A
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A
$Q$
A
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A
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Well --
They certainly said at the Supreme Court that they continued to think it was serious.

Well, these are guys who have been charged with murder, everything else, these are not the most credible of people.

No, that was before the court as well, that they weren't the most credible of people.

And Melnyk got the lightest sentence for a robbery at that time in Saskatoon history a few days later.

That was before the court.
Yeah.
That doesn't mean, though, that they were lying when they say, well, we took it seriously.

But they may be?
Well, yes, they might have been.

Q

A

Well, you had a witness named Edwards who said they confessed to her they lied.

Well, excuse me, you had a witness named Edwards who said that.

You had a chance to cross-examine her.
Frankly, as far as we were concerned, nothing she said, other than her name, was credible.

Okay. So I still want to talk about the allegations that you find so disturbing, and the gist of another allegation was a lack of disclosure; correct?

Yes.
And there was a significant lack of disclosure?
And I didn't say that that was the allegations that were disturbing.

Okay.
The allegations that were disturbing were the remarks you were making about the Federal Justice officials with respect to the fact that they were obviously not paying any attention to what you were saying, were not investigating and so on when you knew very well that wasn't true.

Well, with all due respect, Mr. Brown, that's one of the allegations here as being true.

Which, that they weren't investigated?

Q

A Well, with all due respect, she was being asked to refer the matter to a court.

Because she should find that your evidence proved David Milgaard was innocent?

Q

A
$Q$

Absolutely not. I'll show you the press clippings from Mr. MacFarlane.

Well, that's not my view of it, Mr. Wolch. Perhaps we should leave, you know, the Department of Justice -- they can answer it if we can get around the privilege or something, but let's leave that for a moment. I'm concerned with what really bothered you in the allegations.

Well, the allegations -- well, when you got past that, then there were allegations of corruption and cover-up that you were putting out through Mr. McCloskey, that provincial government officials obviously covered this up because they knew they got the wrong person.

You are talking about Fisher now?
Yes.
Okay. Well, the allegation was that Fisher was handled very strangely, as the Supreme Court said, it came to light in 1970, and that the allegation was that it wasn't disclosed.

No, no, that's not the allegations that I'm concerned about.

Yeah.
The allegations that were being made was that the inference to be drawn from all of this was

Q
corruption.
The inference was to be drawn that it was deliberately not disclosed.

No, that it was corruptly not disclosed, that was the allegation that McCloskey and Joyce Milgaard were making.

McCloskey, okay. But the thrust of it was it should have been disclosed, it wasn't, there's something wrong.

Well, that was ultimately what was argued in the Supreme Court, you didn't argue that officials were all that corrupt, although you raised issues, as $I$ recall, suggesting that everybody had to have known that this would be absolute proof that David Milgaard was innocent and that Larry Fisher was guilty and that it was then, there was a decision made not to tell people.

Well, let's go back. (V1)--- (V1)- was in the Miller file?

Yes.

Okay. David was still before the courts when Fisher got arrested?

Yes.

Okay. Mr. Kujawa had both files?
Well, he had portions of both files.

Q Okay.

A
$Q$

Q

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

A
Putting all that together, isn't that cause for concern?

It may be enough to make someone wonder why that happened that way, but that's not what you were doing, Mr. Wolch, you weren't asking why did that happen, you people went a step further and said that's proof of corruption, that's proof of cover-up.
The appeal record on David Milgaard would not include the police file or anything even close to that.

Okay. Mr. Karst, who took the significant statements in the Milgaard case, took the confessions from Fisher?

That's correct.
Fisher was dealt with in Regina?
Yes.
The victims weren't notified?
That's right.
The public wasn't notified?
Well, I mean, I don't know whether there were news stories with respect to Larry Fisher or not, but certainly there was no effort to sort of announce that.

Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

A

Q

A
Q

A

Q


Wouldn't it be natural to put in the paper, look, we caught him?

A

Q

A

Q
A

Well, if they remembered to do that, that would certainly have been $I$ suppose a good thing, but -the fact that somebody doesn't remember to do that is not in itself some sort of indication of sinister --

No, okay, but would you concede that to an observer, particularly one who 100 percent believes the wrong guy is in jail, when an observer looks at that, suspicion at least would flow?

I would concede that you would be, you know, well within your, $I$ suppose, reason to say, well, that's very curious, why did this happen, but that's a bit different than saying, oh, well, there was a conscious cover-up here, because that -- you know, you say you didn't use the word corruption. Well, not perhaps directly, but a cover-up is corruption, a cover-up is an obstruction of justice.

Well, it is quite, quite strange, is it not, that perhaps the worst serial rapist in Saskatchewan history didn't even get into the paper when he was caught and convicted?

Well, again, we didn't issue press releases to the news media saying, you know, $X$ will be in court
today, come and watch, you didn't do that in those days, and to be honest with you, we still don't do that.

Would you have expected him to get some time for committing the Saskatoon offences?

In Saskatchewan, since he came here with a 13 year sentence out of Manitoba, no.

Even though Manitoba wrote a letter --
To be perfectly honest with you, even today.

Even though Manitoba wrote a letter saying your offences were not considered in the 13 years?

Oh, the court here, the Court of Appeal here and the Queen's Bench are going to look at the totality and it wouldn't matter whether the offences were considered in Manitoba or not, we had, at that time, a considerably more lenient sentencing regime.

Well, except in this case the prosecutor recommended it.

Well, because he knew what the courts would probably go with.

Well, what's the harm in trying to get the worst rapist a little more time for what he did?

Well, Mr. Wolch, when prosecutors go before the court you'll appreciate they do it day in and day
out. You don't go in and make submissions that you know the court is not going to accept, you have to have some credibility with the court, and you do that by recommending sentences that you know the Court of Appeal is likely to uphold. Okay. So --

And 13 -- you know, you say he's the worst there is. Yes, that's probably true, but from that time period show me somebody who got even close to that for rape in this province, even multiple rapes. It just wasn't happening.

I could show you several, but -- would you agree with me, though, that it wasn't just those who were firmly convinced of Milgaard's innocence who saw something strange about the handling of Fisher, it was people in the legal community, people in the community?

Well, people who were reading the news reports that were coming from your camp, yes.

Well --
You were the ones who were saying this is evidence of a cover-up.
$Q$
Well, let's look at 004366 , this is an article in '91 by Dave Yanko in The StarPhoenix, and this is on the issue we're talking about, and here we
have:
"At least one longtime Saskatoon lawyer believes the handling of the case was "extremely unusual," considering Fisher's vicious sexual assaults and the public interest in seeing justice done.
"Surely you'd have thought that the police department and justice system would want to ensure the community was made aware that the person responsible for those crimes had been apprehended, dealt with and sentenced," says Silas Halyk, whose been practising law for about 30 years.
"That, to me, is extremely unusual and it makes you wonder why they wouldn't want it to be known at the time," Halyk added."

And I agreed with you already, that yes, it would raise concerns.

Sure.
A
It would make people interested to know why that had happened, but it doesn't reasonably follow then that you start making accusations of
corruption and cover-up.
Let's go further into the article if $I$ could. Could you put the whole article back? It's not like you weren't given a chance to respond, if $I$ can go here:


Q
A
$Q$

A

Q
A
Q

"I don't doubt that for a moment."
"You can't count on a confession to be admissible."

It seems to me what you are saying there is that rather than rely on the confession, police would continue to investigate.

That's what $I$ would have expected them to do, yes.
But the facts of this case, those who were
investigating didn't know about the confession.
Well, you mean Ed Karst? Ed Karst knew about the confession.

No, no, the other officers in Saskatoon.
Oh.
They apparently weren't told.
No, I don't know anything about that.
Okay, get back to the full page, just -- I'm
sorry, just one little bit here first. You don't have to bring it up, we can see it.
"Brown recalls a note on Kujawa's file suggesting there was a question on whether the confession was voluntary."

Did you recall that?
Well, $I$ don't recall it now, but if it says it there, then I'll accept that $I$ must have said that to Dave Yanko.

Do you recall making any inquiries as to what might have been wrong with Larry Fisher's confession?

Well, no, it just, this is a confession and you've got a pretty tough row to hoe if your case is based entirely on a confession. No, but this is more than that, this is suggesting there is a problem with the confession.

Oh, no, I don't know whether there was. I just noticed the confession, question mark.

Okay. So you would have checked on the file at that time?

A
Yeah. I checked on what we would have had there and it would have been, I'm guessing, just the head office file on that, and $I$ don't think -- I
don't think there were police reports on that at that point, $I$ think all we would have had was maybe a summary from the police.

Would you have gone to Mr. Kujawa and said look, there's a note here saying that this confession is problematic, why?

I did, and his response was he didn't remember. Perhaps it's not a question, but while we're here, I do note the comment from Mr. Fisher's lawyer, that he has doubts about the reasonable -- he has a reasonable doubt about Milgaard's guilt, that does seem a bit odd, but that's not a question, I just noticed that, it caught my attention. Okay, so that's one of the issues that was being raised in the media.

It was also being raised that
Linda Fisher hadn't been disclosed; correct?
Well, that was correct, yes.
Yeah.
It hadn't been disclosed to us either.
Well, true, but it's still an allegation or --
Yes.
$Q$
A
-- a problem with the system or whatever?
Yeah.
And then what got a lot of play was Wilson's
recantation, or his second recantation as
Ms. McLean points out?

A
$Q$

A
Q
A

Q
A

Q

A
$Q$
Okay. But Wilson was saying that he was whatever into giving the statement, he had said that, whatever you want to call it, manipulation, this evidence, we've got this evidence, we've got this evidence and then making the inference that all of this shows corruption and therefore this matter needs to be re-opened.
coercion, whatever?

A
Q
A
$Q$

A
Q
A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
Q
A
Q
A
$Q$

Manipulated, coerced or whatever it was.
That was his words; right?
Yes.
And if in fact, and we know he did, if he lied,
then there has to be some reason why he implicated
David, and the Commission will have to look at
that, but there must be some reason?
Oh, I agree.
Right?
Yeah.
And those who believe that David is innocent can clearly assert that the only reason he would have
lied would have been through manipulation and
coercion as he says, it's a logical conclusion?
Well, he was saying that.
Yeah, but you accepted it. If you believe he
lied, accepting that isn't very difficult?
No.
Right?
I would agree there's got to be a reason.
Right.
Coercion is one reason, one possibility.
And the assertion was that Nichol John's statement made no sense, just made no sense?

A
Q

A

Q

A

Q

A
Q
A

That was an assertion, yes.
Right. And to relate that to some sort of police inducement or whatever you want to call it would not be a huge leap, it's just the conclusion that may or may not be right?

It's one of the possible explanations and certainly $I$ would even go so far as to say one that would come to mind first.

Yeah. And in terms of the disclosure, again, here we have Ms. (V4)--- phoning up and saying hey, I got attacked that morning. Now, you and I can debate for a long time the value of her evidence, but would you agree with me it is something that should be disclosed?

Well, certainly now that would be the case. Back then, if the prosecutor looked at that and thought this really doesn't relate to much, there's no way

I can see defence counsel using it, then the law was that it wouldn't have to be disclosed.

Well, let's go back. The law then was what, LeMay, the duty to disclose anything that may assist the defence?

No, LeMay was later.
I thought that was in the '50s.
No, there's Boucher, the Queen and Boucher.

Q
A
$Q$
A
$Q$
A

Q

A
$Q$
A

Q
A
And the law previously clearly put it on the shoulders of the prosecutor to determine whether or not you felt that was exculpatory and useful,
The law never was anything relevant, it was anything exculpatory.

Well -Meyer CompuCourt Reporting
but Stinchcombe I think properly states that it shouldn't be made.

Well, the police had told Ms. (V4)--- that likely the same man committed both offences?

Well, that's their supposition.
No, but that's just a fact.
Yeah.
And on the facts of the case, it's hard to imagine a scenario where the Crown can say that David Milgaard attacked (V4)---?

Yes, but the problem, though, as well is that on the facts of the case, it would be difficult to say the person who attacked Gail Miller then had time to go over to where (V4)--- was and attack her too.

Well, it's 800 yards away.
Well, that's 800 yards in the winter.
Well, how long -- well, we know how long it will take there, but the bottom line is somebody likely attacked Ms. (V4)---. You don't believe her to be untruthful do you?

A
Oh, no, no, $I$ certainly accept that she was molested that morning. It's the validity of her identification of Larry Fisher as the perpetrator 20 years later.

She described him physically basically accurately, five foot two to four, a hundred and -- or stocky build rather?

To be honest with you, I don't recall what it was. No, I understand that, but that's my memory of it, I haven't looked it up for a while, but -Yeah.

But it couldn't be David, I mean, the description is totally off.

Well, that could be.
Height and build are totally off. But in any event, you know the argument about the railway track leading to the Cadrain house, etcetera, etcetera?

Past there, that neighbourhood, yes.
Yeah. And in terms of time, whether the attacker could get there or David Milgaard could get to the Travelodge, or across town, it's almost the same thing isn't it?

Well, except my recollection is that (V4)----(V4)--- was pretty specific about when she was attacked and it resulted in there being a bit of a window there of $I$ think 22 minutes for the attack on Gail Miller and then the attack on (V4)----(V4)---. Now, that's my recollection. I haven't
looked at the evidence.
I believe the common wisdom is that Gail Miller was attacked somewhere probably between 20 to and a quarter to, is probably the time.

Well, I would recall it being a little later than that. I thought the sort of earliest we got her out of the house was 6:45.

No, 6:35, but we'll get to that, I'm going to bring that up. But in any event, assuming -well, the attack would take what, five minutes maybe, if that?

I, frankly, can't conceive of an attack like that at 40 below, five minutes, 10 minutes, any time. It's got to be real quick?

But it would be relatively quick.
Okay. (V4)---- (V4)--- has 7:07 as a time, keeping in mind is that the last time she looked at her watch, is her watch synchronized, you've got to allow a little bit of leeway, we're talking a fair bit of time?

Well, as $I$ say, if your recollection is that she left at 7:35 and we were able to establish that, that provides a fair amount of time.

Okay, I'll come back to it. It's either 7, it's either 35 or 40 , but we'll get back to that.

MR. WOLCH: 6:35?

COMMISSIONER MaCCALLUM: No, he said 7 .

A

Sure.
Because she had the 7:00 bus, I think.
It's hard, it's 40 below, $I$ mean it strikes one as
kind of impossible to fathom; you've got David Milgaard raping and killing, you've got Larry Fisher, the rapist, waiting at a bus stop, and you've got a third guy attacking (V4)---- (V4)---, you've got three sexual predators within 800 yards at 40 below? I mean that's kind of bizarre.

Well yeah, okay, that's bizarre.
So it --
Doesn't mean it couldn't have happened.
Well, at 40 below there aren't too many guys running around attacking women?

One wouldn't think so.
It's hard to imagine two in the same morning, within 800 yards, by two different guys?

Well, yes, and it's hard to imagine even the Gail Miller incident at that time of the morning, at that temperature, I mean I --

Q I understand that.

A
Q

BY MR. WOLCH:
Yes. Okay. Another matter being raised at some point, at least, was the lack of disclosure on the

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: You mean the
information you refer to as the (V4)--- --
The (V4)---, yes.

-- of the people in the neighbourhood. Merrimans is the one name that comes to mind the most, but do you not agree that that's -- should have been disclosed?

Well, Merrimans were the people waiting for the taxi?

Yeah. At the very spot, necessarily, that had to have seen --

Well, yes, my view would be, even back then, you've got evidence of people saying that they were sort of looking out the window at that spot and didn't see anything. That would be, yes, something that should have been disclosed, in my view, even using the old Boucher test.

And, let me tell you, $I$ fully accept that you had not had the RCMP reports at your disposal until you found them, I'm not suggesting that you withheld anything, but those reports would have been very valuable to Mr. Tallis and to counsel in the Supreme Court; would they not?

Well I -- I mean it's certainly something you can use to challenge the statements of the witnesses, yes.

But, more than that, they had the RCMP theories? COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: You are relating
to -- you're talking about Riddell and Rasmussen?
A Yes.

MR. WOLCH: Yes, sir.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.
BY MR. WOLCH:
The theory about the same guy doing it, we have --
Penkala had that too, but -- the theory that the same person committed the Gail Miller murder, and they were right, but --

Yes.
Okay. But --
And originally, $I$ think if you go back to the early part of the continuation report on the Miller murder, I believe the police did have at least one or two other sexual assaults in there that they were thinking may be linked.

Yeah. My point, though, is that the assertion in the Supreme Court that Larry Fisher was the guilty party would have been bolstered by the Court knowing that that was the very same theory the initial investigators had?

Well, they had the police investigation report in the Supreme Court, --

No --
-- that was part of the materials filed, was it
not?
No, not Rasmussen's report.
Oh, no, right.
We've only got that here.
Right, no, those RCMP ones, that's correct. I
don't think --
They are very specific, we have seen them many
times, --
Yeah.
-- but they are very specific and they are very much focused, they include (V4)--- in there too, but they are very much focused on, well, Larry Fisher really?

Yeah.
You know, they don't know him then, but they focused on him?

Yeah, the person committing, yes.
Yeah. So what $I$ am saying is -- and once again I'm emphasizing I'm not suggesting it was withheld -- but what $I$ am saying is it would have been valuable to be able to say to the Supreme Court "look, the initial investigators were on the right track, it's not that we have this crazy theory about Larry Fisher, look, they thought that back then"; it would have helped?

A
$Q$

Dealing with the media, now the media normally is to report on newsworthy items, as simple as that, and we have investigative reporting as well, of course, but do you know of many instances where the media champions a cause and, if so, is that what you are saying happened here?

Well, I don't know that it was so much
championing. I mean there were a couple of people -- I think Dan Lett and Dave Roberts were certainly, $I$ would suggest, part of the Milgaard team, or saw themself as that, and that certainly seemed to be what Dan Lett was saying last October at the Winnipeg conference. But no, it's not a matter of the news media championing, it's a matter of them reporting what's being put out and, as I said, if justice officials are not prepared to come forward and say "wait a minute, that's wrong, that's not what the report says, here's the report", then we leave you the field, and we can't be critical of the news media for, in effect, producing a one-sided story --

Well, no, but --
-- because we're the ones leaving the one side there.

Okay. But I'm gonna suggest that if, if the newspapers started reporting questions regarding Paul Bernardo or Clifford Olson, or any of those notorious people, there is no need to respond unless there is something of some merit in what's being said or some ostensible merit on the face of it?

A
$Q$ ,
Well, or there's an obvious lack of merit to
what's being said.
Well I've given you the main allegations, Milgaard is innocent, Fisher is guilty, there's been a lack of disclosure, John is impossible, Wilson is a liar, Campbell is wrong; $I$ mean those are all right?

Well those -- and that, as I said, is not the thing that concerned us. What concerned us was the inferences that Joyce Milgaard and David and you were drawing with respect to what people did. The fact that there was no disclosure obviously meant there was an attempt to cover up, the fact that the minister got it wrong meant that her officials either lied to her or misinformed her, $I$ mean, --

Well --
-- come on, that's the part that's the concern. Well, they are not telling us what they told her even today?

Well, and I -- if you are saying that that's a criticism of what they did, $I$ would agree.

You are saying that --
It's my view that that material should have been made public.

Yeah, but you are saying what they told her is the
truth when you don't even know what they told her, we don't know, and the Commission doesn't know? No, no, I didn't say that. What I said was you people then said she was lied to, or $I$ mean it eventually got to the point where she was a co-conspirator, that's the part that's objectionable.

Well --
You are perfectly entitled to say "look, we don't know what the minister got", and quite frankly that was a very powerful part of the campaign that came after February of '91, --

Well what --
-- because when you are not prepared to come out and say "well $I$ considered this" or "I was told that, here's what my decision is based on", you know, it looks -- it looks difficult.

That hasn't changed today.
Well, that may be the case, but --
Well --
And I would agree that those kinds of things should be made public.

Q
Okay. If the minister comes to the wrong decision, if -- I mean no one can deny --

A
"look, she got it wrong, wrong decision", --

Q
A
Q

A
Q

A

2
A

Q
A
Q

A
Q
A
Q
A conclusion that there's corruption involved, that people are stupid, that they are lying to him?

Q
A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A

Q

A
Q

A
$Q$
A
Q
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Well, there is something wrong?
No, Mr. Wolch, I just don't accept that.
What I'm saying is David Milgaard releases privilege to his lawyer --

Well, once the Supreme Court pushed him --
No, no, before, to Justice Tallis.
Oh, to Justice Tallis, yes, and Eugene Williams.
He released privilege --
Yes.
-- and we can't even find out what the minister was told?

Well, no. And, Mr. Wolch, there is no point in beating around on this because I agree with you. Okay, and I appreciate that.

That should have been disclosed.
And still should?
And, as far as I'm concerned, still should, yes. Okay. Would you share my experience that -Well, let me just correct something. Okay.
'Still should' with the caveat that $I$ suspect the federal privacy legislation now makes that an extremely difficult thing to do. You would get a document that is basically a whole bunch of black lines.

Well, okay, I get your point. I won't debate that with you. But would you share my experience, and maybe you disagree, that most reporters, the people who report crime news, Court news, are intelligent people?

Yeah, well, they obviously have some ability or they wouldn't be able to do that job and -But, I mean, they get bashed all the time, "you misquoted me, you got that wrong"?

Oh yeah.
They have a difficult task and they are pretty bright people?

Yes, I don't have a problem with that. I mean you may not care for Dan lett that much but he's certainly a bright guy?

Well, that's your assessment.
Not yours?
I, well, I thought he was, without putting too fine a point on it, used like a cheap whore in respect --

Okay.
A
-- of disseminating the point of view of the Milgaard camp. Anything you guys said, Dan was more than happy to publish.

But, okay, the reporters at the Supreme court were
all top level?
Oh yes.
I think one of them -That's why they're there.
-- is on the criminal review board now or something?

I have no idea.
Yeah, I think he was the, became -- he worked for the court. But, in any event, the point I'm making is that these people are hardly ever going to champion the cause of somebody they think is guilty?

Oh, and Mr. Wolch, I don't for a moment think that these people were out there attempting to create a miscarriage of justice.

Well, just the opposite?
I'm sure -- I'm sure they believed that David Milgaard was innocent, and they believed that on the basis of what you were putting out and what Joyce Milgaard was putting out, and that we weren't responding to.

Okay. But they believed correctly?
Well, as it turns out, yes. But, on the basis of what they were getting, $I$ disagree that that supported that conclusion, and the Supreme Court
seems to have agreed with that.
Q

A

Q
A
Q

A

Q

A
Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
Q
A
Q

A
$Q$

A

Q
A
Q
A
$Q$

Well, he was there, it wasn't -- I didn't see it as developed, that sort of --

Not in this depth, --
No.
-- but it was there?
Yeah.
But Wilson and Fisher were the main thrust, the rest was a lesser degree, but those were the main thrusts of the --

Yes.
What were you going to say in response, your
department say "oh oh, no case against Larry
Fisher, he's innocent"? What could you say?
No, and I said it wasn't the factual reporting that was the problem, it was the comments that the -- the editorial comments that you and Joyce

Milgaard and David Asper were attaching to that, accusing officials of being corrupt and the minister of being a co-conspirator, --

That's --
-- that was the problem.
That's Campbell?
Campbell.
Did you have any reaction when the Prime Minister seemed to jump on board?

A

Q

A

Q
A

Q

A

No, I -- the only reaction that $I$ had with respect to seeing his meeting with Joyce Milgaard was that he was a heck of a lot smoother than Kim Campbell was.

I think her political career supports that. But, okay, so let's turn to the Supreme Court reference. Now what did you understand they were supposed to decide?

Well, my understanding was they were to look to see whether there was any evidence that David Milgaard had been the subject of a miscarriage of justice.

Any evidence?
That he would -- that he was -- or I believe the way it was phrased in one of the questions was whether his continued conviction would be a miscarriage of justice.

Did you place any particular meaning on the words "continued conviction"?

Well, yes. I mean that was put there, as I understand it, to cover off the prospect that, even if the Court found that nothing went wrong earlier on, if they were now of the view that there was new evidence, as in what's his name, Wilson's recantation, then the continued
conviction would be a problem, yes.
Okay. Well what would be your understanding, if the Court came to the conclusion that he was absolutely innocent, what were they supposed to find?

Well, that his conviction was a miscarriage of justice, they could have advised the minister that

That his --
-- his conviction was a miscarriage of justice.
Or his continued conviction?
Well, or continued conviction, yes.
So is there a difference in "continued conviction" and "conviction"?

Well, I think there is, and I think that's what comes out of the decision of the Supreme Court is that, while they were satisfied that things were done according to the law in 1969-1970, they were also of the view that, by today's standards, the Larry Fisher evidence should be available to the defence and should be something the defence can take to Court.
$Q$

A
If you use the word "continued conviction", when would the miscarriage kick in?

Well, $I$-- "continued conviction", if the
conviction continues after the decision of the Supreme Court, then the miscarriage continues. Well I'm going to -- I have trouble with that because --

Well, it's a little bit strange, but yes. If it takes two days for the conviction to be quashed we have two days of miscarriage?

Essentially yes, I suppose, if you wanted to interpret it in a very strict, limited fashion. Or isn't a more logical interpretation that there has been a miscarriage and that continuing it is wrong?

No.
Okay.
No. I think the language, on its face, is plain, and it was put in there to deal with the situation that, if the Court came to the conclusion that everything had been done alright and there was no evidence of misconduct by anybody, but that for some reason you now have concerns, then to continue the conviction in light of those concerns would be a miscarriage.

But, like, why would you have concerns today and not yesterday? Nothing has changed.

A Well, because Ronald Wilson hadn't recanted the
statement implicating David Milgaard.
Okay. But, if his recantation is accurate, then
--
Oh, well yeah, okay.
I mean it's not like -- it's not like things
changed when he recants, things change if he lied
at the beginning?
Well, not -- no. Again, $I$ go back to what $I$ have
suggested. If the Court finds that, according to
the standards of the day, everything was done
properly or there at least is no evidence of
improper activity, then it -- it's not a
miscarriage of justice at that point according to
the -- to that way of thinking. The miscarriage
begins if you are now of the view that there is
some concern with some of that evidence or there
is new evidence --
Okay.
-- that should be reconsidered.
You have a lot of experience with appeals so I'm
going to ask you this question. When a question
is posed to the Supreme Court, or any appellate
court, --
Yes?
-- would you agree that the courts are very
specific in answering the question?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A
Q

A
Q
A
$Q$
Yeah, "We want the truth." Now does that not suggest to you that it isn't that important how evidence was obtained but, more important, is the evidence true?

Q

A

A Yes.

So if
the worst police misconduct, but if it doesn't
lead to innocence it's irrelevant?
Well, no, I wouldn't say that Mr. Wolch. I think you get to the point of -- you know, my reading of what the Court said is "the new evidence you've presented doesn't establish he's innocent but it does establish the need for a new trial", and I would suggest that you have the same situation with respect to process. If you can establish that some part of the process significantly failed then, whether that establishes he is innocent or not, it results in a new trial.

No, but I'm saying for -- in any ordinary appeal how statements are obtained, voluntariness, are all very important?

Yes.
Correct?
Yes.
One might argue that in ordinary appeals it's the trial that's on trial. Have you heard that before?

Well, yes, the process and what happened in the courtroom.

Q

A
$Q$
A

The confession is, the confession is "if you go and look, the murder weapon is under the tree", and they find the murder weapon, but the
confession was beaten out of the guy, --

A
Q
A
is totally different, "did he get a fair trial, was there an error in law", that sort of thing?

A

Q

A

A
A
notwithstanding what they may find, might they do something for him, and in the final decision they said "you haven't established your innocence, you haven't established you are probably innocent, but you have established there is new evidence that should be put before a court and you be given the opportunity to face trial with that as a defence".

BY MR. WOLCH:
Q Okay. So --

A
$Q$

A

Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

A

Q Mr. Commissioner, I'm in your hands, I -COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well, if we take a ten-minute break or -- it means we'll get back in 15 minutes, and that --

MR. WOLCH: I'm going to suggest that --
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: -- we'll have a half an hour left.

MR. WOLCH: I think, in talking to counsel, that this witness will not be done today, I think it's pretty well assured, because I think there is two or three after me.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh, no, by you or by other?

MR. WOLCH: Well, I will be close. I don't want to unduly rush but I'm happy to take the break at your discretion.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes, okay, we'll take the usual break then. Thank you.
(Adjourned at 2:44 p.m.)
(Reconvened at 2:59 p.m.)
BY MR. WOLCH:
I just want to continue regarding the supreme Court and what it was about. There seems to be, you know, some disagreement as to whether they were to look into impropriety or not and what the results would be if they found impropriety, but issues such as -- well, for example, Nichol John at the trial, how she was handled, her statement getting to the jury, that's something the

Commission here I'm sure will be looking at. Was that considered by the Supreme Court? assume that if the Supreme Court says that they think David Milgaard got a fair trial, they turned
their mind to that issue and examined the record. I don't imagine they were just shooting from the hip.

No. Well, you all seem to suggest they were.
On some earlier occasions $I$ think the Chief Justice was, but when the decision was written, I don't believe that was the case.

So you are saying that even though nobody raised it, nobody argued it, nobody invited the court to look at it, that their finding that he got a fair trial meant that everything was appropriate with Nichol John?

Well, $I$ don't see anything in their decision suggesting otherwise. As $I$ said, all of that was before the court.

Okay.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Mr. Wolch, would it have been appropriate for them to deal with it if it had been advanced as a ground of appeal? The Supreme Court refused leave to appeal in the '70s.

MR. WOLCH: No, I don't think it would have been.

COMMISSIONER MaCCALLUM: The matter was res judicata.

BY MR. WOLCH:
Q
I agree with you, sir, but I'm just saying that the notion of a fair trial has to be looked at with some reservation because some issues weren't, either not there or were irrelevant to get to the truth that the Supreme Court directed counsel to go to. It doesn't matter --

Again, Mr. Wolch, the decision was before the court. I'm prepared to assume, unless somebody shows me otherwise, that they made that comment advisedly, and by that I mean they looked at what happened at trial and determined that that was a fair trial. Now, you may take a different view, but that's not in evidence.

If the Supreme Court had concluded that the jury should not have heard Nichol John's statement, would that have had any effect?

Well, it might have had an effect, keeping in mind that Nichol John's statement wasn't the only piece of the evidence.

No, but --
If the court is going to look at, you know, ultimately whether a trial was fair, my experience is they look at everything.

Okay, but the position of the Crown would have
been that her statement was partially at least true that she had seen the murder.

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A
$Q$
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But whether or not the jury should have heard it is irrelevant, especially if you are saying make something out of it, maybe it's true.

Well, no, there's still -- I appreciate that you don't accept the process was any part of the matter, but $I$ don't accept that.

Well, let's take a look at 327858.
And apparently the Supreme Court wasn't ignoring it because that's part of fair trial.

Sorry, 327858. Are you having trouble? I had trouble finding that actually. If it helps,
that's the -- that's it. I think Commission
Counsel went through this with you and this is your interview with CBC Radio.

A
Q Okay.
"Our job will be to examine the proof
they bring in and check it closely to
make sure that it is reliable, and to lead any evidence that indicates the contrary."

Is that how you --

A

Q
Okay, then going down a bit, the announcer says:
"To you. I mean the Supreme Court? I
guess what I'm getting at here is are you going to be able to look over the file of Larry Fisher?"

Turn the page:
"We've got all the file material on
Larry Fisher that still exists.
Announcer:
"Has that changed your case at all?"
Brown:
"No."

Announcer:
"Why not?"
Brown:
"Well, the difficulty with the Fisher matter Maureen is that quite frankly if

I were going to prosecute Mr. Fisher I would have no evidence $I$ could put
before the court.
The so called similar fact evidence is so nebulous and so vague that it really amounts to coincident and nothing else. And if $I$ were prosecuting him a court would not allow me to bring that evidence into trial, and $I$ know his council shares the view, that it's questionable whether it would even be allowable in his defence evidence in the Milgaard trial."

That was a view you held then. Do you still hold that view?

Well, the Supreme Court has indicated that that view was wrong, so no, I don't continue to hold the view that it was unallowable for his defence. Do you still feel it is so nebulous that it's coincidence?

Yes, I still -- I mean, even today, if you were going to try and prosecute Larry Fisher on that, there's nothing there, or certainly nothing that would do me any good. Now, I know, having said that, that the prosecutors who did prosecute Larry Fisher tried to use some of it, but I suspect that the whole point of that wasn't so much to prove

Larry Fisher was guilty as to give them something to wrap the DNA evidence around so that a jury might better appreciate the facts, but yes, if you are asking me do $I$ still think that doesn't prove that David Milgaard wasn't responsible back then, again, $I$ thought he got a fair hearing in the Supreme Court and they came to a result that was reasonable based on what was before them.

Just going down the page:
"And how does that compare to the evidence that you have against David Milgaard, where you now have some of the witnesses who at one time said yes he did it, $I$ found him with blood on his clothes and now they're recanting?" Just turn the page:
"Well, there is one witness that has recanted. The other witnesses are pretty much holding steady..."

And if you just go down the page, please, and turn the page, please. You talk about DNA, and if you could scroll down, and the next page. You answer the question, $I$ won't read the question, you say:
"I rather doubt it. The focus of this
inquiry is whether or not David Milgaard is innocent. It's not a public inquiry to determine whether the Administration of Justice is good, bad or indifferent. The focus is very narrow and it has to do with David Milgaard's status or guilt, his innocence. And really the conduct of the Saskatoon city police doesn't really come into that."

A
Well, that, quite frankly, that may have been a bit of an overstatement. I never intended to imply that if you couldn't show the police had misconducted themselves, that David Milgaard wouldn't have got some relief, because it was always my view that if you were able to produce evidence that particularly say Wilson and John had been beaten into giving their statements or tricked into giving them or whatever, that would have had a substantial impact on the Supreme Court.

Okay, but you are saying here the conduct of the Saskatoon City Police is basically not relevant to the inquiry, that's your -That's what $I$ said, yes. Right.

BY MR. WOLCH:
Okay. But that's your comment at least?
A
$Q$

A

Q

A
Q
A
And I just explained that. Okay.

COMMISSIONER MaCCALLUM: So it was never your position that misconduct could not demonstrate a miscarriage of justice? Well, that's right, and even at that point we were anticipating calling police officers.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yeah.
And hearing from them.

That's the comment, yeah.
And that's basically consistent with what the Milgaard people were saying afterwards, is that they were under that impression as well?

Well, yes. I don't know how you would still be under that impression given you examined several police officers, had the opportunity to examine more.

Well, but if one starts on the assumption that the conduct doesn't matter --

Well --
-- as you said --
I said I think that overstates the matter. The Supreme Court at that point wasn't saying the
conduct didn't matter, we were proposing to hear from police officers.

There was one from Saskatoon; correct?
Well, there were three at that point that were going to be subpoenaed, Karst, Short, Mackie and Art Roberts, and there would have been no point to calling them if police conduct didn't matter. The announcer says:
"But, lets say that he is some how
acquitted by the Supreme Court, is there a chance that it will tarnish the imagine of the justice system in Saskatchewan?"

And you say:
"Well, as the court noted the first time we met, at some point there maybe some consideration to some other form of inquiry depending on the decision the court makes. But, that's not something that will come out of this case.

The Supreme Court will hear its
evidence, it will make its
recommendation to the Minister and she will no doubt act on that in due course.

But, this isn't going to be a public
inquiry into the conduct of the Saskatoon City Police, or the Saskatchewan Justice Department." And that's pretty specific.

In terms of the broad conduct of policing and the Saskatchewan prosecution system, that was correct, and certainly the Supreme Court as I recall, the Chief Justice as $I$ recall, made it clear that in fact we weren't interested in that, we were interested in matters that specifically related to the prosecution of David Milgaard and the gathering of the case against him.

Okay, but this isn't going to be a public inquiry into the conduct of the Saskatoon City Police or the Justice Department, it surely applies to the Milgaard case, it's not a -- no one was ever suggesting we're going into a public inquiry about how the police force operates in Melville and Yorkton?

Well, except that the inquiries that had existed up to that point, as $I$ recall, had looked at sort of how police departments were organized and they were much broader, much fuller, took much more time, and I think that's what the Supreme Court was concerned about, is we want to look
specifically at the matters related to David Milgaard and nothing else.

But let's go back. Virtually every lawyer knows Supreme Court time is exceptionally valuable? Yes.

And many of the most serious matters in the country, whether it's the break-up of a country or God knows what, can be heard in a day or a half a day or whatever it might be; correct?

Yes.
I mean, major, major issues can be heard in half a day or a day, time there is very much guarded and precious.

Yeah. And your point was we're not here to look at conduct, we're not here to look at that? Well, no, no. As I said, that may have been a misstatement because if you take that to include that we weren't here to look at how the police
gathered their evidence or whether Mr. Milgaard was framed or anything like that, I'm sorry, I disagree. The court at no time limited anybody from calling the evidence that would be necessary to establish that David Milgaard had been the product, his conviction had been the product of misconduct by the police or misconduct by the Crown, $I$ just don't believe that.

But misconduct doesn't lead to anything. Well, excuse me, if the police misconduct themself and produce statements from witnesses that are not true, you are telling me that leads to nothing in this case?

The statement has to be false, the conduct doesn't matter.

Well, you have to -- well, Mr. Wolch --
Not at this stage. You are in a reference, you are not in a courtroom.

I'm sorry, I disagree.
All right. Scroll down, and the next page -that's the end of that. I'll move on then.

So you earlier told me that
courts of appeal in particular, or any court really, if they are asked a specific question, they answer the question?

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A

Q

A

A

Generally, yes.
That's what a reference is?
Yes.
And do you recall what the question was or how many questions were posed?

No, I don't. I would have to see the document.
You indicated that the Court of Appeal could have acquitted David -- the Supreme Court I mean?

The Supreme Court?
Could have acquitted David?
That they could have said that he was innocent and directed the minister to deal with it accordingly, yes. They could have, in effect, indicated he was innocent.

Could they have said you are not guilty?
Well, that's what a finding of innocence would be. That wasn't my question. Could they have said you are not guilty, go home, we're done?

Oh, no, no, they were giving advice to the minister. It was the minister's job to then exercise the --

Q They couldn't say you are not guilty in law? Well, they could say you are not guilty, but it wasn't up to them at that point, and nor did they have the authority, to then quash the conviction.

It had to go back to the minister for that.
Would it surprise you to know there was only one question posed to the Supreme Court with a follow-up?

I said, Mr. Wolch, I don't recall, unless you show me the document.

Okay, let's look at it, 058828. It's not actually a document, but it's incorporated in the judgment, and if you can turn to the next page, please:
"Therefore, his Excellency the Governor General ... on the recommendation ... is pleased ... to submit to the Supreme Court ... for hearing and consideration the following questions:
(a) upon a review and consideration of the judicial record, the Reference Case ... filed ... and such further or other evidence as the Court ... may receive and consider..."

And here are the key words:
"...does the continued conviction of
David Milgaard in Saskatoon ... for the murder of Gail Miller, in the opinion of the Court, constitute a miscarriage of justice?"


You see the question?
A
$Q$

A
Q
A

Q

A
$Q$
A
Q
That's the only question. I mean, (b) is a question, but we'll deal with that, but that's the substantive question, that's what Campbell wanted answered?

And that's what the Supreme Court said, it would be a -- the continued conviction would be a miscarriage if he didn't get the opportunity to do certain things.

So the Milgaards won?

A

Okay. The Court cannot be saying anything more than yes. But:
"(b) depending on the answer to the first question, what remedial action under the

Criminal Code, if any, is advisable?" In other words, if you find a miscarriage or a con -- as the wording is there -- if you find it, what's the remedy you would recommend to the minister?

Well, and -- well, thank you for bringing that up, actually, because when you now look at what they decided on, what was it, February of '92 as their options, they went beyond that.

Well you -- well, look at that.
Well, they did go beyond that.
No, they -- what they did --
Where, in the Criminal Code, does it say "and we can do anything we think might be fair".

You --
Because the final option, the what $I$ referred to as the sympathy option, where is that in the Criminal Code?

Okay. So you are saying they are wrong based on that?

No, no, I'm saying that they interpreted that a little differently, $I$ think, than what you are.

I --
You are saying that -- that -- that they could only answer that question. Well, no, they
actually thought they could answer -- give advice that was a little beyond that.

Well, okay. But they then -- okay, what they are talking about here is (a) is yes, there's going to be a remedy; (b) is well how do we recommend the remedy? The Court cannot say "innocent", the Court cannot say "guilty", the Court can recommend what the minister should do; isn't that what it's saying, $I$ mean, in plain English?

Well, yes, they were -- they were asked to recommend the appropriate remedy.

Okay. And what they did was they established guidelines for choosing the remedy?

Yes.
Okay. And if we can just go to the next page. But you'll note it says:
"... remedial action under the Criminal Code ...".

Yeah.
And the sympathy remedy, I don't think, falls under the Criminal Code.

Well, I'm not sure it's called 'sympathy', but -Well, --

That's your name, I didn't hear them calling it that. .

A

0
-- call it what you want, it's not a remedy that exists under the Criminal Code.

Well, let's look at that. If we can scroll -- I'm sorry, back to the same page, I'm sorry, page 2. Okay. Here are the guidelines, and this is for (b), in determining remedy. Right where I am down here. It's not for the main question, I want to emphasize that, and you may agree it's not for the main question, it's to how you determine remedy. And they say:
"The continued conviction of ...
Milgaard would constitute a miscarriage of justice if, on the basis of the ... record ...",
etcetera:
"... this Court in its discretion may receive and consider, the Court is satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt that David Milgaard is innocent of the murder of Gail Miller. If we were to ...", next page:
"... answer the first question put to
this Court ... in the affirmative ...", we would advise that David get a free pardon? That's, yes, that's a mixture of (a) and (b).

Q Okay. So if -- it's not (b).
A
Well --
Q If, under (a), we find innocence beyond a reasonable doubt -- a bit of a novel concept -but if they find that we recommend, under (b), a free pardon, minister, do it or not, but that's our recommendation?

A
Q
A

Q
Yeah.
You asked for it in (b), you wanted to know, -Yes.
-- they are answering the question.
Now they go (b), and it's not
a free pardon under (b) :
"The continued conviction ... would
constitute a miscarriage of justice if
. . .",
continued conviction:
"... if, on the basis ...",
etcetera:
"... of the ... record ... the Court is
satisfied on a preponderance of the
evidence that David Milgaard is innocent
of the murder of Gail Miller. If we
were to answer the first question ... in
the affirmative ... it would be open to

David Milgaard to apply to reopen his application for leave to ... the Supreme Court ... with a view to determining whether the conviction should be quashed and a verdict of acquittal entered, and we would advise the Minister ... to take no steps pending final determination of those proceedings."

So, if it's preponderance of evidence, come back to the Supreme Court on a motion for new evidence?

A
Q

A
Q
A

Q

A
Q
That's if we come to that conclusion.
Let's go to (c):
"The continued conviction of David Milgaard would constitute a miscarriage of justice ...", same as the other (a) and (b) :

A

Q

"... if there is new evidence put before this Court which is relevant to the issue of David Milgaard's guilt, 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." So it's not just a matter of there's new evidence, go have a trial, it's a matter this has to be --

And if we carry on:
"If we were to answer the first question put to this Court ... in the affirmative ... we would consider advising the Minister ... to quash the conviction and to direct a new trial under ... 690 ... In this event it would be open to the Attorney General to enter a stay if a stay were deemed appropriate in view of all the circumstances including the time served by David Milgaard."

A
A

Q

A
$Q$

A
Q
A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A
Q



So (c), like (a) and (b), is conditional on a positive answer to the main question; correct?

And this one is quash the conviction and direct a new trial and proceed or not; that's basically what it is?

Yes, okay.
All right. (a), (b), and (c) are all founded on
the same principle that there is a miscarriage of justice?

Yes.
So didn't they find a miscarriage of justice?
Well, no. I go by the plain wording of the document, that the miscarriage of justice would occur, --

But that's --
-- that's what they said.
So you are saying that, even if they found him absolutely innocent, they are not finding a miscarriage of justice?

The judgement says --
No, no, is that your -- that's your
interpretation? If they had said under (a) --
Oh, if they had said that David Milgaard was innocent --

Q
A
Q

Q

A

Q

A
Q

A
A

Would have been the same?
-- and found that something was wrong, then yes.
Well, how does it differ? The wording is identical?

Because -- no. The judgement, Hersh, is that it would be a conviction -- or a --
(a),
(b), or (c)?

Yes.
So there is no judgement that would call it a miscarriage, in your opinion?

That's right, they did not find there was a miscarriage.

No, but they couldn't find one?
Well --
(a) is not one, (b) is not one, (c) is not one, in your interpretation?

That -- they may not have been able -- well, even assuming that you are right, that did not stop them from saying that David Milgaard had been wrongly convicted or that he was subject to a wrongful conviction because of misconduct by the parties, that was always open to them, and it was always open to them to say, quite frankly from the very beginning, that "this has been a miscarriage of justice since day one and his continued
conviction would be a miscarriage".
But you had told me, before, they answer the questions?

Well they, subject to their interpretation of them, yes.

Well let's look at (d).
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Mr. Wolch, I think it's time to adjourn, but -- and I don't want to introduce debate, believe me, but if you would just go back to the first part of the order, there, the Order in Council, if that's what it is. And before you get to (a), (b), and (c) -(a) is the main question, I think you both agree it's a substantive question, and then go down a little bit. And so the Court then gives guidelines to be followed in responding to the questions to be set out for the parties, one of which, the main one "was there a miscarriage of justice". So (a), (b), and (c), which follow down there, are not devoted simply to remedy, they are also de -- demonstrate guidelines to be used in deciding whether there was a miscarriage of justice.

MR. WOLCH: Yes.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: So are we ad item
on that?

MR. WOLCH: We are. But $I$ do point out that (a) uses the word "continued conviction" -COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes.

MR. WOLCH: -- in terms of constituting a miscarriage of justice. And, if $I$ may, I realize time is running fast, but $I$ may just draw one thing to your attention very quickly.

If we go to paragraph (d),
very quickly, --
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes?

MR. WOLCH: -- just the (d) that Mr. Brown didn't care for $--I$ thought $I$ saw it there a second ago?

A

BY MR. WOLCH:

2
Well, you didn't think they had the authority to do it?

A

Q

A
-- frankly thought that that was not an unreasonable kind of consideration.
$Q$ No, but $I$ just want to point out one thing for you. If you read (d):
"If the judicial record, the Reference
Case ...",
etcetera:
"... fails to establish a miscarriage of justice as set out in ... (a), (b) or (c) ...";
do you see that?
Yes.
Which suggests that (a), (b), a positive finding under (a), (b), or (c) is a miscarriage of justice?

Well, again, what the Supreme Court said was the continued conviction would be a miscarriage.

But that's the question they were asked?
And that's the answer they gave.
But that was the question they were asked.
That it would be a miscarriage.
They went farther in (d) by saying:
"... a miscarriage of justice as set out in ... (a), (b) or (c) ..."?

That's the plain reading.
Well except, Mr. Wolch, then how do you deal with the fact that they say got a fair trial, no evidence of misconduct by the police, no evidence of misconduct by the prosecution, adequately defended, evidence still exists, conviction was
proper at the time'; if you were saying that they were finding that there was a miscarriage of justice on what was it based?

Well, they -- it says it right here. Well, they say because --

They said the continued conviction, given essentially the Larry Fisher evidence and a few other things, --

Right?
-- would be a miscarriage of justice.
Right.
Not that it was.
But that's the question they are asked?
Well you, I mean you may interpret it that way, I don't, and of course I --

I guess it depends what the Commissioner interprets, but --

It's always open to you to make that argument.
I see the hour, Mr. Commissioner, so -COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thank you. MR. HODSON: If I could just indicate, I believe that Mr. Brown will be returning on Monday afternoon to be finished up Monday afternoon, and we have Eugene Williams who will follow immediately after Mr. Brown for the
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