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## Transcript of Proceedings

(Reconvened at 1:00 p.m.)
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Good afternoon.
MURRAY BROWN, continued:
BY MR. WOLCH:
Thank you. Mr. Brown, if a factually innocent
person was convicted of a crime, would that be a
miscarriage of justice?
A factually innocent person, yes.
So in 1970 the conviction of David Milgaard was a
miscarriage of justice?
We didn't know that at that point, no.
That wasn't my question.
Well, if you look at it that way, yes. We have to
deal with what we know, so in 1970 we didn't know
that.
I didn't say that. You agree it was a miscarriage
of justice?
Ultimately, yes, that's correct, and it was shown
to be, whenever it was, in 1997.
Mr. Brown, you say ultimately. It was always a
miscarriage of justice; was it not?
Yes, that's what $I$ said, and it was ultimately
shown to be in 1997.
I would like to touch on the Supreme Court
decision again, 058828, and if we can go to 29 , please, and we dealt with this last time so I don't intend to spend particularly much time with it, but we dealt with the question posed to the court; correct?

Yes.
Okay. And the answer to (a) would be either yes or no?

Yes.
But in terms of (b), in terms of the remedy to be recommended, the court set out some guidance for how they would determine what remedy to recommend; would that be fair?

Yes.
And we'll skip (a), we know what it is, we'll go to (b) and then to (c). Now, (a), (b) and (c) are together, and if we can scroll to (c), (c) is much akin to the test for fresh evidence; is it not? Yes, it's a modified fresh evidence test.

And if we scroll down, or to the next page rather, sorry, now (d) is what should be done if they fail to establish a miscarriage of justice as in (a), (b) or (c)?

Yes.
Right? Now, do you agree with me it seems to be saying that (a), (b) and (c) are miscarriage of justices?

A
Well, it seems to say that, but then when you read (a), (b) and (c), it says would be.

But that was the question posed.
Well, that's the way they worded that, yes.
Okay. So here is if you don't -- in effect, what (d) is saying, if you don't find a miscarriage of justice, if we don't find rather, you might consider a conditional pardon, and was it your evidence, and I don't want to misquote you, that that paragraph is based on sympathy?

Well, that's what $I$ referred to as the sympathy option simply because if you don't find a miscarriage of justice or you don't find something upon which to hang your hat, ordinarily there wouldn't be a remedy, and certainly that would be the minister's -- what the minister would do, but the Supreme Court had a different view.

Well, rather than sympathy, what if the court was left in a position that it felt the new evidence didn't meet the fresh evidence test, and I'm paraphrasing (c), didn't meet it, but caused them to have concerns about the conviction, what do they do?

A
$Q$

Well, presumably they could have said that if that's what their concern was, but they didn't.

But this was set up before they made any determination.

Yes, I'm aware of that.
They hadn't determined what they were going to determine in the end.

Yes.
So looking forward, they could very easily envision a position, would they not, where the applicant didn't meet the test but still caused them concern as to the appropriateness of the conviction and (d) would be the way to handle it? Perhaps, yes.

So (d) wouldn't be sympathy, it would just be a matter of the fresh evidence test, which is quite difficult, hasn't been met, but, you know, maybe Fisher did it, maybe David is innocent, here is a way to look at it if we're in that ballpark. Nothing to do with sympathy at all.

Well, you can interpret it that way.
Okay. And of course if the answer is no, that's the end of it, to the first question, if the court says no, don't do anything, we're done.

Well, presumably you don't get to (b).

Q Yeah. You don't even get to (d). Now -COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well, Mr. Wolch -MR. WOLCH: Sorry. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: -- sympathy, at least in its abject title form, is used in the second last line of (d).

MR. WOLCH: Yes, but that's sympathetic consideration; that is, if you can't -- it doesn't go to his personal circumstances, but rather to the facts is what I'm suggesting. That is --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I see.
MR. WOLCH: That is, if you are in that legal quandary, $I$ mean, sympathy, it's hard to think what's sympathetic in the facts, but I'll deal with that.

BY MR. WOLCH:
Because the other line that causes some concern, and $I$ think you commented on it, if we go to 36:
"However, if a stay is not entered, a new trial proceeds and a verdict of guilty is returned, then we would recommend that the Minister of Justice consider granting a conditional pardon to David Milgaard with respect to any
sentence imposed."
And you interpret that as some form of sympathy?

A

Q
A
Q

A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A
Q
A

Yes. If we had gone through the process of running a new trial, got a conviction, the sentence is automatic, $I$ think that is a sympathetic, and, frankly, an appropriately sympathetic result.

Unless it's not sympathetic at all.
At that point what would it be?
Well, what if, for example, the court thought there was real doubt about the guilt, real doubt, even on further conviction, here is a way around it because the court felt he was innocent.

Well, again, Mr. Wolch, you can read that in if you want. I don't read it in, but --

Well --
-- feel free.
Let's examine it a little more. If David went to another trial and was convicted, that would conclusively say he robbed, raped and murdered Gail Miller; correct?

Well, not on the basis of what you are saying. No, no, no, but in law it would?

Yeah, the question is concluded as far as the law is concerned.

Q

A
Q

A

Q
A

Q

A
Q
A
Q

A

Q
A
Q


Okay. Now, he's convicted of murder, a horrible, horrible murder; correct?

Uh-huh.
He hasn't taken treatment, he's avoided it saying I'm innocent, don't give me treatment; correct? Uh-huh.

He would be considered dangerous?
It was 23 -- by that time it would have been 23 years ago and he was 16 at the time. Things change.

But looking at the crime and lack of treatment, one would not have a great deal of confidence in that person at liberty?

Well, he -- yeah.
He had escaped twice?
Yeah.
You also have the Miller family that somehow the killer, or there should be no conviction against the killer. Wouldn't that cross somebody's mind? Well, $I$ have to say it didn't seem to disturb them that much when we entered a stay.

Only if they considered him innocent.
Well, did they?
Well, we'll get to that. Furthermore, he would have committed perjury in the Supreme Court;

A
$Q$
A
Q

A
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A

Q

A
Q

A
correct?

Because, Mr. Wolch, he was 16 years old when he went into a federal penitentiary for that murder, spent 22 years in hell basically and why wouldn't they have some sympathy for him.

Q

A

So you are saying that they would, on a verdict of guilty in the future, recommend a conditional pardon for somebody they thought committed the crime of that seriousness?

Yes.
Had lied to the court, wouldn't take treatment, they would just say go?

That is exactly what they did.
But $I$ suggest that's consistent with thinking he wasn't guilty.

Well, that may be your interpretation, Mr. Wolch.
I don't accept that.
The court in a Supreme Court, not that all courts aren't strong, was a particularly strong one; was it not?

How do you mean? In terms of the people?
You had the current -- you had the past chief
justice of the Supreme Court; correct?
That's right.
You had the current chief justice of the Supreme Court?

Yeah.
You had --
You had a senior panel.
Yeah, you had Justice Cory who has since had an
inquiry into wrongful convictions?

A
$Q$

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
Yes.
In fact, Justice Lamer did too?
Uh-huh.
Justice Sopinka unfortunately has passed away, but
an incredibly high reputation?
Uh-huh.
And Justice Iacobucci who is respected by
everyone?
That's right.
And you are saying that that court would, would
countenance no conviction or a pardon for somebody
they believed committed an horrific murder?
I'm saying they did, not that $I$ believe they
would. That's what the judgment in my view said.
You are saying based on that as opposed to based
on this guy could be innocent?
Well, you know, if they had thought he was
innocent, they could have said so, and they
didn't.
Well, they recommended a murder conviction be
quashed.
On the basis that there was some evidence that a
jury should consider.
Credible evidence which could affect the verdict?

A Yeah. If they had thought he was innocent, why would they have sent it back for a new trial.

I'm suggesting to you that if they thought somebody was guilty, given that this is not an appeal, we're not talking about legalities of an appeal, given it wasn't an appeal, if they thought somebody was guilty, there would never be a remedy recommended?

Well, Mr. Wolch, you're right it's not an appeal, it was a much broader proceeding than that, and the remedies open to them were unlimited. No, they had one.

I --
That was to give advice to the minister, and the minister will not --

Well --
-- give a remedy to somebody that the minister believes is guilty?

Well, Mr. Wolch, if you want to testify to what that was all about, you can certainly do that, but I'm telling you what $I$ think the decision said.

I appreciate that.
And the decision did not say that they thought he was innocent.

Well, we'll deal with that. There was one thing

A

A
which occurred in the Supreme Court which I'd like to ask you about, and that is when Mr. Fisher testified, it came to light that he had been interviewed by Justice; do you recall that?

BY MR. WOLCH:
I'll draw your attention to it but $I$ just thought --

I believe he was interviewed on behalf of Justice, whether it was done by an RCMP officer or Eugene Williams I don't recall, but $I$ know somebody went to the prison to see him.

Okay. And $I$-- were you aware of the contents of that interview before Mr. Fisher testified?

I -- if it was given to us I'm guessing we were, yes. I don't --

Okay. I don't think you were, but we'll talk about that in a minute. You may have been. If we can go to his evidence, $I$ think it's 232244, and I want it at page 409. At 409, please, thank you.

Now, just to set the stage, this is Mr. Fisher
testifying, and the question is put -- because I'll set the stage a little better and save time -- Mr. Beresh had questioned him about his giving a statement to Mr. Williams and the question was put here:
"Q And you also testified and were questioned by Mr. Williams of Justice?

A Yes, sir.

Q And you put a ban on that, that Milgaard's counsel could not see it?

A That's right."

And if you just turn the page:
"Q Why do you have a ban on it, ...",
and then Mr. Beresh says it's a sensitive area, takes a position identical to the position with Justice Tallis.
"There was an interview. There was an undertaking and for the same reasons that he refused to release the undertaking, so do we."

That's a misstatement of fact, although I'm not sure deliberate. Now I'm setting the stage for you. That statement was a ban or a
confidentiality imposed, it would appear. Does that help you at all, in seeing that, as to what

5
your position might have been?
A

Okay. Perhaps $I$ will be, try to be more fair to you, and go a little farther. 412. You see the Chief Justice addressing Mr. Beresh, I take it:
"LAMER, C.J.: But do you have an objection
to releasing it now?
MR. BERESH: Yes, that's the position $I$
take. I take no different position than
... my friend did."
Now, if $I$ can pause there, at the hearing were you of the view that the Court could order production?

Yes, I don't see why they couldn't, or they could at least require Mr. Beresh to waive it or get his client to waive it.

I'm thinking of this as from the systemic point of view, that it was your view that they could order anybody to produce something, that was your view? Well, subject -- I mean the one sticking point for them was the solicitor/client privilege question, -Okay. -- but subject to that, yes. Okay. Yeah. But with Mr. Fisher, there is no solicitor/client, that's a witness talking to -Yeah.
-- to the investigator?
To the investigator, yeah.
Yeah. But here Mr. Fainstein says:
"MR. FAINSTEIN: I would just like to
clarify the situation from my
perspective because it leaves us in a
very, very awkward position.

There was an interview. I
think $I$ can acknowledge that much
because it is the subject of discussion now. It was at some time prior to the reference. It was in connection with the processing of the application for mercy that was made.

We felt it would be very,
very important for us to have some discussions directly with ... Fisher.

The interview took place when we pledged that that material would be kept under confidence. So we are caught in the middle now. It was in connection with the processing of the application for mercy. It was before the Reference was made and as long as counsel is refusing to have it released, we are caught by the undertaking."

Now, here's a key question from Justice Sopinka:
"SOPINKA, J.: Was that a document that the Justice Minister would have considered in the application for mercy?

MR. FAINSTEIN: I can't say if it came.
directly to her attention or not.
SOPINKA, J.: But it wouldn't do anybody any good if the Minister couldn't consider it, would it?"

Mr. Fainstein says he wasn't involved in the reference. Just turn the page. And he says: "It was for the purpose of ultimately giving advice to the Minister. As to whether there was specific reference to it in the advice she received, $I$ can't say."

So I pause there for a moment. So Mr. Fisher was interviewed by Mr. Williams and in the Supreme Court, we don't know if that went to Minister Campbell for her assessment, we don't know if it went to Justice McIntyre for his assessment; correct?

A
Correct.

We still don't know?
That's right.
We don't know how that was represented to Justice McIntyre?

A
No.
We don't know whether it got to the Minister Campbell?

Well, Mr. Wolch, I'm already on record, I believe with Ms. McLean, of saying that these materials should have been released to David Milgaard, before they go to the minister so that the applicant has one last opportunity to review and comment on them. I mean, if that were an administrative law-type of process you would certainly be required to do that and, you know, if you are talking about somebody's freedom $I$ don't know why you wouldn't impose at least the same standard that you'd use with administrative law. Okay. Well we'll just, for the record, I'll show how it played out. Page 417, you have the current Chief Justice saying:
"McLACHLIN, J.: But, Mr. Beresh, you do face a different problem slightly and because of your own making. It is because you led evidence directed to establishing that this witness had voluntarily come forward with everything, and so on and so forth." I think you -- you see what the Court is getting at, that he had raised it himself.
"McLACHLIN, J.: Now your friend is seeking to challenge that position and you are

A
2
A
saying "no" and it is within your power.
So, in a certain sense,
there is some sort of onus on you, having led that cross-examination, either to make a decision, it seems to me, or to accept an adverse inference at least as to openness."

So might you interpret that to mean the Court didn't feel it had the power to order?

Well, that, they are certainly not exercising it when $I$ think they clearly could have.

Well they are saying, in effect, "you could have kept it a secret" --

Yup.
-- "but you're going to get an adverse interest"? For some particular reason they are giving the authority to release it to Mr. Beresh when $I$ think they could have easily said "it's here".

Okay. But had Mr. Beresh not raised, in examining Fisher, that there was this interview, the entire process would have ended without yourself or the applicants even knowing that Fisher was interviewed?

That's correct.
Because, if you go to 419, you see Justice Cory
saying:
"CORY, J.: Hasn't your position changed a bit? Ordinarily, yes, this document was given in confidence and was based upon an undertaking by the Crown that it would be treated in confidence. Things have changed somewhat in that Mr. Fisher has come forward and testified.

As part of his testimony, reference, at least, was made to this interview with Mr. Williams. In light of that now, do you have any serious difficulty with making that available?" So that just sort of stresses the dilemma, systemically at least, that we could be at this stage of the process and an interview with a key player would never be released unless Mr. Beresh let it slip?

Mr. Wolch, we're at this stage of the process, and have you ever seen the McIntyre opinion?

No. I'd like to deal with a couple of individuals who cropped up at the Supreme Court and ask you a few questions about them. Commission Counsel referred you to a man named Ronald Stickel; do you recall who he would be?

Umm, I had no recollection of him then, and I just have the very vaguest recollection now. Well, if we can refer to 008578 , this would be the statement that he provided. It would appear to be it was provided in 1991, towards the end of the year, and he talks about the summer of 1970, a restaurant, Smitty's -- sorry, sorry I'm messing it $u p$ here -- a fellow known as Hoppy came into the restaurant, he seemed quiet, never had any friends, felt sorry for him, he was alone. If we can go down farther:
"... I became aware that this person called Hoppy was under suspicion for a killing that took place but $I$ didn't know where and I wasn't too concerned about it.

One day about five or six of us guys were having coffee and for some reason everyone except me and Hoppy got up and went outside. We sat there for a minute and then, knowing he was under suspicion for the killing of a girl, $I$ said, 'Hoppy, why did you kill that girl?' He reaction was to hang his head, look at the table and say, 'Did

A

A
$Q$
she ever scratch my back.'
I could hardly believe what I
heard."
Does that refresh your memory at all?
she ever scratch my back.'

I could hardly believe what I
heard."
Does that refresh your memory at all?
Not particularly, frankly, Hersh, no.
Okay. What do you make of that?
I, to be perfectly honest with you, I have a lot
of trouble with people who come forward for the first time 20 years after the fact remembering specific things like this. It's just, I mean what kind of faith can you put in it, it's there for whatever it is but --

Well, there's an initial problem in this, if we scroll back to the beginning. See, he says "during the summer of '70"; David would have been in jail?

Yeah, he would have been in jail then, yes. Now I apologize if my number isn't the right number, 247521 , that's the page number if that can be found. It might be 247398 , could be the starting page, thank you. Now Mr. Stickel was investigated by Mr. Pearson, I take it:
"Called Mr. Ronald Stickel,
who said he was wrong about the dates he provided me so far as his contact with
"Hoppy". He said he got a wrist watch just prior to leaving for Thompson, Manitoba and scratched with 1968 on the back of it. The watch was purchased on 05 Aug 1968. Ron said he then returned from Houston, Texas early in Dec 68. He said the American election was on during 1968 and Ron returned home to Canada just a week or so prior to that election. Stickel now believes that his conversation with 'Hoppy' could not be associated to anything of value to this inquiry."

Now this paragraph, if the conversation took place in '68 that's even before the murder?

A Yeah.

And Stickel is saying he doesn't think it is of much merit, so it would appear his evidence was basically useless?

Appears so.
Now if we can turn to 009767 , there's -- and turn to the next page if we could, or to the last page, whatever you want. This would be a letter from yourself?

A Yup.

Q file.

Well, if we can go to 009875 , this will be two -a letter written two days later. Look at paragraph two is what $I$ am interested in, it's a letter to Mr. Fainstein:
"I fail to understand how Ron Stickel's statement is of any use to the Court. We would like to know if it is proposed that he be called as a witness. If so
then we require an opportunity to check out his background. We do not know
right now if he is a clergyman or an escapee from a mental home. We also have no idea if he has a criminal record and perhaps you might advise in that regard. Why he would be called or his statement tendered when his evidence cannot be true is beyond me;" That's a fair comment.

But you would appear to have some concern about what gets into the media but, of course, Mr. Stickel did get into the media. 004506 , I believe. So here's an article in the StarPhoenix in February, you'll see down there:
"A recent addition to the
Milgaard file at the Supreme Court is a statement from Regina resident Ron Stickel, taken late last year."

If we can just go up:
"In it, he says he knew Milgaard back in 1969 when he was under suspicion for the murder ...",
etcetera, etcetera, etcetera:
"... which ... he took to be an
admission of guilt."
Did you put it -- or did you advise Mr. Fainstein
to put it in the record so it would become public knowledge and become publicly embarrassing?

No. No, we weren't doing that, Mr. Wolch.
If we can turn to 232580 at 701 , please. At 701 , please. This was your co-counsel, Mr. Neufeld, questioning David Milgaard:
"Q Do you know a person by the name of Ron Stickle?

A Ron Stickle.
Q Did you ever meet him?
A It doesn't ring a bell.
Q Smitty's Pancake House?
A It doesn't ring a bell.
Q Do you remember a fellow at Smitty's Pancake House questioning you about whether you had done this crime or not?

A $\quad$ No.

Q A person who had suggested to you that you did, and you said: "She scratched my back." Do you remember that?

A No."
Why would that be put to David when you knew it to be totally unreliable?

Well, I suspect Mr. Neufeld was just checking to see whether David had any recollection of any of
that, and whether any of it was reliable. Well, the same would apply to the witness Dozenko, would it not? He was actually called as a witness.

In -- umm --
As being unreliable?
He was the jail guard, wasn't he?
The jail guard who came forward many, many years
later to say that David Milgaard had made some sort of confession to him about ten years earlier, one that he never recorded, one that he never reported, David had escaped from him, and he had had alcoholic problems since?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A
Q
Yes.
Totally unreliable?
Well, his statement was worth what it was worth. Well, the Supreme Court didn't even comment on it? Well they didn't comment on very much of the evidence, actually.

No, but a confession might have been commented upon if it -Well, if they'd accepted it. As part of the case? No, but it was clearly unbelievable, I'm just wondering why it was put in?

A

Well, you put -- I mean you characterize them as 'obviously unreliable', obviously we didn't. We put their evidence before the Court in terms of whatever it was worth and the Court could assess it.

Now I -- with respect to the
Stickel stuff, I do recall that it seemed to me at the time that it really wasn't worth much.

The Dozenko stuff, the man was
certain that was the case, it was up to the Supreme Court to determine what, if any, value they placed on that evidence. It wasn't something that $I$ would personally discount as being useless. Okay. Another matter you touched upon would have been the evidence of Ron Wilson. The Court did place some -- some weight on his recantation; did it not?

Well, there was, $I$ mean there was that debate that I had with. A short debate, albeit -- but a debate with Justice Sopinka over whether, if he's an incredible witness today in 1992 , isn't that evidence that he would have been an incredible witness in 1970 .

Okay. Well maybe for - -
Umm - -

Maybe, perhaps we could bring that up, I think it's 233090. I think this is the comment that you are making particular reference to, is where Justice Sopinka says --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: What is the doc.
ID, please?
MS. BOSWELL (Document Manager): It's
233078 .

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thank you.

MR. WOLCH: Thank you.
BY MR. WOLCH:
Q
Justice Sopinka says:
"SOPINKA, J.: That might go to the weight, ...",
we're talking, of course, about Wilson:
"... but when you are applying this
Palmer test ...",
and the Palmer test, you would know that to be, Mr. Brown?

A
$Q$
A
Yes.
Just for the record, perhaps?
It's the test set out in $R$ valmer -- Palmer and Palmer.

Q
"... it seems to me you can't be too literal because the credible evidence, the credible new evidence may be that a principal witness is shown to be a perjurer. That is the credible evidence. It doesn't matter that you don't accept the evidence that he has now given, but he is shown to be a perjurer and his credibility is very material in deciding whether the jury should have accepted it."

That's the reference?

A
$Q$

A

Q

A
$Q$

A

A

Yes, that's the reference.
Okay. And Justice Sopinka is saying "look, if the guy is a liar he didn't start just yesterday necessarily, he could be a liar all along".

No, and $I$ accept that if what you are talking about is a year or two later, but this is 22 years later and I'm not sure that his condition 22 years later provides you with that kind of evidence, because it seems to me it requires you make the assumption that people don't change in 22 years, or change much, and that's patently not true. No, but Wilson may have changed for the better. He was a 16-year-old criminal, petty thief, back then and he seems to be have been working and rebuilt his life; why wouldn't it work the other way?

Well, that's part of how he's changed, yeah. Okay.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Wilson was a little older than that, wasn't he?

He was 17 I think.
MR. WOLCH: 17.
COMMISSIONER MaCCALLUM: 17 or 18? 17?
17, I'm pretty sure.
.

BY MR. WOLCH:
Q
A

Q

BY MR. WOLCH:
Okay. Maybe we can just look at a few of the, I'm not going to go through all of the questions, but

Umm, and I'm guessing that's what they were aiming at.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Which offences, sir?

The -- or the Gail Miller murder.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: All right. worerng
a few of them. 144712, I think the doc. number is 144634. This is a sample of some of the questions that are perhaps a little more interesting. You have the Chief Justice:
"LAMER, C.J.: You know there is a broken paring knife that was found on the scene of the ---

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. I read that in a report.

LAMER, C.J.: Maybe somebody else took your paring knife from your house?

THE WITNESS: I can't make any accusations on where the paring knife went. If the wife probably confronted me on it, I probably left her right away, because I didn't stick around long enough to argue with her.

LAMER, C.J.: Mr. Fisher, the testimony that you are giving here today cannot be used against you in a subsequent proceeding. Do you know that?

THE WITNESS: No, I didn't, sir.
LAMER, C.J.: It could be used, but in a very limited way in that you could be charged with perjury if you perjured
yourself.
THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
LAMER, C.J.: But it couldn't be used against you if you were charged with murder, the murder of Gail Miller.

You seem to have changed quite a bit since the days when you were doing these things."

That's a questionable comment, $I$ don't know where he would think that:
"You were obviously a very sick person.
THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
LAMER, C.J.: It's not as if you were committing hold-ups or murdering people for Murder Incorporated, or something. It was something that had to do with your illness.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
LAMER, C.J.: I think we all understand that. I think you understand it now.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
LAMER, C.J.: Is it at all possible that the paring knife that was found near Gail Miller's body could have been yours?

THE WITNESS: I can't say, sir.

LAMER, C.J.: But it's possible.
THE WITNESS: Anything is possible.
LAMER, C.J.: I know, but ---
THE WITNESS: I can't say whether it was the knife that was in our house or not, because I don't know."

Sort of a remarkable answer right there.
"LAMER, C.J.: I see. Is there any chance that maybe you did encounter Gail Miller and when you left her that she was alive.

THE WITNESS: I had nothing to do with the Gail Miller murder, sir.

LAMER, C.J.: Sure.
THE WITNESS: And I am here to prove my innocence in that department.

LAMER, C.J.: I am putting the question to you, so... fine.

SOPINKA, J.: Just to follow-up on the paring knife. You told me that in Fort Garry you got the knife out of the trailer park.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
SOPINKA, J.: You agreed with the Chief Justice that you used a paring knife in

Saskatoon. Where did you get that paring knife?

THE WITNESS: Probably from the house, sir. I used it at -- the one out of our house. I'll admit that.

SOPINKA, J.: You told me earlier that you wouldn't take a knife from your house?

THE WITNESS: I usually did, if it was a bread knife or something else. But I did use a paring knife in there. And I could have got it from Clifford's house or our house.

IACOBUCCI, J.: Mr. Fisher, are you
left-handed or right-handed?

THE WITNESS: Right-handed, sir."

And it goes on and on. Does that tenor seem to indicate that the Court really wasn't buying his denial?

Well, I suppose you could put that interpretation to it. They were -- I think they were very curious about Larry Fisher, he -- when you looked at Larry Fisher, you thought if ever there was a guy that could have done it, that was the one.

I would like to touch a bit on your written
argument to the Supreme Court and I'm curious about how and why you would put stock in the evidence of Kenneth Cadrain, and if you look at 206846 -- 206801 is the doc. number -- and our understanding is that Kenneth Cadrain was either five or six or whatever, an exceptionally young lad at the time, wasn't even spoken to by the police?

There were a number of Cadrains, there was one very young one. I -- was the little one Kenneth? That's right.

I mean, I don't recall.
No, he would have been the very young one.
Okay.
Okay. So you put into your argument:
"Kenneth Cadrain in his statement at Reference Case..."

Etcetera,
"...indicates David Milgaard changed his pants and then went out the back door.

At page 4 ... of that statement he
indicates that when David Milgaard went
out the back door he had something in
his hand but when he came back in he had nothing."

Now, I'm just curious about using the evidence of this young man who would only have been five or six remembering back 20 odd years later, that evidence would be patently unreliable wouldn't it?

It is what it is. As for unreliable, I believe the evidence was that David Milgaard changed his pants at that house.

Whether Kenneth Cadrain had any memory of something relatively innocuous when he was five or six years old --

A
$Q$

A
It's there for what it's worth, Mr. Wolch.
Well, no, but I've always been under the impression that Crown counsel will monitor evidence in the sense if it's of no probative value and could only mislead, they won't put it in.

Well, no, I wouldn't say that this evidence could only mislead, it's there for whatever value it has. There's no evidence that he was lying. There was evidence that in fact David Milgaard changed his pants there and $I$ believe there was evidence that they didn't, couldn't find the pants that he changed from.

Okay. But it doesn't make the evidence of a five
year old of any weight.

A
Q

Albert Cadrain's current testimony that Milgaard threw the blood stained pants out, support for that is found in two sources, first in the statement of Kenneth Cadrain there's a reference to the fact that David Milgaard went out the back door of the house with something in his hand and when he came back he had nothing, so once again Kenneth Cadrain is being relied on in your argument?

It's there for what it's worth, Mr. Wolch. It
fits with what Albert Cadrain said.
No, I guess what I'm saying, when you look at Kenneth Cadrain, Ronald Stickel and Ben Dozenko, you are looking at evidence of really no merit no matter how you look at it.

Well, I wouldn't agree necessarily with that. Now, in your argument, and I'm not going to go through it, anybody can read it, but you did deal with Larry Fisher. I would like to bring your attention to a couple of points at 814. Sorry, perhaps you could go to 805 just for the record's sake. That's where you start your analysis of Larry Fisher, that your first paragraph is:
"Finally, there is the evidence of Larry Fisher himself. He absolutely denies any involvement in the murder. Unlike David Milgaard, who also made such a statement in his evidence, Larry Fisher was not shown to be obviously lying to this court."

So you are -- that's how you preface your argument. Now if we can go to 814:
"With respect to the use of the coat, on three occasions he made his victim lie on a coat and on six occasions he did

A

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
A
Q

A

Q
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not. Again, it's difficult to see what the pattern is that connects these incident to the Gail Miller assault. It is equally difficult to see anything unique in Larry Fisher's conduct in this regard."

Now, you saw nothing unique about having three victims lie on a coat. That would not be a unique thing to you?

When six of them didn't?
Well --
Six of them didn't is the unique thing.
That's where you see the uniqueness, is in what didn't happen?

Well, if you are looking for commonalities, the fact that six of them didn't lie on a coat would be more common than the fact that three of them did.

One was (V4)---, one was (V8)-- (V8)--- who was stopped in the middle, but having said that, you do have Gail Miller's coat being rather unusually on her body?
(

Yes.
Don't the two sort of go together?
Well, $I$ don't think you can necessarily find a
common pattern from that, Mr. Wolch. You obviously argued a different view. Okay. If we can go to 812, you say here:
"Finally, counsel made much of the fact that in the instances where Larry Fisher succeeded in raping his victims he always took..." Off I take it,
"...always took or had them take off their bras. The implication arising from this is that somehow Larry Fisher's breast fetish distinguishes his attack from other incidents of "stranger" rape. In our society it is unusual to find sexual attacks on a female victim where exposure or fondling of the breasts has not occurred. In North American society breast fetishism and breast manipulation is a substantial part of heterosexual eroticism. It is not surprising therefore that some attack on a women's breast is a regular feature of sexual assaults committed against women on this continent."

Do you still stand by that paragraph?

Q

A

Q

A Yes.

Are you serious about that?
Well, I would have to see what $I$ was talking about there, Mr. Wolch.

Okay, that's fair. If we can just go back a bit. You have to go back one more page then. I think we have to go back some more then.

Didn't you go back too much?
I don't think so, unless they went the wrong way.
I think we've got it here. One more page and we have it. Evidence of Linda Fisher.

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

Finally, on face value, her evidence does not link Fisher to the murder. It would indicate he was not guilty of killing Gail Miller. His reaction is at the very best ambiguous. It could be just as easily interpreted as supporting his innocence. She indicates that the weapon known to have been used to kill Gail Miller was not her knife, that when she washed Larry Fisher's clothing there was no blood. And I am paraphrasing, for the record. If we can go further, in our submission, therefore, when examined, her evidence is not capable of supporting a conclusion.
"The single fact left unexplained is her suggestion that Larry Fisher did not go to work that morning. The fact recollected to the police some eleven years after the incident is alleged to have taken place has to be contrasted with Fisher's statement to the police four days after the murder. In that statement he indicates to the police officers that he in fact did go to work.

It is reasonable to assume that if Mr. Fisher whatever his degree of intelligence, was going to make up an alibi to take him out of the neighbour at the time of the murder, he would have been smart enough to figure out that he couldn't use an alibi that could be easily checked. Mr. Fisher's statement to the police is corroborated by his evidence to this Court and to a lesser extent by the statements of the people that worked with him in the reference case materials and who indicate they do not recall his unexplained absence from work. While we concede the latter corroboration is of very limited value, it is nonetheless some corroboration . . ."

And it goes on to say that her evidence is of no value. Do you feel that you looked at her evidence objectively?

A Yes.
Q And found her to, if anything, to be supporting her husband's claim of innocence?

Well, she did say it wasn't her knife, she did say
there was no blood on his clothing. That seems to me to have supported the claim that he wasn't guilty. I mean, you read the parts of the submission that pretty much answer the question you asked. You may disagree, but that's your argument.

No, no, I'm asking you what you thought and what you --

Well, it's right there.
Okay. Then finally at 804 , here's your submission, the Answer to the questions posed by the Minister:
"...the Applicant has failed to prove beyond any burden of proof that he is innocent."

Therefore, no free pardon. That would be the (a) test?

A
Q

A
Q
A

Q Okay, you are right. So the first paragraph, that's (a) and (b)?
different verdict isn't there, so don't send it back, and a court rejected that position; correct?

Yes, they set the test a little lower.
They applied the test that they had set?
Well, they applied a different -- I said probable, they said reasonable expectation, which is probably a little less. It's more like the Palmer.

The Palmer test, okay. Now, your position was:
"In our submission, that leaves only two possibilities open to the court. The first is that the Court answer the Minister's question by noting there was no miscarriage of justice in this case but given the length of time David Milgaard has served in prison, some form of relief should be considered."

Okay. So you are saying there's only two possibilities, one is no miscarriage and given some sort of relief, and then you go on to say: "In our submission, prior to suggesting a conditional pardon be granted ... notwithstanding there was no miscarriage of justice, this court should inform itself of the contents of his parole file. Mr. Milgaard's assertions that he is being kept in jail solely because he will not admit his guilt of this crime, are patently false. His parole record and prison files clearly indicate that the Parole Board has substantial concerns about his psychiatric stability and his ability to function outside the
institution... It is our submission that prior to making any recommendation that results in the release of David Milgaard, this court should take the opportunity to fully appraise itself of the contents of ... parole files. They paint a fundamentally different picture for the reasons for the Parole Board's decisions than is painted by Mr. Milgaard himself."

Then you say:
"Finally, the second alternative left to the court in our submission is to simply report to the Minister that there was no miscarriage of justice. In our submission, this is the appropriate response. It would leave the decision on full release of Mr. Milgaard to the National Parole Board..."

Who,
"...are in a better position to assess
his ... condition ... and to assess and
monitor the danger... They are also in
a better position to ... monitor the eventual ... release ..."

And assess whether he will:
"...continue to pose any danger to society."

So it would appear when you were writing this, you recognize that one of the possibilities is to tell the minister there was no miscarriage of justice and that's what you wanted the court to do ?

That was our submission.
And they didn't accept that?
No.
Okay. I would like to turn now -- just give me a second -- to the time after the Supreme Court rendered its decision. Now, everybody reacted to the decision in various ways and $I$ would like to deal fairly quickly with Mr. Fisher's reaction. Was it your understanding that under no circumstances would the court point a finger of guilt at Larry Fisher?

No. I suspect if they had thought he was guilty, they would have -- they may not have said Larry Fisher is guilty, but they would have certainly said there is a substantial case against him. Well, if they said there was credible evidence that Fisher did it --

A
$Q$

A

Q

A

Q

A

Q

A

Q

BY MR. WOLCH:
I'll try and find the exact quote, but -- if somebody gets it faster than me, I would appreciate it. Yes, on -- if $I$ can get -- well, document 058828 at 32 , they say:
"In our view, this evidence, together with other evidence we have heard,
constitutes credible evidence that could reasonably be expected to have affected the verdict of the jury..."

That is, $I$ emphasize could reasonably be expected to affect the verdict.
"Our conclusion in this respect is not to be taken as a finding of guilt against Fisher, nor indeed that the evidence would justify charging him with the murder of Gail Miller."

They are not commenting on it, they are saying it's -- we're not saying yes or no, and that is consistent with what they said from the very beginning; is it not? If we go into the evidence now - -

Now you've lost me. What's your question?
That the court was never going to make a finding of guilt against Larry Fisher.

Oh, and if what you want me to say is that they were not going to say Larry Fisher is guilty, of course they weren't, there would have to be a trial to establish that.
$Q$
So no matter what they found or believed, they weren't going to say that?

Well, they wouldn't say it, yes, but then why
would they then add the additional not to be taken as a finding or that it was, would even justify charging him.

Because reading the judgment, some people might read it to suggest that Fisher should be charged and they don't want to have a role in that because --

Well --
-- if the Supreme Court says this guy should be charged with murder, can he ever get a fair trial. Well, again, Mr. Wolch, that's I guess a matter that you and I are going to have to disagree on. I don't interpret their judgment as basically restricting themselves that way.

Well, take a look at --
They properly qualified the evidence as not being sufficient to charge him.

Not being sufficient or that their decision should
not be interpreted?
Nor indeed that the evidence would justify charging him with the Miller, the Gail Miller murder.

In other words, don't make anything out of this finding regarding Fisher?

A Well --
$Q$
A

Q

A
$Q$

A

Look at page, if we could, 232030, and this is Justice Lamer speaking to Mr. Beresh. I'm sorry, perhaps $I$ should have the document -The next paragraph down $I$ think.

MS. McLEAN: 231940 .
MR. WOLCH: 232?
MS. McLEAN: 231940 .
BY MR. WOLCH:
940.

It starts at nine, doesn't it, or eight?
Yeah.
"Whatever we say, I don't think we are going to be saying "Oh, we think it is Mr. Fisher."

Yeah.
"You are here on a very special status.
I think $I$ made it clear at the time $I$ granted you status. It is just in case that somebody starts pointing fingers at your client that you should have an opportunity under the rules of fairness to respond to that.

Whatever we say, I don't
think we are going to be saying "Oh, we think it is Mr. Fisher." We are not
asked that. We are just going to answer the question that was put to us, and that is all."

A

Well, if I can also take you to 233068.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Is that a doc. ID, Mr. Wolch?

MR. WOLCH: I'm sorry, the same one I was at earlier, that's 233007. I'm not sure why the A is there following it. This is an argument, the Chief Justice again:
"Why don't we keep that for reply because, $I$ don't know, we have read the material, of course, but $I$ don't know to what extent Mr. Fisher has an interest
in our answer."
You see that? That's the same theme, I'm suggesting, that Fisher was only there for one purpose, is the evidence credible or not, but there would never be a finding that Larry Fisher did it or a direction to go charge him under any circumstance. Would you not agree?

Well, Mr. Wolch, I've already said the Supreme Court is not going to say Larry Fisher is guilty. Okay. But $I$ want to set the stage where now the judgment has been rendered, David is free --Uh-huh.
-- the conviction is -- the minister has quashed the conviction; correct?

Right.
That's the point in time, it's the point of time when he's presumed innocent.

Right.
I want to deal with first of all, deal with Fisher's reaction, 229387. Here we have Fisher most pleased with Milgaard decision. Supreme Court avoided pointing finger at rapist. Given their findings of similar act, it's hard to understand that, but here, here's what is said:
"I'm very pleased with it because I
think it is in essence a judicial
exoneration of Larry Fisher,"...

Mr. Beresh said.
"Fisher was most pleased with the outcome," he said, adding the 42 -year-old inmate just wants to get on with his life."

Now, did you look at this as a judicial exoneration?

A
$Q$
Now I would like to turn to the government's reaction, and if $I$ can go back to 208531 first -208531 -- this is doc. ID 208523.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes, please say that to begin with, would you, Mr. Wolch?

MR. WOLCH: Unfortunately,
Mr. Commissioner, there's some points where I messed up my cross-referencing.

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

Q
This is the Chief Justice, again:
"The right to cross-examine
witnesses will be determined on an ad
hoc basis as matters develop. We will hear you on an ad hoc basis whenever you feel you should be allowed to put questions. In this regard, it is to be remembered -- and I reiterate this -that this is not a trial; this is not a rehearing of an appeal; nor is it a Royal Commission of Inquiry into certain matters. It is a reference that is governed by very few sections in the Supreme Court Act and a couple of sections in our Rules of Court."

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: You're speaking about Fisher's right to --

MR. WOLCH: No, that's the inquiry -A At the very opening.

MR. WOLCH: The very opening, this is setting the rules at the very beginning.

COMMISSIONER MaCCALLUM: Well, he just finished talking about Mr. Fisher, is there a feeling that Mr. Fisher is in a somewhat different situation here, right to cross-examine and so on?

MR. WOLCH: Right.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: So he's not
talking specifically about Fisher?
MR. WOLCH: No, he's not.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.
BY MR. WOLCH:

No. If you could just turn the page:
"At our meeting this morning, we agreed, and I should announce to you, that we do not think that the rules of the Criminal Code apply whatsoever here.

Those rules will apply if we, in
answering questions $A$ and $B$, order $a$ rehearing or a retrial."

That's sort of a, I take it, a slip because A and
$B$ don't order a rehearing or a trial.
"Then, of course, if that is ordered, that will be governed by the Criminal Code. This is not the Criminal Code.

We have been asked by Cabinet to assist them in exercising their power of mercy, which is an administrative power. In that way, while we are still
a Court, we are assisting in the exercise of an administrative power. We are entitled in that regard to do most of what Cabinet itself could do. We
intend to proceed judicially, though I think we could not necessarily go that route."

Odd comment, but:
"The rules of evidence, also those sections that have to do with previous statements and hostile witnesses and putting previous statements in writing to witnesses do not apply. The rules that govern us are the rules of fairness and the rules of natural justice. Of course, they are not very far away from the rules of evidence, but in some regards they are not identical."

Now, I'll leave it there, but that's what -where the Chief Justice makes it pretty clear, or quite clear, that it's not your everyday, ordinary proceeding, that the rules are very different, and it's not a royal commission into whatever, and they are -- they have been asked the question and they are going to answer it.

Now when -- I've indicated before, now David Milgaard is set free, Fisher is saying he's exonerated, and is it not a fact that
government, the Saskatchewan Government, was still saying David Milgaard was guilty?

The Government of Saskatchewan said that?
Well, let's take a look at 164842, and scroll down
the first. Well, look at the headline, Minister stands firm on Justice record, it's the Globe and Mail, and it's this little piece down here is what I'm interested in. I'm not sure if you can read it.
"Mr. Mitchell, however,
remains adamant. In an ...",
sorry, if somebody could help me with that word? MS. McLEAN: Unusual.

BY MR. WOLCH:
$Q$

Well, Mr. Wolch, one of the problems with
Ministers is sometimes they decide they will speak out on their own --

Okay.
-- and they sometimes don't take the precise

|  | 1 |  | counsel we give them. I believe the briefing |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 |  | notes I sent him didn't say "he did it", I said |
|  | 3 |  | "the Supreme Court found he had been properly |
|  | 4 |  | convicted, that there was still evidence upon |
| 02:20 | 5 |  | which he could be convicted", and so on. |
|  | 6 | Q | Well, -- |
|  | 7 | A | Mr. Mitchell was expressing his opinion. |
|  | 8 | Q | -- okay, but here you have the highest law |
|  | 9 |  | enforcement person in the province saying that a |
| 02:20 | 10 |  | person who is presumed innocent committed murder |
|  | 11 |  | and rape; is that not true? |
|  | 12 | A | Well, he appears to have said "I think he did it", |
|  | 13 |  | yes. |
|  | 14 | 2 | Yes. Now -- |
| 02:20 | 15 | A | And I think that the newspaper notes that that's |
|  | 16 |  | an unusual comment for a justice minister on a |
|  | 17 |  | case -- |
|  | 18 | Q | Well, it's more than unusual, isn't it? |
|  | 19 | A | -- that's before the courts. |
| 02:21 | 20 | 2 | You know, you expressed outrage that Michael |
|  | 21 |  | Breckenridge had been a vehicle to get an |
|  | 22 |  | investigation or whatever when he was accusing |
|  | 23 |  | people of perhaps obstruction of justice -- |
|  | 24 | A | And when you knew very well that that was false. |
| 02:21 | 25 |  | MR. WOLCH: Can I finish the question? |
|  |  |  | $\qquad$ Meyer CompuCourt Reporting $\qquad$ ertified Professional Court Reporters serving P.A., Regina \& Saskatoon since 1980 Central Booking - Call Irene @ 1-800-667-6777 or go to www.compucourt.tv |

COMMISSIONER MaCCALLUM: Just a minute. MR. WOLCH: Can I finish the question? COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.

BY MR. WOLCH:
And yet, at the Supreme Court reference, you put in Stickel, Dozenko, and Kenny Cadrain, and here you have the Attorney General saying somebody is guilty of murder when they are not charged and not convicted. Is that not worse?

Well, Mr. Wolch, if you want to talk about what the minister of justice said or did perhaps you can call him as a witness. I can tell you what advice I gave him, and you should have the documents in the CaseVault, what he does with that information is up to him.

I guess what $I$ am getting at, Mr. Brown, is you've expressed outrage at Mr. Breckenridge, you've expressed outrage at some of the media reports, I'm wondering why you don't have the same outrage when --

Well, let's correct the record here.
I'm not finished the question.
Let's correct the record, Mr. Wolch. I didn't express outrage over Mr. Breckenridge, Mr. Breckenridge can say whatever he wants. It's
the way it was used by people who knew the statements were false, that's what caused me some concern.
$Q$

A

Q

A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A

An investigation was asked for. Surely you knew that Stickel was false, surely you knew that Dozenko was false, surely you knew that Cadrain, Kenny Cadrain --

If $I$ had known their evidence was false it would not have been put, I would not have recommended it being put before the Supreme Court.

In the Stickel case you had --
If it's of limited weight --
-- Sergeant Pearson --
If it's of limited weight, that's a different
matter, you are perfectly entitled to argue that Cadrain's evidence, that Stickel's evidence, that Dozenko's evidence is of no value and no weight. Okay. Whatever Breckenridge did, he caused there to be an investigation?

Yes.
And that investigation could have found the real
killer? It didn't, but it could have?
Well, it thought it did, actually.
Sorry?
I said "it thought it did".

Q

Well, it thought it did, but it could have found the real --

Well, if the DNA had been done at that point, yes.
I mean there was as much evidence on Larry Fisher as there was going to be, apparently, at that point absent the DNA.

Well I'm going to suggest to you there was enough evidence to convict Larry Fisher at that time?

Well, I disagree, Mr. Wolch.
But, in any event, Breckenridge would keep a matter alive that needed to be kept alive?

Well, that's your view.
Well, the real killer was free?
Well except, Mr. Wolch, to be perfectly honest with you, $I$ don't think you were the slightest bit concerned about that.

Well --
You were after money at that point.
Let me ask you this. If somebody is going to get money from the government for wrongful
convictions, how many ways can you get money?
How many ways?
What are the means for wrongfully convicted people to get compensation?

Well $I$ suppose you start by showing there's been a
miscarriage of justice, some wrongdoing that's
resulted in your conviction, or you can sue, or
you can do --

Q

A

Q

A

Q

A
$Q$
A
Q
A
Q
A

Q
Before you ask too many questions, it went, the
lawsuit proceeded, it went to the Court of Appeal
for rulings, it was proceeded vigorously, it

A
Q

A

Q

A
Q
A
proceeded --
proceeded --
Well --
-- and it was settled for a large amount of money. That's not the issue.

My question to you was lawsuit
or ex gratia are the only two ways to go?
Yes.
Okay. And a lawsuit, it doesn't matter what you say, it's going to be settled in a courtroom or between the parties?

That's the usual course, yes.
And if it's ex gratia, if you are calling somebody a crook, is he going to give you money?

Not usually, no.
So how is accusing wrongdoing going to advance the government to pay you money?

How is accusing wrongdoing? You were trying to keep this matter alive and get an inquiry in order to advance your cause for a claim.

Maybe the cause for the claim was to catch Larry Fisher?

Well, I wish I believed that, Mr. Wolch.
Well, you said it had to be kept alive?
Well, that was your view, not mine. I was of the view that it still was alive, as long as those DNA
samples weren't done it was still alive. The Federal Government was holding them, they were waiting to get on with doing it.

They were waiting?
They were waiting.
Okay. I'm trying to understand, though, how calling people whatever they are called and then saying "please give me money" works, just, I'm trying to reconcile that?

Well, of course, you weren't accusing sort of current people except for Serge Kujawa. Ken Lysyk, by that point, had moved to Alberta -- to B.C., Roy Romanow was Premier but not involved in the Justice portfolio --

Well --
-- and, I mean, it was clearly aimed at trying to generate an inquiry, get the federal minister to call an inquiry.

Well, getting an inquiry is far different than your accusation of money grab?

Well, with respect, that's what it was aimed at is getting money. You weren't going to get evidence of Larry Fisher's guilt in an inquiry. Okay, but the Inquiry that went on had 12 RCMP officers looking into the case?

A
$Q$

A

Q
A

Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
Q

A
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Well that was, quite frankly Mr. Wolch, that wasn't my fault.

No, but wouldn't that be a good thing now that you know the guilty guy was still at -- loose?

Well except you may recall, Mr. Wolch, that that actually brought up more evidence of David Milgaard's guilt, that didn't --

Only --
That didn't --
Only in the eyes of the investigator, Mr. Brown. Well, it confirmed Nichol John's story that she saw something, she apparently told a friend.

I will be dealing with that. You said that you were getting support from the public at that time?

Well, at that point it was my impression that the public had kind of lost interest. We weren't getting the kinds of inquiries that we were, for example, between -- when was it -- the first application was turned down February of '91 -You --
-- until the reference was called.
But you were getting letters?
We were getting a few, yes.
As far as the matter being current, I think the -there was a TV movie about it that was suggesting

David's innocence?
A
Yeah. I think it won the award as the best movie of the year?

Okay. I don't know.
I'm talking about the idea that this thing was dying, so to speak?

Well, the public's concern about what had happened was dying.

Well --
That seemed to start dying after the Supreme
Court's decision.
$Q$
A
That's your assessment of it?
Well, I mean certainly there was some interest in the public, but I'm simply saying that it wasn't nearly as intense as it was --

Oh.
A
-- from that February period until the reference was called.
$Q$
Well certainly, once David is out of jail, it can't have the same degree of intensity?

A
Q
Well, whatever the reason, it was --
There was lots of support in this province; was
there not?
A
A

Q
A
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Not a huge amount, Mr. Wolch.

Q
A
Q

A

Q

BY MR. WOLCH:
I -time.

Not a huge amount.
I don't mean to raise it, but $I$ think even your own family was supporting David Milgaard?

That was before, Mr. Wolch, that my mother sent him $\$ 5$. It was before, $I$ think, even before the first application was --

Your mother was supporting -- she had it right? COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Mr. Wolch? MR. WOLCH: Oh, certainly, that's a good
(Adjourned at 2:30 p.m.)
(Reconvened at 2:51 p.m.)

Mr. Brown, at the end of the Supreme Court reference and the decision has come down, what would have been your view as to the guilt or innocence of David Milgaard?

Well, I suspect $I$ probably was of the view that he was guilty at that point.

And what would have been your view as to the guilt or innocence of Larry Fisher?

Well, $I$ certainly didn't think that he was guilty of the Gail Miller murder at that point.

And so you didn't place much credence in Linda

Fisher, or the jailhouse confessions of Fisher, or the similar acts?

Well the -- again, I mean, my view was that Linda Fisher had substantially backed away from what she'd said in the sense that she said it wasn't her knife and that there was no blood on any of his clothing when she washed it. I mean, at the end of the day Linda's evidence was that when she accused him of that he appeared shocked, and he should have been at work that morning and wasn't. The rest of it, well, the similar fact was what it was. I didn't think it -- certainly didn't think it proved Larry Fisher was guilty.

Okay. And then there was an inmate named Patterson who seemed quite credible I think?

Well, yeah. I mean all of their statements, including the one by that what's his name, the guy that ended up murdering the --

Morgan?
-- Morgan, they all had a, you know, certainly in retrospect they all have a ring of truth about them, but $I$ didn't think that then, and $I$ certainly wouldn't be prepared to rely on that kind of evidence.

The reason $I$ mention Patterson is that in Larry

Fisher's trial the Crown put him forward as a witness and $I$ wouldn't expect them to do that unless they thought he was credible?

A

Q

A

Q

Q ع

Oh, I don't think we thought he was incredible, we just didn't think that his evidence was kind of a confession of Larry Fisher's.

Okay. And the fact that Fisher lived in the same house as Cadrain was dismissed as a coincidence, was it, or --

Yes.
Okay. So it's fair to say, at the end, you believed David had done it and that Fisher was innocent of the murder of Gail Miller?

That's right, yes.
I want to just touch on a few of the letters that you've written at various times, just a few points on them, and I'll try to go through them fairly quickly. 033150. This is a letter March the 9th of '93, and if we can go to 53, I'm just interested in this paragraph here:
"I am satisfied that in the final analysis, the supreme court judges were satisfied he was guilty of Gail Miller's murder."

That's David Milgaard, of course.
"Reading between the lines of the
judgement, that's the only conclusion I
can come to."

Now, in fairness, you say "go talk to Mr. Asper", but you say that, in your mind, that you felt the judges were satisfied of David Milgaard's guilt;

Yes.
-- is that correct? And you were of the view that they would recommend the quashing of a murder conviction of somebody they thought was guilty? Yes, --

And --
-- because they thought he'd been punished enough.
And --
You have to -- the other thing $I$ would point out, Mr. Wolch, is that you have to put that in the context of a 16-year-old committing that offence at that point. When you are looking at three years custody and two years supervision, that's a very different thing than 22 years in jail, and he certainly wouldn't have been serving it in a federal penitentiary.

Okay, that's your view of the Supreme Court, that's fine.

A
$Q$

A

Q

A
Q

Well, that's a background consideration I'm sure they had.
026986. Sorry, just for the record's sake, the previous letter was your letter. This letter -if we can go --

Yes, it will be signed by the Minister of Justice, yes.

Yeah, but prepared by yourself or --
Yes.
Okay. I'm interested in the first page. You say:
"Even if Mr. Milgaard's lawyer ...",
and this is August the 10th of '92:
"Even if Mr. Milgaard's lawyer had known about Larry Fisher's conduct, that evidence would not have been considered sufficiently relevant to be admissible at Mr. Milgaard's trial. This lack of relevance at law is also the reason Crown counsel did not have to disclose it to defence counsel at that time. It was because of this the Supreme Court was able to say the Crown disclosed all that was required by law in 1970." Now you're saying, here, that the evidence would not have been considered relevant to be
admissible at his trial?

A
there is a difference when you are using acts to show propensity as opposed to using acts to show identity?

A
Q
A

Q
A
Q

A

Q
A

Q

A
You could use it for identity if it meets the standard that the Handy and Shearing sets out for the Crown.

But if you are talking about, for example if the issue is lack of consent, it's pretty hard to get into similar acts when consent is an issue; would that be fair?

A
Well, yes, but that -- that's because the Criminal Code says you can't.

Well, but it's harder, because the issue normally
is identity, how do you identify the perpetrator, as opposed to determine if this particular individual consented or not; that's sort of the difference?

A
Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

Q
I draw your attention to 164797. And this will not be your letter but one of the Minister of Justice; would you have written this letter or had any part of it?

A
Q
A
$Q$

A
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Umm, can you -- is there --
Turn the page now?
-- anything on the bottom?
If you turn the page you can see. Next page, sorry, to 04.

Umm, all $I$ can say is very probably it would have started out on my desk. The process they go through allows for additions by other people, I can't say for sure whether that's all my letter or not, but it would likely have started out on my desk.

Okay. I'm interested in this paragraph here.
"The suggestion you make that $I$ engage an independent person to review the Fisher evidence to determine whether he should be prosecuted is astounding. Again, $I$ have to wonder how carefully you have bothered to read the judgement of the Court. All the Fisher evidence was presented to the Court. The Court makes it clear that they do not think there is enough evidence to charge Mr. Fisher."

Now that's not accurate; is it?
Well, that seemed to be what they said.

Q No, they --
A Yes, it did.
Q

A
$Q$

A
Q

A

Q
A
Q

A
-- no, I don't think that was ever considered.
I mean just with a view is there enough to charge Fisher or not?

I don't recall that ever being -- that issue being brought to my attention. That's not to say somebody didn't look at it. Cent

Q
A

Q

A
$Q$

Okay.
But I would assume, frankly, if that was a live issue, $I$ would have been asked.

Okay. 026946. This is a letter of October 29th, and if $I$ can just turn the page to see, it's a letter from the minister but seems to be prepared by yourself?

Yes.
Okay. If we can go back to the first page, then, I'm interested in this portion here:
"The answer to your question is that Mr. Milgaard is neither 'guilty' nor 'not guilty' in the eyes of the law. I can't blame anyone for thinking it's a curious result, but $I$ will attempt to explain how it arose."

Let's just go to the next paragraph.
"Guilty or not guilty are verdicts found after a trial and the only trial Mr. Milgaard had produced a guilty verdict. That verdict was set aside and a new trial ordered, so we are now back in the position that there is no verdict. Mr. Milgaard is therefore, neither guilty nor not guilty."

He's presumed innocent.
No, but that's not what it says?
Well yes, $I$ agree, it says he is neither guilty nor not guilty.

No.
Those are verdicts after a trial.
Oh, I appreciate that, but do you not think that this is an incorrect impression given to the reader?

Well no, --
The only verdict was guilty --
-- Mr. Wolch, I don't.
The only verdict was guilty, we are now back in a
position where there was no verdict. No, we're
not, because the position earlier had a trial --
had a charge outstanding. There is no charge
outstanding?
That's correct, and so --
Same as no verdict. He had a stay entered.
That's right.
Stay means there's no credible case to put to --
No, it doesn't.
What does a stay mean?
It means we're not proceeding.
For what reason?

A
Q
A

Q

A
Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

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

Q
I just want to go over a couple of things here. You say:
"Let me begin by explaining the process of review involved..."

Here we're talking about not the Supreme Court, but pre Supreme Court.
"The initial investigation of the murder of Gail Miller was conducted by the..." SCP.
"The initial prosecution of Milgaard was handled by officials in my department. Neither the Saskatoon City Police nor my department played any major role in the re- investigation of this case... The Saskatoon Police and my officials were confined to providing information to federal investigators. This was done by allowing these investigators free and unrestricted access to all the files concerning this matter... The purpose of the federal review is to provide an independent, impartial assessment of the handling of the case by both the original police agency and the original prosecutor. In this case as well, since
there were allegations that there was
new evidence, this review had to assess
this evidence to determine how reliable
it might be and whether it could
reasonably be expected to have any
effect on the original verdict."
Isn't that exactly what the question, or the
question that was posed? It zeros in on the
question, but I'll go further:
"During this assessment, any ambiguity
or doubt was resolved in favour of Mr .
Milgaard's arguments."

Where does that come from?
Well, that was our understanding of the federal government's process. I mean, we were told that if there was a doubt about something, it would be resolved in favour of the applicants.

And who told you that?
That would have come from somebody at the Federal Department of Justice.

Any ambiguity resolved in favour. Now, you say:
"In this case something extra-ordinary happened. Because Mr. Milgaard's lawyer complained about the Department of Justice review, everything, including
copies of the police and prosecution file material, the original transcript of the trial, the new evidence as submitted by Milgaard's counsel and the R.C.M.P. reports on the reinvestigation, were turned over to an outside party for re-assessment."

If we can just turn the page:
"That outside party was retired Supreme Court of Canada Justice ... MacIntyre. Mr. MacIntyre had a great deal of experience as a defence counsel ... earned a very good reputation ... as a judge ... took his time and reviewed everything. In the end he was satisfied that the review done by the Department ... came to the correct conclusion and that there was no reason to order a review by the ... Court of appeal. He was satisfied that the original trial had reached a just and fair conclusion concerning Milgaard's guilt. And he was also satisfied that the so called new evidence was more illusory than real."

Now, where did you get all that information?

A federal officials, $I$ was talking mostly to Eugene Williams at that point. He and $I$ were both sort of on the lower order, so we talked together and the upper echelon talked together. I think the
deputy minister may have even been talking to their deputy minister.

Q
Then go to 83, you say:
"The third proposed new evidence is a suggestion that some one named Larry Fisher might have committed the murder because he lived in that area. On careful investigation of this prospect, the R.C.M.P. were able to find absolutely no evidence connecting Mr. Fisher to the murder. This aspect of the new evidence has no basis in reality at all."

How did you come to that conclusion?
Which, that it has no basis in reality?
Yeah.
The point $I$ 'm making is that it, in my view, did not affect the conviction of David Milgaard and that there was nothing there to connect Fisher to the murder.

Not even a basis in reality?
Well, that may be a little strong, Mr. Wolch, but there wasn't a basis, in my view, to suggest that Larry Fisher was the person who committed that murder.

Q

A

BY MR. WOLCH:
Can you tell us something about your reaction when you found out about the DNA?

I -- to be perfectly honest with you, Mr. Wolch, I was flabbergasted by that. I really was not expecting it to show that Larry Fisher had committed that rape, but it then seemed to me that if he did that, the inference has to be drawn that he's the one responsible for the murder too. It's the only possible conclusion isn't it? Well, Mr. Wolch, you would be surprised how many two-perpetrator theories there are out there, none of which I, frankly, give any credence to, but there are some very reasonable people who hold the view that she encountered two people on that
occasion, one was Larry Fisher, the other was David Milgaard.

But that's not a view that you share?
No. No, no, no. You know, at the very least - at the very least, and $I$ think it goes beyond this, but at the very least had the saskatoon police known who raped Gail Miller, David Milgaard would have been absolutely no interest to them at all and they would have just chased Shorty Cadrain out of the police station as fast as they could, but $I$-- my view is that if you know who raped her, then you know logically who has murdered her, it has to be the same person.

Okay. And when you came to that conclusion, what was your view about Nichol John?

Well, my view about Nichol John was then and is now there's no question she didn't see David Milgaard doing anything, but $I$ don't know whether she saw something. According to their evidence, they were stopped in that area, $I$ mean, even Ron Wilson is still at that point, so $I$ don't know. As $I$ say, the only thing I'm sure of is I'm sure she didn't see David Milgaard doing anything. Are you saying there's some possibility she saw the murder?

A
$Q$
A

Q
A

Q

A

Q

A
Q
A
$Q$
A
$Q$
A

Q

I don't know frankly, Mr. Wolch, what she may or may not have seen, and $I$ don't suppose anyone is ever going to be able to establish that -I'm not so sure about that.
-- perfectly, and to be honest with you, the two prosecutors who prosecuted Larry Fisher take the view that she was lying from the get-go.

Lying about what?
About seeing anything.
They take the view she never saw a thing?
Yeah, that's right, about seeing anything or seeing David Milgaard or anybody else.

Let's deal with that then. Now, one of the prosecutors was Al Johnston?

Al Johnston, yes.
Tell us a bit about him.
A senior prosecutor with Saskatchewan Justice, been there maybe two years less than I have.

Okay. A highly respected prosecutor?
Yes.
And Dean Sinclair?
I think he's been -- well, it would certainly be 24, 25 years, something like that now. Again, senior prosecutor in the head office now.

Also very competent?

A Yes.
Q
Now, with the exception of the DNA, they would be looking at basically the same evidence that you considered?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Who would be?
MR. WOLCH: Sinclair and Johnston.
I'm sorry, Mr. Wolch, you can't say with the exception of the DNA, $I$ mean, that is the smoking gun, and that is the thing that points directly at Larry Fisher and irrevocably at Larry Fisher.

BY MR. WOLCH:
But it doesn't change what Nichol John said. Well, no, it doesn't change what she said. It doesn't change what Linda Fisher said. No, it doesn't, and it doesn't change the problems with what Linda Fisher said.

Well, we'll deal -- what $I$ 'm saying is the DNA doesn't change any of the other evidence. It might change how you look at it and how you evaluate it, but with all due respect, it shouldn't.

A
Well, maybe it shouldn't in your view, Mr. Wolch, but the reality is it did.

Because shouldn't the prosecutor look and evaluate the evidence without an agenda?

A

Well, and we looked at the Larry Fisher evidence and our view was it didn't establish Larry Fisher was guilty, didn't establish a case we could run against him. I know you take a different view, but that's our view.

Well, those prosecutors looked at Nichol John's evidence as having no merit whatsoever, the case against David Milgaard having no merit, and I'm trying to zero in on why they would see it one way and you would see it the other.

Well, no, no, their view is that Nichol John's evidence indicating that David Milgaard was, had some involvement was false. I agree. Whatever Nichol John did or didn't see, she could not have seen David Milgaard committing that assault. Did she see something? I don't know.

Well, I would like to deal with how they saw the same case that you saw with, albeit, the exception of the DNA, but in looking at the same evidence, and if $I$ can get to 297487, and that's document 297421, this is from Larry Fisher's trial, and this is Mr. Johnston addressing the jury. I want to go over some portions with you.

Well, except before you do that, Mr. Wolch, if you want to know why Al Johnston and Dean Sinclair
took the position they did, ask them, I didn't run this trial.

No, no.
I didn't direct the trial.
That's not my question. Johnston says:
"These are the signposts along the real evidence road which we tell you -- which we suggest to you are significant and tell you something significant about this crime. You remember way back when when this trial started six weeks ago or so, one of the -- I think maybe it was the first witness we heard, Detective Parker, Parker told us that he spoke to Larry Fisher, to the accused, the morning of February 3, 1969. That is the morning, three days after Friday morning when Gail Miller was killed. He spoke to Fisher who told him that he, that is Larry Fisher, lived at 334 Avenue O South... And I suggest it's very significant now, it wasn't to the police back then, but $I$ suggest to you knowing what we now know it is very significant that Larry Fisher was that time living at 334 Avenue O South, and on Monday morning at 6:49 a.m. he was at that bus stop. That is the same bus stop that Gail Miller caught her bus to work most mornings."

So I pause there. See, you said to us you considered it a coincidence. He considers the same thing significant.

Well, and as I said, Mr. Wolch, ask him why he -No, I'm asking you.

Why? I didn't run the trial. It wasn't my prosecution.

Q
A
What's more, the evidence we had, as I recall from the Supreme Court, was that she frequently used the $N$ bus stop. We'll get -- okay.
"You heard evidence as well early on
that Gail was killed about that time on Friday, January 31, really just yards away, just yards away from the bus stop. There is a red X I'm referring to, My Lord, there is a red X here, we were told by any number of witnesses that the bus stop was on the southwest corner of

20th Street and Avenue O. And if you remember the evidence of Maria Trupej, she was the lady who is now getting a little elderly, and as $I$ recall her testimony she said she remembered each morning a pretty young nurse walking from the north and a construction worker with a hard hat walking from the south. And remember this, Gail Miller lived at 130 Avenue O South, and her friend Adeline Hall told us that to catch the bus she would walk south to that bus stop. You remember Linda Fisher told us that Larry Fisher took the bus and when he did he walked north. It's for you to say, but who do you think Maria Trupej is talking about? Because $I$ suggest this to you, Ladies and Gentlemen, if Maria Trupej noticed Gail coming from the north and Fisher coming from the south, do you think Larry Fisher noticed Gail coming from the north?"

Now, that submission there would destroy, if accepted, would destroy the entire Crown theory of how David Milgaard killed Gail Miller, it has
it on a different street; do you agree?
A
Well, certainly the -- as $I$ recall from the trial
transcript, the theory $I$ think was that she was
taking the $N$-- going to the $N$ stop, that's why she was on Avenue $N$.

I'm not going to debate that with you, but --
I think that's the case isn't it?
No, it's not.
Oh.
Simon Doell is another issue that I'm not going to take the time.

No, no, my point is that that was the theory of how she ended up being going down that street. Oh, yeah, Simon Doell, that's another story. Go to 297493:
"McCorriston, you will recall, found Gail's purse. And he testified that he found Gail's purse in the lane behind either 414 or 418 - 20th Street. The only point $I$ want to make there is if you go down the lane and take a right and then a left to get to Larry Fisher's house, you walk by that garbage can."

Is that something you would have considered?
To be honest with you, I'm not even sure what he's
talking about there.
All right.
I thought her purse was found in the garbage can in the $T$ alley. Is that what we're talking about? Yes.

And then you take a right and a left to get to
Larry Fisher's house?
Yes. Anyway, leave that --
Yeah.
I'll move on.
I would have to look at a map.
I'll move on, $I$ don't want you to start looking it
up, but here's something which I think is very
significant. We've heard very much about the cosmetic bag, okay, we've heard about it from Nichol John, we've heard about it from Ron Wilson, Cadrain testified to that, we have the conflict between David and Justice Tallis, it's been a major factor, we've heard about it here over and over again. I would like you to see how the prosecutors handled that piece of evidence:
"Now that little bit of evidence takes
on a little bit more significance because in exhibit $P-19$... there is another booklet of photographs but I
won't make you scramble for it ... photograph 14 in it was a photograph taken of Gail's purse that was found in that garbage can and you will see, and I will invite you to look at it at your pleasure when you're deliberating, but you will see the purse and all the contents. One of the contents is a cosmetic bag, and you will see the cosmetic bag right there below the purse. The evidence of McCorriston was Gail's purse was found in that garbage bag (sic) and this photo depicts the contents."

Turn the page:
"...and you can compare it, if you wish, to the photograph.

Now, you might say well what
is that cosmetic bag have to do
anything, it's not a big deal, but
Nichol John, and a big deal was made of
it here, Nichol John in her second
statement, and I'll talk about that
second statement more, said a cosmetic
case was thrown out between Saskatoon
and Rosetown. Well, it wasn't Gail
Miller's because we have Gail Miller's."
Now that's -- well, I mean, I'm having a difficulty how this prosecutor can see it so clearly, same facts, we have the cosmetic bag, it's in the purse, the one out on the road means nothing, and yet in David Milgaard's case it means everything.

Well, it could be because he had the DNA results that absolutely tied Larry Fisher to the murder. But it shouldn't cause you to see the cosmetic bag any differently should it?

Well, first of all, I'm not sure $I$ would say that that necessarily excludes that as being a cosmetic bag she may have had. Certainly she had one in her -- with her purse, maybe she had two, I don't know, but the point is that the whole colour of all of the evidence changes dramatically when you know the results of that DNA, because it then -Shouldn't the cosmetic --

Maybe it won't for you, Mr. Wolch, but it certainly does for me. If $I$ had known the results of the DNA, the process in the Supreme Court would have been very short.

Well, I appreciate that, but why should it cause
you to look at straight evidence and interpret it different ways; that is, the cosmetic bag was always in the purse, it was always --

A cosmetic bag was always in the purse.
This prosecutor says look, much ado about nothing, because Mr. Beresh obviously made a big deal of it, much ado about nothing, it's in the purse, take a look at it, ladies and gentlemen. Yeah.

That prosecutor is looking at the same evidence as you in the same factual circumstances.

Well, see, Mr. Wolch, that's not correct, it's not in the same circumstances, it's with the very different circumstance that he now knows Larry Fisher is the one that raped Gail Miller and is likely the one therefore that murdered her, most likely the one that murdered her.

You are saying you start with the presumption of guilt and then evaluate evidence that fits the presumption?

He has the evidence to establish that Larry Fisher raped Gail Miller and that puts a whole different colour on all of the other evidence. It puts a whole different colour on Nichol John's evidence, it's useless. It puts a whole different colour on

Ron Wilson's evidence, it's largely useless. David Milgaard isn't in the picture any more and so anything having to do with David Milgaard isn't in the picture any more.

So what you are saying is that you can look at objective evidence and it will be evaluated differently whether you -- as to whom you presume to be guilty?

The inference you draw from that evidence is going to be different depending on what facts you know, and if you happen to know that Larry Fisher is the one who committed the rape, that allows you to draw a very different inference with respect to whether David Milgaard is involved. The case against Milgaard was largely circumstantial with the exception of those, whatever you call thems, in the motel room and whatever you call what Nichol John said and Wilson said, I mean, the sort of confessions. At this point all of that was irrelevant, it was gone.

So you are saying the same objective evidence will
be looked at differently depending on what you think the conclusion is?

No, no, Mr. Wolch, what I said was the same objective evidence, you will draw different
inferences from it depending on what the other circumstances are, and if one of those other circumstances is you know who raped the woman, that's a whole different case.

So you are saying that it's your view that if Mr. Johnston looked at this evidence without the DNA, he would have formed a different conclusion on the same point?

No, he may very well have. I would note that the Supreme Court of Canada didn't see it that way, they thought there was a basis to prosecute David Milgaard, and ample evidence upon which he was convicted, and again, all of that evidence that convicted him was something that was looked at without the knowledge of who raped Gail Miller and, as $I$ said before, had the police known that then, David Milgaard, the purse, Nichol John, none of them would have been of any interest to them. What I'm getting at is you are a prosecutor and Mr. Johnston is a prosecutor, you are both looking at the same evidence. I'm trying to understand how you could interpret it so differently.

A
And I've just told you, because the case that Mr. Johnston and Mr. Sinclair was looking at was a very different one.

Q
A

Q

A
$Q$

Well, let's look --
It included the evidence that Larry Fisher was the man who raped Gail Miller.

Well, let's look at this if we could --
And this, $I$ mean, the cosmetic bag wasn't evidence against Larry Fisher, it was nothing. That was something that Brian Beresh introduced to try and prove that David Milgaard was the one who committed the murder, or at least used that to raise a reasonable doubt.

Let's look at 297495:
"You will remember as well when we're talking about these early witnesses, Reid and Parker, Detectives Reid, Parker, Penkala, Kleiv, they were, as I recall, all asked as to whether or not they saw any signs of a car being stuck in that alley, and not one of them did. Not one of them saw any signs in that alley of a car being stuck."

Did the fact that there was no sign of a car being stuck cause you any concern when you were handling this matter?

Well, as $I$ recall the evidence from the Supreme Court, the evidence was that you wouldn't have
seen anything anyway at the entrance to the alley because either the snow was packed down, and you are not going to see the result of anybody being stuck there, or they didn't observe it.

Okay. Let's take a look at Nichol John:
"Now, I want to deal with the evidence of Nichol John. This was the lady who remembers nothing. And it's up to you what you want to take of her evidence but, of course, I have to deal with it because it's before you, what to believe of her statements back then because you will recall she made two. One as a simple witness on March 11, 1969 when she gave a recitation of what she and Milgaard did, and the other guy. And then on May 24 she gave another statement. It was in that May 24 statement that she alleged she had seen David Milgaard stab a woman. And I suggest to you, Ladies and Gentlemen, it's up to you, but $I$ suggest to you it's important that not one day since May 24,1969 has that lady Nichol John ever remembered that happening. She was
on the stand for quite a while and, as I recall her evidence, she indicated that not one time before that had she alleged she saw David Milgaard do anything and, as a matter of fact, not one time since then. That was the only day in that woman's life that she alleged she saw David Milgaard do anything, and my friend suggests you should take a lot out of that. She has never made that allegation since.

The March 11 statement,
Ladies and Gentlemen, was read to you, and $I$ just want to read her recitation of what happened when they got to Saskatoon that day. March 11, 1969, a little less than six weeks after Gail Miller was murdered:"

It then follows a paragraph $I$ won't read for the record, unless I'm asked to, which quotes from the March lith statement about the arrival and looking for Shorty, and then another paragraph about driving around the block and coming across a convertible. He continues:
"Now, in that statement, in the witness
statement, that's the first and only mention she makes of their first stop, and it's behind a convertible stuck in an alley. And you remember Mr. Danchuk just testified the other day, the fellow who had such a hard time remembering, but the one thing..."

He,
...had was a statement that he made in 1969. ...he testified that the alley he was in if $I^{\prime} m$ not mistaken was way aver here, Avenue T. I digress. I'll come back to that. But Nichol continues in that first witness statement..."

And she says, and another paragraph is quoted, where it's coming upon the Danchuks.

Mr. Johnston continues:
"Listen to this, Ladies and Gentlemen, and see if it compares to Mr. Danchuk's evidence..."

And then there's a paragraph from Mr. Danchuk talking about the tow truck and being stuck.

Johnston continues:
"Now, when you look at her second statement of May 24 , she claimed that
this happened after she saw David
Milgaard stabbing this woman. Imagine this situation; it is alleged here that David Milgaard did these things to Gail Miller, and moments later they stopped to help a guy who is stuck and then they hang around in the guy's house for an hour or two, and you heard Mr. Danchuk say the other day David Milgaard was the chatty one. Does that make any sense to you?

> He also said, you might
recall, that when they took him to the tow truck and got the tow truck, Milgaard had no money. Well, if he killed Gail Miller he had money. And he also had a lot of blood on him. The man saw nothing. He did say that Milgaard's pants were ripped, the same as Nichol says in this statement. Nobody has ever quarrelled with that. But Nichol says specifically in this first statement Milgaard's pants were ripped. "I didn't see any blood on anybody's clothing". She says as well in this first statement
that's very significant, I suggest ... because she sure didn't spend any time
in jail before she gave this one."
So he's alluding to the fact that Nichol John was kept in custody before she made the statement.
"All during the morning we were in Saskatoon..."

Next page,
"...the 3 of us were together and I am sure that David or Ron never left me for more than one or two minutes that morning."

And that statement is corroborated, he says, word for word by Danchuk.
"Then we go to the May 24,1969
statement, the statement she has never remembered before or since. I suggest that statement, Ladies and Gentlemen, is riddled, riddled with evidence of the suggestions that had been made to her. I'm not saying this is an evil thing or even that it wad done deliberately, but I do suggest that statement of the $24 t h$, the one and only day in her life that Nichol John ever alleged David Milgaard
did anything wrong is riddled with suggestion. She says, in talking about the maroon handled knife:
"This knife was the same one of a group of knives that $I$ was shown by Mr. Roberts."

She says:
"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." You'll remember when $I$ asked

Sergeant Mackie, I said specifically, "did you take her there or did she take you there?" He said, "I took her there". So again, I'm not saying it's deliberate, but she's 16 years old, she has just spent two nights in the jug. She didn't do anything wrong. The only thing she was doing was not implicating David Milgaard.

She then says very significantly, Ladies and Gentlemen,
because this is the part of the
statement upon which people jump:
"We ended up stuck at the entrance to the alley behind the funeral home."

Somebody, one of the
witnesses, $I$ think maybe it was Mackie, I'm not sure, wrote in hey, right at the entrance to the alley behind the funeral home, right across the street from where Mrs. Merriman ... lived. And you will remember the other day Mrs. Merriman ... said they called a cab for 6:55, and she saw no one stuck there. And that was steps away from her cab -- from where her cab would have been. 6:55 a.m. If Nichol John's statement has any element of truth, they had to have been stuck right at the spot as Mrs. Merriman walked out of her house looking right at them, and she didn't see them because I suggest it didn't happen. And I suggest it shouldn't come as a surprise to you that it didn't happen because the one and only time Nichol John in her lifetime said it did was on May 24 , 1969, after she had been talked to by a number of police officers and spent two
nights in the jug."
So the prosecutor is clearly saying it's not true, that Nichol John was kept overnight in jail, suggestions were made to her, etcetera, etcetera.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Mr. Wolch, can I just ask you one thing?

MR. WOLCH: Absolutely.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Was the background to this address a suggestion by defence counsel that they should accept the May 24 th statement of Nichol John --

MR. WOLCH: Yes?
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: -- as raising a reasonable doubt of Fisher's guilt?

MR. WOLCH: Yes. I think what happened if I'm correct, and I'll try and be -- hopefully I'm precise. Crown counsel -- sorry -- defence counsel asked that Nichol John's May 24 th statement be ruled admissible.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Sure.
MR. WOLCH: The Crown said that you can't put it in a vacuum because of the earlier statement given should put it on a different light, and the trial judge ruled that both
statements should go in.
THE COURT: Right.
MR. WOLCH: I think the Court of Appeal said neither should have gone in. I'll get to that, but $I$ think they said neither should have gone to the jury.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.
MR. WOLCH: But I might be wrong about that, $I$ don't know.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well, at any rate, what $I$ was -- what had just occurred to me, that it was -- it then fell to Mr. Johnston to discredit the statement of Nichol John --

MR. WOLCH: Yes.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: -- in order to get Fisher convicted?

MR. WOLCH: Yes.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.
MR. WOLCH: Yes.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Go ahead there,
I'm sorry to interrupt, but --
MR. WOLCH: No, that's helpful, thank you.
BY MR. WOLCH:
Q
So:
"Remember Danchuk's evidence.

He cited David Milgaard as the chatty one was my note. ... as I recall

Danchuk's evidence he said these three; two guys including Milgaard, a girl, and another guy, were in his presence *from between 7:30 and 7:40 until 9:30 or 10:00. We are to believe that this guy who has just committed this offence against Gail Miller is sitting ... chatting with Mr. Danchuk some blocks away. Sitting in the house talking to him and his wife, with no money.

Nichol John also says in the May 24 statement:"
about the cosmetic case. And he says:
"Well, I suggest, Ladies and Gentlemen, it's for you to determine it wasn't there because we have it here.

Perhaps the most significant statement in this May 24 statement which I suggest is a fantasy ... is the one on the second-last page where she says:
'I have not told anyone about witnessing this murder. I didn't recall actually witnessing a murder
until yesterday when $I$ talked with

Mr. Roberts.'

Never recalled it before and has never recalled it since, and $I$ suggest it's because there is nothing to recall. She can get hypnotized until the blue moon comes out and there is nothing there to recall.

You see, I suggest for the
reasons I have ... gone over ... Nichol
John's statement cannot be true. And I want to suggest it for one last reason and one very important reason that what she says in the statement, and it's important you remember she has never said it since, is that she saw Milgaard with this woman that they had talked to on the street beside the car and saw him stabbing her, saw him stabbing her, and dragging her around the corner down the alley. ... Well, Gail Miller has no stab wounds in her dress, there are no stab wounds in the back of her dress, the wounds inflicted to her back were inflicted after her dress was off and
after her coat was back on. There is no other explanation."

And then he goes on to continually talk about how her statement can't be true, the Merrimans would have seen it, and then he says:
"And for the reason that she was obviously suggested to over and over and over in the course of the statement and finally for the reason that 'I didn't even remember witnessing this until I spoke to Mr. Roberts'."

So your prosecutor there, looking at the same evidence, is saying "this is ridiculous". I'm interested in why you didn't look at it the same way?

Well, $I$ didn't have the same information that Mr. Johnston did.

Well you had Mr. Merriman?
At the end of the day, you know, you argued all those things in the Supreme Court --

No, no, that's not my question, Mr. Brown.
Her evidence was what it was.
Mr. Brown?
He takes a different view of it.
No, I'm not -- I'm asking you why you, why you
think, as the prosecutor, you couldn't see what he saw in terms of the incredibility of the story, the fact that the Merrimans would have had to have seen this thing if it had happened, how ridiculous it is that "I now remember, out of the blue, a murder", it went through a coat and not through a dress? I'm not going to repeat everything there, it's very powerful, but I'm just wondering why you didn't see it? I mean, surely, DNA doesn't change any of that?

A
$Q$
A
Well are you saying that, if you know substantial and very important new facts, that doesn't change how you interpret other things?

Well --
Of course it does.
Well, look at the next paragraph here:
"We are to ...",
A
The point $I$ would make with respect to Nichol
John -- and I think I may have made it to
Ms. McLean -- is, at this point, we know she did
not see -- or she did not see anything, so we know
that's -- or didn't see David Milgaard doing anything, so we know the, you know, slashing her beside the car and all of that is false, we know that now.

Well --
Absolutely know that now.
-- aren't we sort of --
Because the DNA evidence proves it wasn't David Milgaard.

But aren't we supposed to evaluate it fairly, and look at the absurdity of it, or --

You look at it in the context in which it occurs and the context in the case we had in the Supreme Court, and you argued all of these things, and the Supreme Court didn't jump to the conclusion that you now want.

I'm dealing with the prosecutor's role, you are the prosecutor, that's what $I$ am asking you?

And we looked at it, and it went to the Supreme Court on the basis of it is what it is, some of it is corroborated by what Wilson says, by where things are found, it's there.

Carrying on:

```
"We are to believe, if you believe
```

Nichol John, that David Milgaard commenced this attack when their car was stuck. What, did he rape and murder Gail Miller and then come back and push the car out and then drive a couple blocks and stop and help push somebody else out? It's ridiculous. It's transparent in its lack of credibility. But I don't want you to get distracted by it, I'm compelled to deal with it because it's been tendered as evidence ...",

A
$Q$
A
$Q$
A
Q
A

Q
A
$Q$

Well, that's Mr. Johnston's view.
It is --
Obviously Bobs Caldwell didn't take that view, I didn't take that view, Eugene Williams didn't take that view, Eric Neufeld didn't take that view, -But do you agree it's the correct view?
-- all of them prosecutors.
It is the correct view; isn't it?
Well, now that we know who committed the murder, yes.

Well, wasn't it patently absurd to begin with?
Well, I wouldn't say it was patently absurd, no.
I mean Mr. Johnston says it was transparent,
anybody can see?
A

Q

A

Q Okay. Now Mr. Johnston says he wants to talk about real evidence:
"And I want ... to recall the evidence of (V1)--- ...",
if you can turn the page:
"... (V1)--- (V1)-, (V2) (V2)--, and
(V8)-- (V8)---. These are the three women that we know with certainty Larry Fisher raped. We know that with
certainly because with respect to two of them ..." ,
there were convictions that were recorded and he was convicted of (V8)---. It talks about: "... introducing evidence of similar fact, and His Lordship talked to you a little bit about this just even before we called the evidence, we are not asking you to find that Mr. Fisher is the type of guy to do this. That has nothing to do with the tendering of this witness and is it is wrong for you to consider it that way. We are asking you however, to consider as a result of those similar acts that he is the very person, the very person who raped and killed Gail Miller. These offences, Ladies and Gentlemen, with respect to ... (V2)-- ... (V1)-, and ... (V8)---, we suggest are strikingly similar to the rape and murder of Gail Miller."

That's something you wouldn't agree with?
Again, that's Mr. Johnston's characterization, I've already told you mine.

It's also consistent, I suppose, with the judge's ruling that it was admissible?

Yes. Well, $I$ don't know that the judge found it
was strikingly similar, why didn't he include the others if they were strikingly similar?

Yeah, well, we'll deal with that. And here's, I suppose Mr. -- he is talking about Mr. Beresh's argument, which is fairly consistent with your position:

> "My Learned Friend says they're different. Well, of course they are. They took place on different dates and they were different women. There is always differences. The significance here, from our perspective, is not the differences but the similarities. Because remember this, we suggest these are some of the similarities, around the same time (V2) and (V1)--- were raped I think in October and November of 1968, just of couple of months before Gail Miller, they were raped just a few blocks away from Larry Fisher's house. Where was Ms. Gail Miller was raped and killed. They were raped in residential areas, and this is something that I suggest you might find strikingly similar, in residential areas where
there are houses all around and people all around. Now, my friend says she must have been in a car and nobody heard her screaming. Well, nobody heard (V2) (V2)-- scream and nobody heard (V1)---(V1)- scream. And why do you suppose that is? Because Larry Fisher had his hand over their mouths and a knife at their throat. Would you scream? Maria Trupej had that figured out when she said to my friend 'How are you going to scream with a knife to your throat'. And we know Gail Miller had a knife to her throat, with all too much certainty.

You see, I suggest the striking similarities include the residential area, the time, the location, the fact that they were attacked on the street and pulled down an alley with a knife to their throat, from behind, with a hand over their mouth. And I'm going to come back to the hand over the mouth because when you look at the photographs of Gail Miller's dead body and remember Penkala's
evidence of how her mouth was scrunched up, I suggest you will know why. And of particular interest, I suggest, Ladies and Gentlemen, in those other rapes is the fact that (V2) (V2)--, (V2)-----, and (V1)--- (V1)-, with each of them, he attacked them on the street, dragged them down the alley in the way $I$ suggested, and then, and then in a residential area, ordered them to take their clothes off, to take their coat off and lay on it.

Now, if you want an
explanation for how Gail Miller came to be stabbed with her dress off and her coat on, look to those people, because they too were ordered to take their clothes off and lay on their coat. What is strikingly similar is the fact that Larry Fisher in those other rapes was prepared to take those kinds of risks, those kinds of risks just to strip these women down, in a residential area, with his hand over ...",
her
"... mouth and a knife to their throat.
(V1)--- (V1)- said that she
was raped on October 21 st ...",
now I won't go through this but it goes through all the facts of (V1)--- (V1)-; -- if we can scroll down -- then we have (V2) (V2)-----, and it goes through all or some of the facts, at least, of her statement; and then (V8)-- (V8)---, it goes through her facts. And then he says:
"Now, our position with
respect to those, Ladies and Gentlemen, are that there are striking similarities between the acts, that is between the rapes of those three women and the rape and murder of Gail Miller. The value of the similar fact evidence is that it tells us, I suggest, what happened to Gail Miller. If you want to know how Gail Miller got to that alley where her body was found; ask ... (V1)- ... (V2)-... (V8)---. If you want to know how Gail Miller got her face all scrunched up; ask those three women. If you want to know how Gail Miller came to have her
dress down and her coat on; ask ...
(V2)-- ... (V1)- ... and ... (V8)---.
And If you want to know why no one heard Gail Miller screaming; ask those three woman. In each assault it was the same type of weapon, in a residential area, and on each occasion he made them disrobe and lay on the coat. Not with (V8)-- (V8)---. He told her to take her coat off but they never got that far. I suggest that it's important, Ladies and Gentlemen, that these women, $I$ 'm now referring to ... (V1)- and ... (V2)--, were strangers. They may very well be living today because they were strangers to Fisher. I suggest to you, Ladies and Gentlemen, from the evidence of ... Trupej and ... Humen that Gail Miller and Larry Fisher took the same bus and consequently if they weren't introduced to one another, like Tony Humen, they very likely recognized one another, and $I$ suggest that that's why Gail Miller is dead. My friend suggests these other women
weren't stabbed, and he's right, they were just threatened to have their throat cut. But he didn't know them. And he went to work on the same bus with Gail. Mrs. Trupej, as I recall it, described it as each morning. And you may find, it's up to you, but you may find Larry Fisher determined it was either kill Gail Miller or get caught. Because how could you rape a person who knew you to see you? Then what are you going to do, let her go? If you weren't going to kill her you wouldn't pick somebody you knew. You wouldn't pick somebody you rode on the bus with." Well there's, there is the use that Mr. Johnston makes of similar acts, and $I$ take it you would disagree with that?

I disagree with his characterization that all of that proves Larry Fisher raped Gail Miller. It only does that when you line it up with the DNA evidence.

Now the last part that you read about him attacking someone he knew, that's my reasoning for why, if you know who raped Gail

Miller, you know who killed her. If you know it's Larry Fisher, the guy she took the bus with for several months in a row, that's why he killed her. I guess I'm having trouble with -- and I don't want to be unfair to you -- but I'm having trouble with the suggestion that we get the conclusion first --

Well, Mr. Wolch, you are starting ---- I haven't finished the question -- we get the conclusion first and then interpret the evidence to fit the ultimate conclusion?

Mr. Wolch, you are starting first of all with the presumption that the DNA evidence and that is irrelevant to how you assess the other evidence, and I'm telling you it's not. You look at what you've got, all of what you have got, and you make your assessments on the pieces of evidence based on that.

And, second, you are assuming that every prosecutor sees everything the same way, and that's simply not the case. And I'm not sure, even today, given what the Supreme Court has said in Handy and Shearing, that that fresh evidence application would turn out the same way, because they seem to have raised the bar back up
quite substantially with that, with those cases.
They were both considered in the Court of Appeal in this case; weren't they?

Umm, yes they were, and the Court of Appeal
thought that you probably got by that. But again, if you're looking at that, the Court of Appeal is also looking at the DNA evidence, which wasn't challenged in the slightest.

Oh ?
And the DNA evidence said it's Larry Fisher. Well, no, it was certainly tried to be challenged by Mr. Beresh?

It wasn't touched.
Oh, it wasn't touched, but it was tried to be?
Well, he did, but --
Well, and --
-- I think it blew up on him.
And you keep mentioning Handy and Shearing?
Handy and Shearing.
Wasn't that a collusion case?
Well that, I mean, that was one of the issues they had to deal with.

Q
It was consensual sex, --
Arguably.
-- arguably?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
A

Q

A

Q

A
Q
A

Q it's --

I want to deal with another little bit of evidence, 297507. I think Mr. Beresh actually called Kenny Cadrain, if you can believe it. Down here:
between the trial and the Court of Appeal, but
it's --
"You know, Mr. Fisher through his counsel strenuously attacked the credibility of Linda Fisher, John Patterson and Pat Alain, and then to support his theory he puts Ken Cadrain on the stand. Ken Cadrain was a child when all of this happened. He says you should believe Ken Cadrain. Kenny Cadrain was five years old when all this happened and he gave no statement, as far as $I$ know of, to anyone until about 1990. In his statement to Pearson he said specifically, 'I never seen tattered clothes or blood'. I never seen tattered clothes or blood. But by 1993 in the statement he gave that had changed. Now he says he saw blood and he saw Milgaard go out the back door and back in. Today, or the other day when he testified, now he remembers seeing a garbage truck. 'I remember this garbage truck'. The man is remarkable. His memory is improving as time goes on. I was joking with Sinclair, I said you call him to the stand a couple more

> times we'll solve the Lindbergh
> kidnapping."

A rather colourful way of assessing Ken Cadrain, but certainly ridiculing the absurdity of relying on a five-year-old now in his twenties to have any probative value. Umm, any comment on that at all?

Well, at that point, his job was to do whatever he could to discredit that because that was being -that was the evidence being called to put the David Milgaard theory before the Court and, of course, that wasn't where he was going at that point.

I would point out however,
just for your information, that Mr. Johnston has prosecuted child sexual abuse cases where he has called people who have indicated they were abused when they were very, very young and are testifying a decade or two later, so it's not that you never believe them.

Well, fine.
A
In this instance he had a reason for attacking the credibility or the reliability --

Mr. Brown, --
A -- of that witness.

Q -- is there not a big difference between a child being able to recall some adult molesting their body as compared to a child being able to recall whether somebody came and went on a particular day, do you not see a major difference?

Ken Cadrain said that he remembered that, that was put before the Supreme Court for what it was worth, and again, it was corroborated by the notion that David Milgaard had changed his clothes there.

Okay. Just carrying on:
"I want to talk about Linda
Fisher ... because she said -- you might remember Linda's evidence, on the day of Gail Miller's murder Larry Fisher was supposed to be at work and he wasn't. He was at home in his dress clothes, freshly showered when she awoke between 9:00 and 10:00 that morning. She said under oath, they had an argument and she not seriously, and $I$ suggest it's for you to say, but $I$ suggest she said to him, not seriously 'you probably killed that nurse'. And you will recall his response to her, as described by Linda,

I think she said something like the colour drained from his face or he appeared shocked or something like that. My learned friend says Linda, if she was telling the truth, would have mentioned that to the police. Well why, she didn't blame him at the time. She told us that. She was mad at him for being out all night. She made the accusation in a moment of anger. She even said when he looked so shocked she backed off because now she felt bad, she thought she had gone too far. My friend says she is just vindictive. Well, is that vindictive? I suggest, and it's entirely up to you, but $I$ suggest Ms. Fisher was very forthright because she never talked about scratches or bruises or missing any bloody clothes or any of that stuff, she said to the contrary, 'I said that to him I didn't even mean it.'"

So he is looking at her as being forthright while you are saying that her not saying there was that supported his case. Do you see the difference?

A

Q Going down to here:
"It was only after that she found out about the rapes that he was committing in Saskatoon and then later the rape in Winnipeg, and she testified that it was around 1980, and I recall and again His Lordship will have better notes, but I recall her saying that she thought he was getting out or something, and this was bugging her so she had -- she drove to the police station or her boyfriend or something drove her to the police station at four o'clock in the morning in 1980, she had been drinking and she gave this statement to the police. Well, you know, when you think about it first, you think she's just -- she's half-loaded, it's 4:00 in the morning, I'm sure that's what the police officers thought because he didn't do anything with the statement, but he kept it. And I'll suggest something to you, Ladies and Gentleman, Linda Fisher has not
wavered significantly from that statement that she gave in 1980 to this day, and she has been called upon to testify and talked to a lot of people about it, and $I$ suggest she has not wavered in any significant way. I suggest the evidence proves that she has not waived because my friend certainly had an opportunity to cross-examine her on it."

So Linda Fisher is being assessed very, very differently by one prosecutor, here, as to you assessed her back then?

Yes. Now, after the break, Mr. Johnston continues down here. He talks about Linda Fisher and her credibility, $I$ won't read that, but if we can go down to the next page.
"As I recall from the evidence, the first time anybody raised the spectre of Larry Fisher in regards to the Gail Miller murder was in 1990. ... between 1969 and 1980 to the best of our knowledge from this evidence, no one connected him, except Linda, and her voice went unheard. The only thing she
did was go down to the police station in 1980 and give a statement. And I say it's significant because she has never wavered significantly from that statement. And nobody else ever connected them until 1990. Linda

Fisher's evidence is significant for several reasons. She says Larry Fisher was at home the day Gail Miller was murdered and was supposed to be at work. You will recall Mr. Fisher told Detective Parker that he was at work not at home. Linda Fisher says she accused him of the murder and stopped him in his tracks. She says additionally that she, with Larry Fisher, bought a knife similar to the murder weapon at the OK Economy, and that these two items ...", he identifies $P-18$ and, perhaps erroneously, P-15.
"Now, it may be my fault, Ladies and Gentlemen, because $I$ know in questioning her there may have been some confusion about these knives, and $I$ want to talk a little bit about my
recollection of Linda's evidence.
Linda Fisher has maintained
from the first day and continues to
maintain that the knife she missed was a wooden handled paring knife with rivets in it. She has never said anything different, and you may have been confused about that. His Lordship will correct me if I'm wrong, but Linda Fisher has maintained from day one that the knife she missed was a wooden handled paring knife with rivets, not this knife. She did however testify that at the preliminary hearing, you heard that was back in January of 1998, she was for the first time, for the first time shown this knife handle and the blade, and it was then she said 'Good heaven's, we had a knife like that, Larry and $I$ bought it at the OK Economy. She never, ever claimed and didn't claim on the stand that she was talking about the same knife. Clearly the knife she described as believing was missing was a different one, wooden
handle with rivets. But when she was shown the knife for the first time she said that was 'similar to one Larry and I bought at the OK Economy.'

If you remember there was a bit of to-do with Eugene Williams and whether she was shown a photo or not.

And when $I$ questioned Linda Fisher I put this question to her, I said, 'Do you remember the interview with Eugene Williams?' she said 'Yes'. And I said did Eugene Williams ask you these questions and did you give these answers:

Okay. I'm producing and showing to you this document which is entitled 'murder still under investigation' and ask you to look at that. My question is, have you ever seen this document before?

The answer is no. I said: 'Linda did you hear the question and say the answer 'yes'.

The next question is:
It reads; the police department are
interested in learning from any householder that may be missing a paring knife of this description; kitchen paring knife, 6 inches in length, maroon handle, made in Japan. Anyone having information kindly phone ...", a certain number.
'Below that is a depiction of a| paring knife. At the time that you went to the police did you know that a blade from a paring knife had been found underneath the victim's body?' She said no. I said 'Linda, were you asked that question and did you give that answer'? Now $I$ simply say this, Ladies and Gentlemen, that question from Linda, if you accept her evidence indicates that it was this document that was shown to her. Now I simply ask you this; she is shown this document, she doesn't recognize it, she is shown this item and says she does. I leave it to you but, $I$ suggest, it's not unreasonable that a person doesn't
recognize this and might recognize the real thing. But $I$ do want to suggest to you that Linda Fisher has never, ever claimed they were one and the same. The knife she has always talked about was a wooden handled knife with rivets. This is a different knife. She talked about two different knives.

I suggest to you when it comes to Mrs. Fisher and when it comes to John Patterson, that their evidence stands alone. There is no evidence to the contrary before you and you are entitled to consider that when you are deciding whether or not to accept it." So this Crown attorney puts a lot of weight on Linda Fisher and, $I$ won't go through it all, and John Patterson as well, and are you saying it's because the end result causes prosecutors to look at people's evidence differently?

No, I'm telling you that it's the evidence in its totality that causes prosecutors to assess their cases differently. Had we had, you know, had Eugene Williams and Ron Fainstein and Rob Frater and Eric Neufeld and $I$ had all that, the Larry

Fisher DNA evidence, in the Supreme Court, we would have seen it differently too.

You mentioned Ron Fainstein and Robert Frater; what was their position?

Their position on what?
At the Supreme Court reference? Were they --
Well they --
-- partisan or non-partisan?
Well in -- they were there to assist the Court, but I'm aware of the fact that they didn't take any different view than what we had.

Well, Fainstein actually cross-examined David?
Well, he started to, and isn't that at the point where the Chief Justice reminded him that they were basically there just to assist the Court? Would you accept that Fainstein and Frater were, let's say, on the same side as you? Oh, I would think that's a fair characterization, yes.

Just go to 297538. Just as interest, here's how Mr. Johnston ended his address to the jury: "... Ladies and Gentlemen, I say with respect, it's time to leave David Milgaard alone. Finally let's leave him in peace because, I suggest, knowing

A
what you all now know that the verdict you ultimately come to will be the just and proper one."

I take it you would agree with that?
Yes. I think David Milgaard's potential culpability was the only real defence Larry Fisher had. The attempt to discredit the DNA, if I recall correctly, blew up in his face.

So I just -- well, I'll leave it for now, but I'm interested in how -- or your point you make about, when you know the end result, you look at specific evidence differently, I mean -No, no, when you have all of the evidence you look at the specific parts differently, and I don't -I mean suppose, for whatever reason, the jury had come in and said "not guilty" at the Fisher trial, that wouldn't have changed my mind.

No, but what $I$ am saying is I'm having a very hard time coming to grips with the idea that, if Nichol John's evidence is not worthy of belief, why that's influenced as to whether you have DNA or not?

Well, because you come to the conclusion that it's not worth any credit because you know all of the evidence, you know that Larry Fisher is the one
who raped Gail Miller, and therefore you know Nichol John's evidence can't be true.

But why can't you form the same opinion just assessing the frailty of the evidence, --

Well, --
-- assessing the nonsense of the evidence?
-- and you can look at its frailties, and
certainly those were before the Supreme Court and they were argued before the Supreme Court, but at the end of the day it was what it was.

I'm zeroing in on the prosecutor, I'm interested in the prosecutor's assessment of this case, because how a prosecutor looks at his case is a great influence on whether a miscarriage of justice occurs or not?

Quite true, but the point $I$ would make, Mr. Wolch, is you don't take a single piece of evidence, look at it in isolation and then decide, well, there's a flaw here, discard it, then go the next piece of evidence, look at it in isolation and discard it, you look at all of your evidence together. Now, obviously if there's a piece of evidence that is totally unreliable, you will discard that, but everything is looked at in terms of the whole case, it's not looked at piecemeal.

Q

A

Well, I'm still astounded by your assertion that you think Nichol John may have seen something after hearing Mr. Johnston --

I mean, I don't know whether she seen something or not. What $I$ am absolutely sure about is she didn't see David Milgaard do anything. Now, whether she saw somebody else, whether she got out of the car, if they got stuck, $I$ don't know, it's impossible -- how do you probe someone's evidence when their only response is $I$ don't remember. Wouldn't you look at the circumstances of how the statement took place, wouldn't you look at her original statement?

Yes, we looked at all of that and the arguments that Johnston made were the kinds of things that were put to the Supreme Court and the issues taken.

You keep taking refuge in the Supreme Court. No, no. I'm asking about you. I'm simply pointing out that those arguments were made and they are arguments you can make and there were counter arguments that you can make and at the end of the day it's for the court to decide what they are going to do.

Q

A
$Q$
A

Q

Can we turn to 307464 , this would be the Crown's factum in Larry Fisher's appeal, and this is doc. ID number 3074-- is that a six?

It looks like it.
60. Now, do you know who prepared the factum?

Tony Gerein, Anthony Gerein.
Okay. He's a very competent prosecutor?
Yes.
He provides a summary starting at, on page 464:
"On January 31 ... Gail Miller resided in a rooming house at 130 ... O ...
worked as a certified nursing assistant...

Ms. Miller usually took the bus to and from work, catching the "Route 2" bus which travelled east on 20th St. to downtown Saskatoon. She would normally walk south on Ave. O to $20 t h$ St. and catch the bus at that location. Her shift at City Hospital on January 31 began at 7:30 a.m.

Gail Miller was last seen alive between 6:35 and 6:45 a.m. on January 31, 1969... She was looking out the window onto Avenue O. ...ready to go to work and was dressed for that purpose."

Now, I'm just wondering, the evidence here, and the evidence has always appeared to be, that Gail Miller would logically leave her door, go up Avenue $O$ and get to the bus stop. Were you ever troubled by the fact that the Crown's theory depended on her going up Avenue $N$ ?

Not particularly, no. I mean, I recall examining the diagrams that we had and the logical route for her to go would be out the front door and up 0 , but that doesn't mean she can't take a different route from time to time.

Q
A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
had an hour to commit the crime, and frankly, I mean, if a jury was going to have a reasonable
doubt based on the evidence in that case, the time numbers would be where it should have been $I$ would have thought.

Can I take you to 467:
"Before and after Gail Miller's death the Appellant attacked seven other women in highly similar fashion, sometimes within blocks of the very spot where Gail Miller was killed. The evidence of three was admitted as similar fact at trial."

You'll find that your counsel, Crown counsel was arguing that the judge should have let all of them in, that he erred?

Well, yeah, but again, that's in the context of defending the fact that some of them were let in. I suppose the notion there is that the best defence is a good offence. Did you say seven? Yes.

Before the Gail Miller murder?
No, before and after.
Oh, okay.
If we can go to 481, one of the grounds advanced was that:
"The Learned Trial Judge was correct in
telling the Jury to disregard David Milgaard's ... conviction for the murder of Gail ... Miller."

And here's Beresh's position:
"To effectively present this defence [that David Milgaard is ... culpable], it is necessary to show that there is a link between the third party and the offence in addition to an air of reality to that link. Tendering a prior conviction of that third party for the same offence, regardless of the fact that the conviction was later stayed, is substantial evidence of that required link."

That was the Beresh position. And here is the Crown's position:
"That is untenable. Firstly, as the prior conviction would be based on all the evidence in that other proceeding, which evidence was not presented here, there is no way to effectively evaluate the propriety of the original conclusion and determine whether there was in actuality any link at all. Secondly,
the Supreme Court of Canada reference overturned the original conviction. Thirdly, despite whatever evidence there was in 1970, a stay was entered by the Crown indicating that there is no reasonable likelihood of conviction and supporting the conclusion that the original conviction was unsound. To permit consideration of a conviction notwithstanding that it was subsequently overturned and the proceedings stayed would be to foist a half truth upon the jury."

I'm particularly interested in your reaction to "...a stay was entered after the overturning by the Crown indicating there is no reasonable likelihood of conviction and supporting the conclusion the original conviction was unsound"? Well, number one, $I$ think perhaps Mr. Gerein is making some inferences there that aren't correct. I don't recall him asking me why that stay was entered. I did at the time think that when the stay was entered, that the likelihood of being able to successfully re-prosecute was considerably reduced, but the other reason, the principal
reason was that in my view it was no longer in the public interest to prosecute him, and as for supporting the conclusion that the original conviction was unsound, the Supreme Court said that the original conviction was proper. Are you saying he's wrong in what he's saying here?

Well, that's -- particularly the last part there is not correct.

Okay. Just turn the page, he goes on to say: "Equally, if the defence evidence had stood in favour of an inference benefiting the Appellant, then one would also have to allow information in regarding the Supreme Court Reference and the background to the stay of proceedings. In the end that would render the entire issue a wash and the conviction of no probative value. That was the destination reached by the learned trial judge's ruling, without going on a circuitous and unnecessary route."

You see the judge instructed:
"You must decide what the facts of the
case are only on the basis of evidence presented here in the courtroom." If we can go to 784, this is the interesting situation where you have the Respondent on an appeal arguing that the judge erred in making a decision, which is a rather unusual choice, and I think you might agree?

Well, I mean, we occasionally have to do that and then you go to the no substantial miscarriage of justice fallback.

You talk about Nichol John:
"Through numerous interviews, and numerous court proceedings ... Nichol John did not implicate...

Milgaard,
"...in the Gail Miller murder save on
one occasion: May $24 \ldots$ The single
time Ms. John gave a statement
incriminating David Milgaard, telling
Detective Mackie of the Saskatoon Police
Service that she saw David Milgaard
stabbing Ms. Miller.

In her testimony on a voir
dire in the case at bar, Nichol
indicated that she could recall almost
nothing from January, 1969. In particular, she could recall almost nothing of travelling by car to Saskatoon from Regina in the company of David Milgaard and ... Wilson, of their search for Cadrain ... or of any other events ... she could not recall the various occasions when she was
interviewed by police and gave
statements. She claimed that she could not even recall appearing before the

Supreme Court ... that led to the exoneration of David Milgaard."

I take it you wouldn't agree with those words?
I don't know that it exonerated him and $I$ suggest you wouldn't agree with it either.

Pardon me?
I say $I$ don't think you agree with that either.
Oh, no, I would, but anyway --
That it exonerated David Milgaard in the Supreme Court.

They quashed the conviction.
They quashed the conviction. I don't know that they exonerated him.

Well, leaving that aside, that's the words that
our prosecutor --
A And she couldn't remember --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I'm sorry, the words of the prosecutor are that led to the exoneration of David Milgaard.

Yes.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Right. Didn't say
that that happened at the Supreme Court.
BY MR. WOLCH:
Q
It was during the reference that led to the exoneration. I'm sorry, I may have -- I may have heard it pretty quickly, but $I$ think Mr. Commissioner said during the reference that led to the exoneration.

A
Well, and I, frankly, Mr. Wolch, would consider the reference as something that continued until that DNA evidence was tested.

The reference continued?
Well, I appreciate that they had given their decision, but the federal government kept that evidence, they kept it for the purpose of
following up on a commitment given to the Chief Justice that that would be tested in due course and that's what was done and that's what led to David Milgaard's exoneration.

Q

A
$Q$

A

Q
,

And you think that's what the prosecutor was thinking about?

I don't know whether he was thinking of that or not.

All right.
I said that was my view. I was actually taken by the statement that she didn't recall being in the Supreme Court.

Okay.
"The May 24 statement came nearly four months after Gail Miller's murder. It was only taken after Ms. John had been brought to Saskatoon from Regina on May 22 - two days before. She spent those two days either in cells or in the company of police officers. Detective Raymond Mackie, the officer who took the May 24 ... statement, had been the one who picked her up in Regina on May 22. On the voir dire he could not recall if he told her where they were going or how long they would be. He could not recall if he told her parents about what was happening, although she was only sixteen. He took her to the Regina

Police station where a statement not implicating David Milgaard was completed (it is apparently lost). He could not recall the circumstances of that. He then drove her to Saskatoon and immediately drove her to the place of the murder in an attempt to "get her memory reestablished".

He next took her to the Saskatoon police station where he did an interview regarding her recent and repeated use of LSD. That statement is also apparently lost. She was then kept in police cells for much of two nights and two days. Her second day in Regina she was interviewed by ... Arthur Roberts of the Calgary Police service at a Saskatoon hotel. On the third day in Regina she provided the statement to detective Mackie."
$Q$
A Yeah.
But basically, though, he is certainly questioning the method in which the statement was arrived at?

A Yup.
Q
Yup

A

Q

A
$Q$

A

Q

A

 ,

Q

I mean, police conduct is certainly on his mind there?

He is repeating the issues that Al Johnston raised in the evidence.

Okay. But he does seem to be concerned about how Nichol John was handled, the losing of statements, the suggestions. Did those things cause you concern?

Yes, those were concerns to us. We were particularly concerned that Art Roberts' report, he said he filed a report on this, was never found by anybody. Yeah, I mean, certainly those were concerns and for the very reasons that you wouldn't do that today.

What about the Mackie statements that couldn't be found?

Well, yeah, that's -- actually, I don't recall the notion that he took specific statements, that $I$ think is new. I know he talked to her, but I didn't know that he had specifically taken statements from her that were now lost.

Did that cause you concern?
Well, that would cause me some concern. I can
understand how Art Roberts' statement might get
missed because it wasn't of any value to the Calgary police, but $I$ don't know why the information of Art Roberts would have recorded -wouldn't have been on the file.

MR. WOLCH: Mr. Commissioner, I note the time.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes. We'll just continue until you are finished.

MR. WOLCH: Sorry?
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: We'll continue until you are finished.

MR. WOLCH: Finished completely?
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: When might that be?

MR. WOLCH: I probably have about 45 minutes.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes, continue.
MR. WOLCH: Just keep going?
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yeah.
A
We can order pizza if you are feeling faint, Mr. Wolch.

MR. WOLCH: I appreciate the consideration.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Does anybody need
a bathroom break? We can stop for five minutes for that purpose if you wish.

MR. WOLCH: I wouldn't mind five minutes.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Five minutes it is.
(Adjourned at 4:30 p.m.)
(Reconvened at 4:37 p.m.)
BY MR. WOLCH:

Q about there was the issue of using it as some kind of $K G B$ statement or whatever and proving that it
was sworn in order to do that. Well, yeah, obviously that makes a big difference. Can we go to paragraph 77 then. You see: "The defence adduced no evidence from Detective Roberts, who though deceased had testified previously in the proceedings involving David Milgaard. The statement came after he was with Ms. John and even had exhibits delivered... No evidence was adduced from officers in detention, or who otherwise dealt with her during her time in Saskatoon."

And 78:
"Then there are the positive indicators the statement is in fact unreliable. The knife which Ms. John described as being stolen from the grain elevator at Aylesbury did not come from there.

Further, though she described a struggle over the purse and David Milgaard stabbing Gail Miller, the wounds suffered ... were not accompanied by holes in her dress. Her clothing had all been moved to the middle of her body
before the stabbing."
Her,
"... statement therefore cannot be correct. Such basic errors demonstrate it was unreliable to a degree that should have forestalled it being read to the jury. Her admitted history of LSD use causes further concern."

If we can just turn the page, paragraph 80:
"The learned trial judge's ultimate decision to permit in the earlier statement as well went some distance in negating the error in that it gave the jury a more complete picture. In the end, the initial error went in the

Appellant's favour, and admitting the second statement in no way overbalanced
it. Any injustice went to the
Appellant's advantage."
Now, in a general sense, you see how this Crown also deals with Nichol John's statement? I still come back that you still think she saw something possibly, it just seems so totally opposite of how these Crowns look at it.

No, I said I don't know whether she saw something.

Maybe she did, maybe she didn't. As I say, the one thing I'm sure about is that it wasn't David Milgaard killing anybody.

Okay. I would like to quickly go through similar acts and how he dealt with it at 504:
"In the course of pre-trial motions, the Crown sought to adduce as similar fact the evidence of seven confirmed victims of the Appellant. Each of them had been raped or suffered attempted rape by him. One he tried very hard to kill. In most instances he had or claimed to have a knife. Each had strong hallmarks shared with Gail Miller's tragedy.
115. Their evidence was relevant to determining the identity of Gail

Miller's attacker. The learned trial judge allowed three of the Appellant's victims to testify..."
(V1)-, (V2)-- and (V8)---. I won't go through it, but he summarizes (V1)--- (V1)- and then (V2) (V2)----- -- and next page -- and then (V8)--(V8)--- -- just go down -- and he talks about the law:
"The definitive statement on the law..."

Is Regina versus Arp. That's a case you referred to?

A
$Q$

A

Q

And:
"There was no dissent from ... Justice Cory."

And keep going down, there's no need to, but it does also refer to the Supreme Court case of 1989 of Justice Sopinka's.
L.E.D., yes.

And then goes on to talk about the basic law on similar acts. And if you can turn the page, I'm not going to go through it, but it's purely the law, general law on similar acts.

And then if we can go to 09,
this will clarify what we were talking about earlier in paragraph 123:
"The learned trial judge relied on Arp
in considering the admissibility of similar act evidence. Since the trial
the Supreme Court has issued two other judgments on the subject:"

Shearing in 2002 and Handy in 2002 .
"While neither changes the principles
set down in Arp, they do provide helpful
guidance on the manner in which to
approach the evidence."
Would you agree with that?
A Yes. Shearing and Handy don't change Arp.
Indeed, Arp purported not to change the law, it was the application of the law to the facts in that case --

Q
Right.
-- that gave people the notion that somehow the --
So it would appear that the Court of Appeal had Shearing and Handy when they made their decision in this case?

A Yes.
Q
And if we can go to the next page:
"The second aspect..."
In paragraph 126,
"...is to identify the issue. The only
issue in this case is the identity of the person who attacked Gail Miller. Evidence of "strikingly similar",
"unique", "distinctive" or peculiar criminal acts can provide powerful evidence of identity. However, Handy and Arp confirm that such jargon is less important than assessing probative value and prejudicial effect bearing in mind the issue the similar act evidence speaks to."

I take it you have no difficulty with that?

A

Q
Yes, that's correct.

And the bottom of the page:
"The first factor is proximity in time. The Supreme Court suggested this was relevant because a person might change his behaviour over time. In this case the trial judge considered this issue to be a significant element favouring admission, and it was operative in his exclusion of (V10) (V10-'s evidence. The events admitted were all very close in time, which supports the trial judge's decision. Indeed, the Crown
submits that in the end this is another
reason to instead admit at least the
(V10) (V10) - evidence - it showed the Appellant did not change over time."

And then on paragraph 129:
"The similarities among those whose evidence was admitted, and the attack on Gail Miller, were clear and compelling:",
age and gender, residential area, walking alone in dark with no one else around, highly vulnerable, each victim was close to home when attacked, the appellant was not afraid to confront, drag, struggle with and rape women in areas surrounded by occupied homes, the Appellant initiated attacks by walking past his victims, grabbing them from behind, putting his hand over their mouths, held a knife to their throats.
"Gail Miller's assailant was armed with a knife. He applied considerable force to the area of her mouth and nose before she died. Her right boot was missing and there was a scratch on the back of her right leg."
"In each case the Appellant compelled
the victim into an alley or area between houses;",
"The use or threatened use of a knife. The Appellant did not just arm himself with a knife when he attacked his victims. He also threatened to use that knife. He variously threatened to stab, kill or cut the throat of whichever victim he was attacking. Gail Miller was stabbed, had her throat slashed and she was killed."
"In each case the Appellant concentrated on threatening them with harm from the knife if they made noise or resisted;" "In each case the Appellant had the victim remove her coat and pushed her clothing out of the way. The Appellant was not interested merely in a quick act of forced vaginal intercourse.

Notwithstanding the danger of detection, he significantly prolonged his attacks by forcing his victims to expose most if not all of their bodies to him before he raped them. So did Gail Miller's assailant. He could have raped her
simply by unbuttoning her coat, pulling down her underwear and completing the act. However, he chose to forcibly strip his victim on one of the coldest mornings of the winter."

He:
"... was particularly intent on exposing or assaulting the chest area of his victims. So was Gail Miller's
assailant. Her chest was exposed, her right bra strap was broken."
"The Appellant allowed his victims the comfort of lying on their coats after he had forcibly removed them. Gail

Miller's assailant allowed her to put her coat on, perhaps in recognition of the temperature. Nevertheless, and in keeping with above, her assailant did not allow her the comfort of doing her coat up."
"In each case, save the one where he was caught in the act, the Appellant made off with personal items from the victim. While the Appellant argues they were not scattered like Ms. Miller's were, there
is no indication anyone ever looked for that in the other instances. The similarity is that the items were taken at all. It may be the Appellant feared being seen with her recognizable personal items; that would explain her sweater and her right boot found buried at the head of the alley. He went through the contents of her purse. He discarded that purse before leaving the alley. He carried her wallet away from the scene when he left."
"In some of the instances, the Appellant indicated he had seen the victim before or had ridden the bus with her. The Appellant rode the bus with Gail Miller."

When you read that, do you not find that compelling?

A
Not -- well it, it has more weight in light of the DNA evidence, but I still take the Supreme Court's view that is there wasn't evidence upon which Larry Fisher could be prosecuted using that, and --

Well, we may disagree as to what they said about
that.
Well, we can agree to disagree on that.
I --
But, no, $I$-- my view of the similar-fact evidence remains unchanged. It's there, it's -- I didn't think it was enough upon which the Supreme Court should quash the conviction, the Supreme Court thought it was, and thought it was something that could be used to raise a reasonable doubt.

All right. I'm trying to look at this, a prosecutor looking at this evidence, I'm having a hard time you not seeing it generally the same way that these two prosecutors did?

Well --
I mean, it's set out here in point form, but it does seem awfully compeling?

The point $I$ would make is that they see it, as I said, the five of us in the, involved in the Supreme Court reference didn't see it. They saw it as evidence sufficient to prove Larry Fisher was guilty, I didn't, and I -- again, while we may disagree, $I$ don't think the Supreme Court saw it that way either.

Just turn to 521. Here's the Crown position:
"Indeed, the Crown's ultimate position
on this appeal is that the other similar fact witnesses should also have been heard. While the argument was not as strong in regards to such victims as ... (V5)--- and ... (V7)---, the only significant difference is the apparent absence of a knife. All the other hallmarks are present and combine with a distinctiveness that warranted them testifying before the jury. If anything, the learned trial judge erred in excluding most if not all of the other victims."
"That was particularly so in respect of (V10) (V10)-."

So the Crown, here, is saying they all should have gone in, and you are saying none of them should have gone in?

A
$Q$

Well I'm saying that, in my view, they did not provide evidence that Larry Fisher was guilty of that crime. Absent the DNA evidence --

Okay. Well these two Crowns seem to think it does?

Well, that's their view.
And perhaps an independent prosecutor may have
come to that same conclusion many years before? Well, that's possible, who knows.

Now (V10) (V10)- was a bit different. If we can scroll down to this part here. Now you'll recall (V10) (V10)- was horrific?

Yeah, the 1980 case --
Yeah, I mean --
-- in the Battlefords.
It was, for all intents and purposes, a murder; was it not?

Well, he certainly did his best.
"During the rape he told her, 'I've spent ten years for doing this, only I slit her throat.' The victim asked him what his mother would think of this if she knew. He told her, 'Leave my mother out of this.'"

If we can go to 154 , sorry, paragraph 154.
"(V10) (V10-'s experience was the same as Ms. Miller's, save that the Appellant had opportunity to prolong it and that she survived. The difference the
learned trial judge noted between the two regarding age was premised on an assumptions as to how she would have
appeared to the Appellant when he first encountered her and his lust and rage took over. Such assumption is not defensible as he met her at night, on the street, in the dark, in autumn. More to the point, however, other than the victims' age difference, the two crimes are essentially identical."
"He used his standard method of attack, he made her undress, he had a knife, he cut her with the knife, he attempted to inflict fatal wounds, he talked of having done it before (regardless of whether he meant Gail Miller, he was confirming by his own admission that he raped and killed/tried to kill). He left her to die."
"(V10) (V10)- was accosted while walking near her home on the streets of her community. It was a residential area." He :
"... was not concerned about confronting, subduing and raping his victims close to occupied houses. He grabbed her from behind and held a knife
to her throat. He dragged her to a more secluded location."
"What is particularly striking about the similarity between the murder of Gail Miller and the attempted murder of (V10) (V10)- is the manner in which each assailant wounded his victim.

Ms. (V10)- had her throat cut and was stabbed numerous times. Ms. Miller had her throat slashed numerous times and her body was repeatedly stabbed. After he Appellant had finished with his knife, he covered Steel's nose in an effort to smother her. Lt. Penkala testified that when Gail Miller's body was found there were indentations at each corner of her mouth frozen into her face, and bruising to her mouth and nose. A trier of fact could reasonably infer Miller's nose and mouth were covered shortly before she died." "The similarities between the attack on (V10) - and the attack on Miller continue. After Fisher stabbed (V10) (V10) - he rifled through the contents of
her purse and stole money from it. Gail Miller's assailant did the same thing. All these things made the evidence highly probative." "Yes it was potentially the most prejudicial. It did not, however, on its face invite conclusions beyond its probativeness. The Appellant had pled guilty. He had been punished for it. The defence case and a proper direction from the learned trial judge would have controlled the possibility of reasoning errors flagged by the Supreme Court. Frankly, the more heinous the crime the more probative its happening - fewer people do such things. The question is will that be abused. The answer is that there was no basis to conclude it would have been and the potential for that was controllable."

Now, in making the ruling on similar acts, the judge would have known there was DNA evidence; right?

Yes, oh yes.
Would you agree with me, if there was going to be
an error made, it would be an exclusion rather than inclusion on similar acts?

Oh, absolutely.
You would take the safe route anyway, you've got the DNA?

Well, my view was that -- you can argue with this as well -- but my view is that the trial judge admitted that, the cases he did, so that the case did not simply rest on the DNA.

In terms of any of the
similar-fact evidence, in terms of just what happened, the (V10) (V10)- one is the most similar. No question it's the most similar. Whether it amounts to similar-fact evidence or not, whether it can pass the Arp test and the Handy and Shearing test, I don't think it can because $I$ think it is so prejudicial you run into problems, and that was what the trial judge held, I understand.

Well, if you look at the pictures of (V10) (V10)and Gail Miller --

A Oh, --

Q
A
-- they are almost identical?
-- there is no question that she had her throat slashed and was dealt with in some similar
fashions.
If $I$ had been running the
trial $I$ would have simply wanted the statement, just as the motel room incidents can be fashioned as confessions, the statement made to (V10) (V10)that he had done it to a woman in Saskatoon, or evidence of a confession.

No, I understand that. And (V10) (V10)- is a very credible lady?

Oh yes. I suppose the problem, though, is how do you get that in in isolation without getting into the whole incident.

Well $I$ guess my question to you is why wouldn't that have influenced you when you were assessing the case against Milgaard?

We looked at that. Our view was that the ten-year difference in Larry Fisher's life, where he'd been, had a substantial or very likely changed the way he looked at the world, he'd been in penitentiary for ten years, and the statement at that point was as consistent him attempting to intimidate her as it was -- and control her as it was a confession, and $I$ think that's the argument we made.

Okay. I'll just conclude Mr. Gerein at 307535:
"The learned ...",
he says at this page:
"The learned trial judge could not allow the jury to be misled. He gave leeway to the accused whenever it could be done without distortion. While that led him to erroneously exclude certain probative evidence - such as (V10) (V10)- - and to sometimes relax the rules of evidence excessively to favour the Appellant such as with Nichol John's May 24, 1969 statement - he never visited unfairness upon the Appellant, or applied the law on his rulings ... without full justification and reasonable conclusion. He did not err in law to the prejudice of the Appellant, nor did he suffer any miscarriage of justice." Now I'm -- the last item I want to deal with briefly, and $I$ don't know if it's on the system or not, is the Court of Appeal decision. I wasn't able to find it, I don't know if it's there or not.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: In which trial?
MR. WOLCH: The Larry Fisher trial.

A The Fisher.

MR. HODSON: Does anyone know a date?
MR. WOLCH: Yes, September 29th, 2003. My copy has notes on it.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: You can just put the sections to him that you are interested in orally if you wish.

MR. WOLCH: Okay. Perhaps I'll try and do it expeditiously as possible.

BY MR. WOLCH:
The Fisher appeal was heard before Justices Sherstobitoff, Cameron, and Gerwing; is it? Gerwing. The day $I$ have is September 29th, 2003. One issue is did the trial judge err in admitting the similar-fact evidence, and the Court reviews all that, and then they summarize the Crown's factum, they actually refer to the Crown's factum and read it and they go through it all, and they actually quote from the -- that list $I$ read you earlier from the Crown's factum in terms of where it's similar, why it's similar, that -- all the features that -- so they go through all of that. And then at page 52, or paragraph 52 of the judgement, they very briefly say:

While we cannot know the details of the assault upon Ms. Miller the most reasonable inference given the time, place and other circumstances is that while on the way to her usual bus stop to go to work she was dragged from the street into the alley and sexually assaulted with the aid of a knife with which she was stabbed. It's on that basis that a comparison may be made to the other attacks.'

I won't read paragraph 53, but it goes through comparing. And paragraph 54:

All of this, considered along with other similarities in the assaults, lead us to conclude that it was open to the judge to find as he did that there were sufficient similarity of the acts, that they were likely done by the same person, and that it was unlikely that the similarities were the product of coincidence. The evidence in question had a very high and substantial probative value.'

And the Court then goes to assess Handy and talks about those cases. Now here's the Court of Appeal saying this evidence has a very high and
substantive probative value; I take it you don't agree with that?

A

Q
A
$Q$
2 2 paragraph 77, Mr. Commissioner. This is the one $I$ referred to earlier. In paragraph 77, which is on page 7 of my copy at least: We are ...
actually discussing Nichol John: We are inclined to the view that neither statement should have been admitted because both were unreliable but we need not decide the question since the admission of the statements can only help the Appellant. We are satisfied that the judge having determined that one statement was admissible was required to admit the other as he did so
that the jury would be given the whole of Ms. Demyen's evidence viva voce and the $K G B$ statements, something necessary to enable the jury to fairly assess the credibility of Ms. Demyen and to assess the weight to be given to the various components of her evidence. As the appellate himself argued, the trial judge is under a duty to see the trial was a fair one -- a fair trial. That duty is owed to the Crown as well as the defence. As part of that duty, it was his obligation to see the jury was not given a misleading view of the evidence of Ms. Demyen by allowing one statement given to her to be placed before the jury while a conflicting statement was concealed from the jury, particularly when she had no memory of the material parts of either of the statements.

So what I understand the Court to be saying is that neither statement should have gone to the jury, and that Beresh would have had the benefit of it -- or at least Fisher would have had, rather, the benefit of it, and was not prejudiced by the inclusion of the first?

A
take the view that the Supreme Court has said that you couldn't convict him on the basis of just the similar-fact evidence, and I agree.

Well, the decision will speak for itself as to whether they said that or not, but I'm just wondering how you could take this position -- and I'll bring it to your attention if you can -- the last document $I$ want to bring up is 233116, and that's in document 233007. Now these are your words to the Supreme Court in oral argument: "I would suggest, in fact, that that evidence ...", and we're talking about Larry Fisher: "... isn't even capable of raising a doubt. There is no unique criminal fingerprint demonstrated in anything Larry Fisher did. He, in fact, seems to be, if I could use the expression without getting into a great deal of trouble, a pretty garden variety stranger rapist. There are no unique patterns, unusual aspects of his behaviour.

Everything that shows a pattern, everything that shows some
common factor in any of these assaults is pretty standard stuff."

Those were your views then?
A
Q
A

Q

A

Q
A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A Central Booking - Call Irene @ 1-800-667-6777 or go to www.compucourt.tv Appeal said, and what your own prosecutors said .

A
and what Justice Allbright said, do you think perhaps you were in error there?

Oh, obviously I underestimated the evidence. The Supreme Court took a different view, the Court of Appeal took a different view, I'm not entirely sure that it's quite as strong as they seem to suggest, but $I$ quite readily admit $I$ took a different view of the similar-fact evidence and the strength of it.

Not -- are you saying that was on an assessment or perhaps influenced by a form of tunnel vision? No, that's my assessment of it. I don't, you know --

But if you have to look at the DNA -- if you have to look at the DNA to evaluate evidence, then we're always going to have tunnel vision, will we not?

Well, $I$ don't know what you are referring to as 'tunnel vision'?

Well you --
We look at -- any case is assessed on the basis of all the evidence.

No, but --
And if you have evidence sort of as clear and strong as DNA, I don't know where tunnel vision
comes into it, it just changes the way you assess the strengths of your case.

But DNA could be a confession, it could be anything very strong evidence, correct?

Well, yes, I suppose.
A positive eye witness?
Yes.
But if you're looking at that to how you interpret
the original evidence, that's a terrible error?
No, no, I'm not saying that that changes the way you do everything, $I$ 'm saying you look at all of the evidence you've got and if part of the evidence you've got is a very strong piece of evidence like the motel room incident confessions, which looked like the confessions of the day, or the DNA evidence that clearly pointed at Larry Fisher, I mean it's -- you assess it, you assess the whole package. You don't, as defence counsel would like us to do, take one piece out, look at it, toss it away because there's some minor imperfection, and then keep doing that, You look at everything.

I'm not saying minor, but if it doesn't make any sense or have any probative value?

Well if you come across something that doesn't
make any sense, then yeah, you would.
Q
A
Q
A

Q

A

2

A
$Q$
A
Q
A

Q Those are my questions, Mr. Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thank you. Okay. Who's next?

MR. HODSON: Mr. Gibson, I think.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Mr. Gibson, go
ahead, please. We are going until 6:00, by the
$Q$ . way.

## BY MR. GIBSON:

I will be brief.
For the record, Mr. Brown, my name is Bruce Gibson, I represent the RCMP. You made some comments, early in your direct examination with Mr. Hodson, that during the 690 process you never actually saw the work that Rick Pearson had done; do you remember that?

I didn't, no.
And I take it that your communication in that process was with the federal Department of Justice and not with the RCMP?

That's correct. The RCMP, at that point, were basically acting as the agents of the federal Justice Department.

And it was your understanding, and correct me if I'm wrong but $I$ will try to go through this quickly, they were assisting the federal Department of Justice and were taking direction from the Federal Department of Justice on what needed to be done in that process?

That was my understanding, yes.
If we could put up document 056743 , please. You
made a comment that you -- and $I$ hope I'm getting this right -- were told by the Federal Department of Justice that the RCMP had investigated Fisher, but that it was something short of a full
investigation into the Miller murder; is that accurate?

A
Well, that's what $I$ have been told since, it was our understanding that the RCMP did a full investigation of the Larry Fisher cases. And I will take you through this. These are Staff Sergeant Rick Pearson's notes, and this is just the first page, it's about 200 pages like this. There is also other documents. Staff Sergeant Pearson testified for a number of days at this Inquiry and his evidence is clearly before the Commissioner, but $I$ just want to go through a couple of parts of this which show the efforts that Mr. Pearson went through on the Fisher connection.
If we could just go to
paragraph 8 of this document, it is likely on the next page or the one after that, $I$ 'm just going to make reference to the paragraphs there. And paragraph 8, it indicates that Staff Sergeant Pearson got ahold of the Prince Albert

Penitentiary, and he is trying to track down Larry Fisher's penitentiary records. And as you can appreciate, Mr. Brown, judging, you know, by your background and the work that you've done, it's pretty difficult to investigate a case like this some 20 years later?

Yes.
It's fairly cold at that time?
That would be correct.
And if we can go to paragraph 15, there's not very many places one can look, and again, paragraph 15 shows that Staff Sergeant Pearson is out contacting the Prince Albert Penitentiary and he's going to the North Battleford Hospital and he's, in essence, trying to track down Larry Fisher's blood type and that may be of some probative value in his investigation. So were you aware of some of the steps that he might have been taking to follow up on this?

No, we were simply told that he had investigated it.

Q Okay. And I'm not going to go through numerous paragraphs here, $I$ think we're all tired of this evidence, but were you aware that he was trying to locate and assess the evidence of Sidney Wilson,
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the person who came forth with the connection to Larry Fisher?

A

Q

A
$Q$

Well, I'm aware of that now. I don't know that $I$ was aware of that in 1991, '92.

And he was following up on the possibility of Larry Fisher having borrowed a car and having used the car in the offence and that there was a car seen outside Miller's residence the night when she was dropped off?

Yes, I'm aware of that.
And he was trying to determine whether the knife used in the Miller murder somehow could be connected to other offences that he was involved in that they knew about in Winnipeg. Were you aware of those efforts that he was taking?

No. I thought our theory was the knife was lying under Gail Miller.

But there could have been other knives similar following up on knives?

Yeah.
That he was following up on those aspects. And that he was working to locate Mr. Fisher's work records?

Yes, we knew that.
But your understanding is that that was fully 5
investigated and you accepted that?

A
Q

A
statement that implicated David Milgaard, they still believed that Ron Wilson had told the truth when he implicated him, they knew certainly by then about the motel room incident and the witnesses involved there, so my guess is that even if every police officer on that force had known about the Larry Fisher guilty pleas, none of them would have associated it with the Miller murder. And if you only have the similar fact evidence and you have the Milgaard conviction, and of course its gone throughout supreme court by that time, is it going to be fairly easy for defence counsel to raise a reasonable doubt in defending that case? Well, given what happened with Ron Wilson and Nichol John and all, the passage of time, $I$ think it just inexorably becomes easier to raise a reasonable doubt.

What would have happened, and $I$ guess $I$ probably know the answer to this, if you go and you prosecute Mr. Fisher simply on the similar fact evidence and a reasonable doubt is raised, what does that do if DNA is found three years later, two years later?

Well, he's in the position of pleading otra foi acquit (ph) and he cannot be prosecuted at that
point.
Q
So if I'm a prosecutor and I'm trying to assess whether $I$ move ahead with this and I simply have similar fact evidence, or I'm a police officer and that's all $I$ can come up with on the investigation are these similarities, is there a fairly large risk that until $I$ find other evidence, that $I$ could be jeopardizing ever prosecuting an individual that $I$ may have very strong suspicions about?

Yes, that's certainly a problem.
I think you indicated in your evidence that in the course of the Supreme Court of Canada reference, you said, and again please correct me if I'm wrong, if you came across any information that would have caused you to re-look into the Miller death once again, or cause an investigation to be started into the Miller death, you would have done so?

Yes, that's correct, and when we ultimately did get that evidence, that's exactly what happened.

And that was the --
The DNA evidence.
And in the interim, with the investigation that was carried out by Staff Sergeant Pearson and Mr.

Williams, there was no evidence that was uncovered that raised that, and nothing obviously that was brought forth by the Milgaard camp that caused you to change your mind?

That's correct.
And subsequently when the RCMP followed up in 1993
and 1994 into the investigation of wrongdoing by police and prosecutors, again, from your view there was nothing coming out of that investigation that caused you to think the Miller murder investigation should be re-opened at that time? That's correct.

Yes. And it was only the DNA link that led to that?

Absolutely. In my view that was the only way we were going to get a conviction on Larry Fisher and, frankly, notwithstanding what everyone has said about the similar fact evidence, it remains my view that if we did not have that DNA evidence, we would not have got a conviction on Larry Fisher.

Q
You indicated that the Saskatoon Police Service could have investigated without your direction, but they didn't do that. I guess it was open to them, it was in their jurisdiction to follow up

A
and continue on with the Miller murder
investigation following the Supreme Court of Canada reference had they wanted to do so?

Had they wanted to do so or seen a need to, yes.
And regardless of what any police agency might have uncovered, would you think that it would be reasonable in the circumstances that were at play here, that they likely would have contacted your office before they would have done anything with respect to preferring charges?

Oh, absolutely, yes.
I want to touch on a slightly different matter, and you indicate in your evidence, and $I$ think you were somewhat surprised that Pat Alain, a scientist with the RCMP, was chosen to examine the exhibits that went forth in the Supreme Court of Canada reference?

Well, it was more than a couple of years, you know, my memory suggests a six to eight kind of period.

A
A
$Q$

A
Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
$Q$
$\qquad$

And I believe you are wrong on that and there will be evidence likely put forth on that. My understanding is it's two years.

Yes.
And I take it that you may not be in a good position to give evidence on that and I'm not going to push you on that.

Well, no, I'm relying on what somebody told me.
And I take it that you were not aware that prior to that she had done about 20 years of serological work in the RCMP lab? analysis, that she was heading up the serological department within the RCMP?

I think so, yes, I think that's how she was introduced.

And you were aware that in the subsequent Fisher prosecution, that she was qualified as an expert in serology?

Yes.
I take it you have some knowledge now about the manner in which she may have examined the evidence?

Yes.
The exhibits rather, that she used a tactile examination, a visual examination and a random acid phosphatase testing procedure?

A
$Q$

A
Yes.
And would you be aware or would you have been aware that that would have been standard protocol within the RCMP and whether she had done it or another serologist had done it, that's the manner in which they would have approached that? No, I wouldn't have been aware of that. I hadn't been doing trial work at that point for six, seven years, something like that, and absent doing that, you kind of lose touch with what they do.

COMMISSIONER MaCCALLUM: What was the third test? I've got tactile, acid phosphatase and what else?

```
MR. GIBSON: Visual analysis, Mr.
```

Commissioner.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Visual under ultraviolet or --

MR. GIBSON: No, just visual analysis.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: All right.
BY MR. GIBSON:

Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
Q .
analysis rather than destroying it, that may have assisted in the process as well?

A

BY MR. GIBSON:
We do know that Pat Alain did find a small amount of DNA on the panties?

Yes.
You are aware of that?
Yes.
And you would agree with me that that was fortunate because that did in fact keep alive the
whole question of DNA analysis which eventually cleared David Milgaard's name and had she not found that, it's likely that there may not have been any other testing ever attempted?

Yes, that's probably true. Had she not found that, I suspect the exhibits would have been returned, and given that they were the only exhibits in the courthouse from 1969, '70, they might well even have been destroyed.

And of course we do know that by the time the subsequent testing was done in Britain, Mr. Milgaard had already been freed for a number of years and was no longer in prison?

Yes, that's true.
And are you aware that the DNA sample that she did
find on the panties was eventually analysed and matched up to Mr. Fisher?

No, I wasn't specifically aware of that. Well, there likely will be evidence to that effect. Thank you very much, Mr. Brown.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thanks.
MS. KNOX: Mr. Brown, for the record only, my name is Catherine Knox and $I$ appear as counsel for T.D.R. Caldwell, the trial prosecutor.

A Yes.

MS. KNOX: And I just have a few areas that I want to touch on with you, and, Mr. Commissioner, $I$ will finish before six $o^{\prime} c l o c k$ if that's of any assistance in planning the day.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thank you.

## BY MS . KNOX :

Sir, you had indicated during the course of your direct examination that it was your view and indeed the view of the Supreme Court of Canada that Mr. Caldwell had complied with the disclosure rules of the day in terms of the information that he provided to Mr. Tallis with respect to the investigation of David Milgaard?

Yes, that's correct.
And, sir, with respect to that, are you aware that additional to the documentary evidence that we have been able to show through his file that had some fairly detailed correspondence as to materials he sent, conversations he had with Mr. Tallis, that we have as well indications that, from Mr. Tallis certainly, that he was treated in a very cordial fashion and was permitted to read prosecution files, although not necessarily given copies of materials of certain aspects of the
file?
A

Q
And are you aware through a review of the transcript, and I'm thinking particularly of the preliminary inquiry, that he, for example, had knowledge of witnesses whose statements he didn't have copies of, like Betty Hundt, Anne Friesen, who were of the view that when Ms. Miller took the bus, sometimes she would have gone down Avenue O versus Avenue $N$ ?

I don't know that $I$ was aware of that specifically, but $I$ was aware, as you say, that Mr. Caldwell allowed Justice Tallis to read his files.

Okay. Mr. Brown, in the interests of time, I won't go to the transcript, but in the cross-examination of Adeline, and $I$ won't pronounce her name properly, but one of the woman in the rooming house, Nyczai $I$ think is perhaps one pronunciation of it, that Mr. Caldwell questioned her about where Betty Hundt was, where Anne Friesen was and was told that those particular ladies, one $I$ believe was in the Northwest Territories, one was in B.C., but certainly that his questions would indicate a
knowledge that information had been obtained from them as part of the investigation?

Yeah. Well, $I$ would have known that because $I$ did read both the preliminary hearing and the trial transcript. I don't recall it specifically today. But like most of us, it's gone from your mind, even those of us who have read it more recently. Sir, with respect to the file itself, you indicated in your direct examination to -- or actually, before $I$ go there, did you review the address to the jury that Mr. Caldwell did at the conclusion of the case prior to the judge instructing them?

Yes. I believe those came to us in Ottawa. They had not been reproduced as part of the original record, but the notes were around and they were able to find someone who could interpret the court stenographer's notes and they were produced. And Mr. Wolch in particular has referenced you to the theory of the Crown that he described as, and I'm not paraphrasing, I'm summarizing, but basically he described them as needing the evidence to place Gail Miller going down Avenue $N$ ? Yes.

Do you recall that in fact in the address to the
jury, that Mr. Caldwell referenced both a theory Avenue $O$ and Avenue $N$ and that both theories, in terms of her passage of travel, were put to the jury as part of the instructions that the judge gave them?

A

Q

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: You are speaking about what the judge told the jury though?

MS. KNOX: Yes, and Mr. Caldwell as well, if I'm recalling correctly, referred to both Avenue $N$ and Avenue $O$ as possibilities.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes.
BY MS. KNOX:
But that certainly the jury was given instruction and direction with respect to either of the routes as being a possible route of travel for her. Do you recall that?

Well, again, $I$ don't specifically recall it, but that could be why it didn't particularly concern me, that it might have been Avenue $O$ as opposed to Avenue N.

And not by any means to have this question taken
as a way of criticism or critique of the work that was done by the prosecution office and yourself and Mr. Neufeld in particular in preparation for your attendance at Supreme Court of Canada, but did you or he to the best of your memory actually sit down and do a page-by-page comparison of the materials that were in Mr. Caldwell's prosecution file with the materials that were in what was described as the Saskatoon City Police Gail Miller murder investigation file?

A

Q

Well, not page by page, but $I$ do recall it was our view that there was really nothing left out of the prosecutor's file that, from the police that was of any real significance.

Okay. Do you realize that what was not in the prosecution file as an example, that has been referenced here as having some significance, is the police report, the investigation report that contained the content of the interview, I believe it was with Mr. Merriman, that in his file there was a paragraph in the police report about one of the Merrimans, I believe Mrs. Merriman, but that in fact he didn't have the Mr. Merriman interview in his police file as we look at it?

I don't recall that. My recollection of the

Merriman one was he had the taxi thing, but I don't recall --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Who did, Caldwell?

A

Q
A
$Q$

A

Q

A
Q Q

Caldwell did, yes.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: All right.
BY MS. KNOX:
And the --
My recollection, Ms. Knox --
He had the information?
-- was yes, he had the information.
Yeah.
That there were a few files there, or a few statements there and things that they had done during the investigation that weren't in his file, but again, my recollection is that Eric and I looked at them and didn't think there was anything significant that the police left out.

Okay. And again to come back to your original response, you were satisfied that he had complied with the disclosure rules of the day as they existed in 1969?

Oh, yes, absolutely.
Okay. Now, sir, with respect to a document that has been, a great deal of time has been spent dealing with it through the course of this
inquiry, and indeed through Ms. McLean's cross-examination of you and to a lesser degree Mr. Wolch, but what has been referred to as the Ray Mackie document, that five page document?

A
$Q$

A

Q

A

A Yes.

You testified in response to a question from Mr . Hodson some days ago that you believed that that came from Mr. Caldwell's file?

That's my recollection, yes.
Okay. Sir, at what point in time specifically, if you can, were you actually assigned to become involved in the file and did you take physical possession of what we have as approximately six volumes that were Mr. Caldwell's prosecution file? Well, I was assigned in 1990 to look at the head office file which was essentially the trial transcript and the Supreme Court, or the Court of Appeal materials. We didn't look, we didn't get Bobs Caldwell's file $I$ think until shortly before the reference was called. We knew it was coming and we knew we were going to have to go into that. Okay. So at that point in time when you say you didn't get it, do you mean that it hadn't made its way out of Saskatoon into Regina?

We hadn't called for it and it hadn't been sent
down.
So it had stayed in the office here in Saskatoon? That's correct.

Now, the evidence on the record reveals that a number of people had gone through that file in 1983 -- well, in 1981, perhaps Mr. Young, although he and Mr. Caldwell have a differing recollection of whether he actually went and looked at the file, Mr. Carlyle-Gordge went through it in 1983, the evidence is that a researcher with CBC, Sandra Bartlett, looked at it and had access to it in 1988, Mr. Caldwell went through it a couple of times at the request of Mr. Williams, Mr. Williams went through it, Sergeant Pearson may, I'm not sure, have had some access to it, but that there was a path of people who had access to the file between 1983 and the time when it would have gotten to your hands?

Well, yes, $I$ knew some people had gone through it.
I wasn't aware that Mr. Young or Carlyle-Gordge had been through it.

Okay. Now, sir, do you know whether any steps were taken after the major focus of attention became a public issue in about 1988 after the first application was filed to ensure that the
contents of that file, as they existed up to that point in time, were kept intact?

No, I'm not aware of any special steps that were taken, no. I can't say that I'm aware of anybody doing anything.

Okay. Would it be fair to say that once the Section 690 application was generated, that some of the information that was sought, or information was sought both from Saskatoon City Police files and the prosecution's files?

That's my recollection, yes.
Okay, sir, and it's more a matter of argument subsequently, but is there any way that you can say with any degree of certainty that that document, that script document was, that came to your attention was part of Mr. Caldwell's file when he did the prosecution of this matter in 1969 ?

I have no idea.

Okay.

I can't say that.
And you $I$ believe reviewed various copies of it at the request of Mr. Wolch when he sent a copy to you that somehow -- and $I$ assume through Mr. Asper in fact -- had been obtained from the file, you
sent copies of it to the Saskatoon Police Service to have them attempt to get a source and authorship of it. In the various versions of that document that you've seen, that you've examined and you've worked with, did you ever see any marking or anything on any copy of it to indicate that my client, Mr. Caldwell, at any point in time had ever had contact with it during the course of his preparation for trial?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Contact with whom? MS. KNOX: With the document.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: With the Mackie summary?

MS. KNOX: Yes.
I don't remember anything, no. I know that for most of the time he was with the department Bobs Caldwell wrote in an horrible peacock blue ink. BY MS. KNOX:

We've seen it.
And it tended to leap out at you wherever it was and there was nothing on the file like that. He also had a fairly, once you look at it, he has a fairly distinctive and persistent kind of handwriting too, doesn't he, and lots of the documents in his file had marks, notes, underlying

A
$Q$
various things on it that can clearly be looked at and say "oh, yeah, that's Bobs Caldwell who did that"?

Yes.
Okay. And nothing in any copy that you came across would indicate him having physically done anything to it or had contact with it?

No.
So your evidence that you believe it came from his file when you took possession of it would at best be a guess, but you have no independent evidence to suggest that in fact it was on his file and if there are indications, including his memory, that he had never seen it, there's nothing you can offer to concretely contradict that is there? Well, that's correct. The only reason $I$ think it came off his file is because $I$ believe we provided a copy of that to Mr. Wolch and Mr. Asper when they came to review the file at our office in Regina and $I$ don't believe we had the police file at that point, so my only source would have been his file.

Okay.
That's the best recollection $I$ have now.
But you don't know who would have done anything to
have added anything or mixed anything in his file before it came to you late in 1991 just before the Supreme Court of Canada reference?

That's correct.
Okay. Did anybody else within headquarters review the file before it came to you or were you physically there when it was unpackaged, looked at and sorted through?

My recollection is it was boxed up and sent to my attention and I'm the one that opened it up.

Okay, thank you. Now, sir, just a couple of other areas that $I$ wanted to touch on. You indicated in response to some questions from Mr. Wolch last week and the discussion about the role of the media that -- was $I$ correct in understanding that you had attended a conference in Winnipeg last year, the Unlocking Innocence conference, where Dan Lett was a speaker?

That's correct, yes.
And I take it you were at the presentation where Mr. Lett spoke and where Mr. Asper spoke, and in fact I've had the excerpt of Mr. Asper's presentation played in these proceedings. Yes.

And I take it you were present when Mr. Asper made
the statement that the media attention that they garnered in this particular case was a key part of the efforts to get David Milgaard released from custody and without the media they wouldn't have succeeded?

A
Q

A

2

A
Q


Yes.
And you would have heard him make the statement, as we heard when we played the tape here, that he could go on record as stating that none of the stories that had gone in the media had been shown to be incorrect?

I believe $I$ recall him making that statement.
Okay. Sir, do you also, and you've been referenced to a story that was done, and I'll just pick this particular one because it was a
particularly directed one towards my client, but there was that media story in July, I believe, of 1990, where the allegation was that Mr. Caldwell had not disclosed the original March 2nd, 1969 statement that Ron Wilson had given to the RCMP. Do you remember that statement?

Oh, yes, yes.
And you in fact, and Mr. Hodson took you through some review that you had done without the benefit of the file but just based on transcript, that
showed that Mr. Tallis had in fact questioned Ron Wilson about that statement at both his preliminary inquiry and his trial?

That's correct, yes.
And you would be aware that right in the body of the transcript of the preliminary inquiry before Albert Cadrain testified, Mr. Caldwell went on record and made the statement that he had given copies of the statements of Albert Cadrain, Nichol John and the combined statements of Ron Wilson both in May, as well as his March 2 nd statement, to Mr. Tallis?

Well, again, $I$ don't recall it specifically, but if that's in the transcript, I would have read it. Okay.

The point $I$ was making to the deputy minister was he had to have had it because he used them in cross-examination, which was the point of the whole concern.

Mr. Brown, were you aware or have you become aware that not only did he have it for purposes of cross-examination, but that there was clear evidence in the documentary record that it had been sent to him, there was correspondence between Mr. Caldwell and Mr. Tallis that confirmed it
being sent to him in August of 1969 ?

A

2

Did you know that there were transcripts of telephone discussions she had with Ron Wilson back in 1981 where she talked to him about his March

2nd statement, referred him to parts of it, and assured him that she had a copy of it.

A
$Q$

No, I -- all I've heard or know about it is the summaries that Ms. Krogan sends, sends to the department every day. I haven't specifically read her evidence, I've trying -- been trying to avoid reading specific evidence before $I$ gave evidence. I take it, $M r$. Brown, then, that you didn't know,

Did you know as a result -- well, I'll start by asking -- did you read the examination or
cross-examination of Mrs. Milgaard at this asking -- did you read the examination or
cross-examination of Mrs. Milgaard at this Inquiry?
sumaries that Ms. Krogan sends, sends to the
 Meyer CompuCourt Reporting
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No, I know none of that.
Okay, didn't know any of that. Sir, did you know that, after the story was written, Mrs. Milgaard phoned Dan Lett and told him that when she read that story in the paper she nearly freaked because the story was wrong?

No, I wasn't aware of that.
Did you know that Mrs. Milgaard shared with Mr. Asper the very day after that story, July 18 th, that they'd made a mistake when he gave that information or when that story went in the paper, that indeed Mr. Tallis had had that story? No, I didn't know that. Central Booking Callren@1800.667-67i.argo mw.compucour.ıv
and perhaps will now come to know, that after Mrs. Milgaard contacted Dan Lett and David Asper and told them that the story was a mistake, that she then proceeded to make multiple contacts with other media outlets and not disclose to them that the story was a mistake, but to encourage them in the belief that what Mr. Caldwell had done was terrible, that indeed he hadn't disclosed that March 2nd statement?

I wasn't aware of that, no.
Did you know that we have a transcript of a conversation between Mrs. Milgaard and Reverend McCloskey, who subsequently authored that report of Centurion Ministries, where she lied to him and told him that the statement hadn't been disclosed? No, I wasn't aware of that. Okay. Did you hear any such information as that at that conference that you attended where Dan Lett was present and where the statement was made none of their stories were wrong?

No, I don't recall anyone bringing that up. Did you ever read in the paper, either under the authorship of Dan Lett or anyone, that in fact that story was wrong the day after or the days after that misrepresentation had happened and my
client had been accused of misconduct?

A
$Q$

A
Q

A

Q

No, it was left out there.
And with the exception of the evidence at this Inquiry for those who choose to read it, what little may have been afforded the attention of that in press, and what $I$ have just told you, had you any knowledge that that in fact was the true state of affairs?

No, I wasn't aware of that.
Mr. Brown, would you agree with me that with the limited resources that the media has, when they find out that they have made mistakes where the mistakes have been because they just didn't bother to do the work, as in the case of Mr. Lett, he had the material, that at the very least we could expect from them is that there might be a correction on the record?

Well, it was a fairly substantial allegation of wrongdoing leveled against a prosecutor, one would assume that if you're -- you know, trash somebody's reputation in error, you might want to retract, but --

Mr. Brown, $I$ just have two other areas to touch with you, and these will seem slightly off topic to you if you haven't been following the details.

But when the prosecution file was returned, or turned over to the RCMP for project Flicker, and ultimately when it was turned over to the Commission as part of the preparation for these hearings, there was a file contained in the box of the prosecutor's office that had a label on it Meeting File that some have concluded was part of Mr. Caldwell's file. He has indicated that he had no such file and, with the permission of the Commissioner, I would like to approach you with two files that have writing on them just to ask whether you can identify for us whether these are files that you set up as subcategories of the prosecution file and which didn't get reassembled back into their original form?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: What was the label on that again?

BY MS. KNOX:
The first one $I$ refer to is one that has a handwritten label in large blue ink Meeting, M-E-E-T-I-N-G, File. The number on the file jacket, the Commission number is 331785, and contained in it are some various statements that have witness statements, like Ms. Nichol John, that have the original handwriting of my client in
that awful ink that Mr. Brown refers to, and perhaps if we could pass it to him and ask him to have a quick review?

A
Q
A
Q

A
$Q$

A
Q
Yeah, that's my writing.
Okay. And it --
This was just a file cover that we were reusing.
So Ms. Krogan was right, that you recycle file
covers, because we tracked that one, if you look
at the name on the back of it, to a Court of
Appeal matter in 1983?
Yeah, absolutely.
So Mr. Caldwell's recollection that that wasn't a file he set up is correct?

That's correct.
Mr. Caldwell also testified that the first time he has a memory of seeing the Mackie summary, the script document, was when he went down to the courthouse with Sergeant Pearson while you were in Supreme Court of Canada, and he found a file folder that had a label on it -- and $I$ may not have this exactly right, yeah, I do have it, I have it in front of me -- Milgaard witnesses Roberts, Art - polygraph. And I'm going to pass you another file folder that doesn't appear to have a number on it, but again it has handwriting
on it and a label that he says is not his, and that it was in this file in the prosecution office in Regina at the courthouse that he found the script document for the first time in 1992; is that your handwriting?

That's my handwriting too, yes.
So, again, this was a file that was set up by you
in preparation for the Supreme Court of Canada? Well, subject to the fact that when we got the file back from the RCMP they had done some resorting, so $I$ don't know whether what's in there is what $I$ originally put in.

No, and I'm not --
But I'm going to tell you that's my file cover. I'm not suggesting, indeed, that the contents of what was your file, because the one I passed you that says Art Roberts no longer has the script document in it, so there have been changes. But Mr. Caldwell's evidence was that he didn't recognize these file jackets, that they weren't part of his file, and it's your evidence that in fact these are part of your preparation for the Supreme Court of Canada?

That's correct.
And I take it, given that you were setting up file
folders, that there was some reassembling or, as I have a tendency to do, you sort your categories of witnesses into file jackets. So what the RCMP received in project Flicker, and what we received, wouldn't necessarily be Mr. Caldwell's file as he had prepared it and put it together?

Oh, yes, by the time we got to the supreme court of Canada everything was shuffled around. I think what we were trying to do was basically gather all the statements for a particular witness, and put them all into one file, as opposed to digging them out of different files.

Okay. Sir, just a quick question, I meant to get an excerpt of tape and $I$ didn't, but you were asked some questions by Mr. Wolch about the significance or whether certain actions that happened in 1970 , 1971 with respect to Fisher, might have been of a questionable nature, I -that it might have been indications of some malfeasance on the part of people. And one of the topics that continually comes up in assessing what happened with Fisher, the fact that the charges were, or the pleas were done in Regina, is that there was no media coverage. Do you have any memory of to what degree the media covered
anything to do with offences involving women in 1970, '69, '71, as compared to how things changed in the mid-'80s after the Criminal Code was amended, sexual assault offences were introduced, and there was a general whole sociological movement towards the recognition of the rights of women as victims of crime?

Well certainly one of the things that changed with respect to dealing with sexual assaults in the late '80s-early '90s, was the way we treated witnesses, the way we treated complainants.

Uh-huh?
It became clear that it was our responsibility, as the prosecutors, to make sure that there was communication with them, that they knew what was happening on the file, that they were always informed of the results. Prior to that, and even when $I$ was prosecuting, $I$ know $I$ did some sexual assault cases and $I$ never told the victims what happened. I told the police, I mean I -- we always were supposed to send the police a note with respect to the -- what finally happens on a case, and if they were going to deal with the complainants, then they would do it.

Okay.

A
$Q$

We didn't. Now certainly, in terms of the news media and whether they became more sensitive to it, umm, they did. But you have to understand that throughout the 80 s , as well, you saw the erosion of news services or the numbers of people they employed steadily through the ' 80 s and the ' 90 s to the point where most of them, now, are really not in a position to cover much news. Certainly the radio stations these days, they get their news almost exclusively by phoning you and asking you what's happened, they never attend Court.

Yeah. To go --

Go ahead?

No, sorry, you can continue, I didn't mean to interrupt?

And even back then attendance in Court was, I think the newspaper in Regina had one reporter that was sort of reliably at Provincial Court, but that was it, the others were basically hit and miss.

Q Okay. Sir, to step up onto my feminist soap box for a minute, the reality is in '68, '69, '70, '71, into the early ' 80 s , that the place of women in the criminal justice system didn't rank very
highly; did it?
A
Well, women or anyone else, they were just witnesses.

Yeah.
I mean, when we were done with them, we were done with them.

And we didn't necessarily check to make sure they were okay, or they knew what had gone on, or to even give a passing thought to how it might affect them if they didn't find out what had happened in a crime that they'd been a victim in?

A
$Q$
That's correct.
Thank you. I have no further questions. MR. HODSON: It's almost 6:00, Mr.

Commissioner. I believe Ms. Cox, for Federal
Justice, has about 45 minutes, and Ms. Krogan to
follow. Did $I$ miss anybody?
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thank you very
much, Mr. Hodson, and thanks very much, counsel, for staying.
(Adjourned at 5:58 p.m.)
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