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## Transcript of Proceedings

(Reconvened at 1:10 p.m.)
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Good afternoon.

ALL COUNSEL: Good afternoon.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Mr. Hodson, just before you start, I have a word with -- for all counsel.

I don't know if you read
Thursday's StarPhoenix, there was an article in there by the Business Editor, if you haven't read it, read it and take it to heart. Because, apparently, the conduct of some people is bringing the process of the Inquiry into disrepute.

Go ahead, Mr. Hodson.
MR. HODSON: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner.
If I could, just before we
start with Mr. Williams, there was an issue raised last week about the reach of Chief Justice Laing's ruling on the constitutional limit. If we could just call up his decision, 339089, and go to page 106. And, in particular, I think I had asked Mr. Frayer, on behalf of the federal Minister, to comment on his -- on this issue. What Chief Justice Laing says, that:
"The constitutional limitation set out in the Keable decision precludes the Commission from asking federal Department of Justice lawyers 'questions which seek to probe the reasons behind actions, including questions about advice given or received.'"

Which on its face, I think, suggests that there should be no questions about the reasons for any actions, including actions taken in the fact-finding or investigative phase. I think I had tried to communicate on the record last week that $I$ had understood that the federal minister's position -- or I had asked for clarification of the federal minister's position on whether or not it was their view that Chief Justice Laing's decision precluded me from asking questions such as "why did you have Deborah Hall testify under oath", which is reasons, and what $I$ put on the record is that $I$ will rely on Mr. Frayer to indicate if $I$ cross the line of this constitutional limit, and $I$ asked him for his position. His -- he will speak to this in a moment. He has now advised me that the federal minister's view is that Chief Justice Laing's
decision covers all questions, including those relating to the reasons behind investigative steps taken, unless they apply directly to the information given to Saskatchewan Justice, in addition, of course, to the issue of advice given and received. So that is their position.

Mr. Frayer -- and I'm fine
with that, $I$ just, $I$ raised it so that $I$ know where I'm entitled to go and where I'm not entitled to go, and $I$ suppose other counsel will want to know the same direction.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well, Mr. Hodson, I thought the application for judicial review was based upon the subject of advice. I don't -- I don't recall reasons having been part of it, but this is clearly what the judge said, so he took into -- he expanded it.

MR. HODSON: Well, that's the reason I raised it last week and, in fairness, simply to get the Federal Minister's position, and perhaps Mr. Frayer can speak to that issue. The reason I raised it is so that we would know what the federal minister considered to be offside Judge Laing's decision.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Mr. Frayer?

MR. FRAYER: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner. I think it's safe to say, Mr. Commissioner, that Mr. Hodson and $I$ have had considerable discourse over this particular issue since the exchange occurred in advance of Mr. Williams starting his evidence last Monday, and I communicated this position to Mr. Hodson just in advance of arriving here today. He had asked the question as to whether it was our view that the decision of the Chief Justice Laing extended to the reasons behind investigative steps taken, and in addition to those that related to advice given and received, and my instructions are, based on the reasons as they are articulated in the paragraph to which Mr. Hodson has just referred, that they do encompass -- they do encompass further reasons from --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Where is that quote from, do you know, Mr. Frayer?

MR. FRAYER: The --
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: The part in quotation marks?

MR. HODSON: It's from the notice of motion of the --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: It's from the
notice of motion?
MR. HODSON: Yes.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh, okay, thank you.

MR. FRAYER: So that's the position that I articulated to Mr. Hodson. It's my understanding that he is agreeable to that, that we can proceed on that basis.

There have been a number of
'why' questions that relate to reasons that have been asked, and I haven't objected to them, and I think Mr. Hodson has put a fair process in place that, should he feel he is crossing the line, much as he did last week in his examination of Mr. Williams, he would allow me an opportunity to respond. And he's been very fair in sort of abiding by the understanding that counsel have and, subject to that comment, the examination proceeds today of Mr. Williams and continues.

MR. HODSON: Yeah, I --
MR. FRAYER: And hopefully, without objection.

MR. HODSON: Yeah, I'm fine with that, Mr. Commissioner, as long as $I$ have comfort in the fact that, if Mr. Frayer does not object to one
of my questions, that $I$ can take it that the federal minister is not taking the position, or is going to take the position, that my question crosses the line that is drawn by Chief Justice Laing's decision. That's my concern. We all know what it says but applying it is sometimes a little more difficult.

MR. FRAYER: I appreciate that and, subject to the comments that Mr. Hodson made last week, I didn't see occasions where he crossed that line in any event. So I think we have a pretty clear understanding, at least as between counsel, of the limits of the questions asked, and that's been discussed with Mr. Williams and with his counsel, Mr. McLeod.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay. Thanks, Mr. Frayer. We're relying on you, then, to -MR. FRAYER: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner.

## EUGENE WILLIAMS, continued:

BY MR. HODSON:
Q
If we could call up 157115. I think, Mr.
Williams, where we finished off last week we were in early September 1990 -- I'm sorry, 157113 is the doc. ID. And you'll remember, Mr. Williams, I think $I$ showed you a September 10, 1990 letter
from Mr. Wolch and Mr. Asper, and I believe what you told us last week is that towards the end of August 1990 you had more or less completed your investigation subject to a few follow-ups, and I think you told us you had a conversation with Mr. Wolch and/or Mr. Asper asking for sort of a final submission; is that a fair summary?

Yes.
And so here's your letter back thanking Mr. Wolch for the September 10th letter:
"... fully responds to my earlier
request for a summary of Mr. Milgaard's submissions concerning his application under Section 690 ...".

Is it fair to say, we talked about this back in June, that in light of the fact that the original written application was supplemented on a number of occasions, is that a fair way to put it, that over the course of your investigation additional grounds were added?

A Yes.
Q
And they would be added, I think you told us, sometimes by way of letter, sometimes by way of a phone call, or both, or even in a media report; is that fair?

A Yes.

Q

Q

A Yes.
Go to 157117. I now want to turn to the October 1, 1990 meeting, Mr. Williams, and $I$ will go through some of the documents. But maybe, before we do that, if you can just generally give us your recollection, what was the purpose of that meeting and what, generally, happened at it? And I will go through some documents to assist you, but just, if you could give us a general recap?

The purpose of the meeting was twofold, firstly to provide Mr. Wolch and Mr. Asper with materials that had been collected; and secondly, to allow them an opportunity to make a presentation, or at least present an oral submission that embraced all of the points that they wished to bring to the minister's attention on the first application. That meeting would be with the Assistant Deputy Attorney General at the time, Mr. MacFarlane, and would also have involved then-Director of Criminal Law, Mr. Corbett, and myself.

And would it be correct to describe the October 1, 1990 meeting as being a presentation, by counsel for Mr. Milgaard, of their case, as opposed to your presentation to them of your findings? That's correct.

Q

My recollection is that the transcripts of interviews, the materials that we had gathered from the police files and other investigative sources, had been assembled in two to three binders and, as $I$ recall, there was a brief, a brief meeting in which we exchanged pleasantries, there was a discussion about the process to be followed, then Mr. Wolch and Mr. Asper retired to a conference room for an hour or two, or possibly more, and thereafter -- we may have worked, had a break for lunch, I'm not certain, and then they more or less presented an argument that was designed to establish why David Milgaard was entitled to a remedy. And in that regard they, as I recall Mr. Wolch, I believe, led the presentation, provided a synopsis of the grounds, the facts, and the legal considerations that he wished us to bring to the minister's attention for
the purposes of deciding the application.
And then did you question them or was it more of a listening exercise?

There were some discussions during the course of it. There may have been questions about the strength of certain -- or the weight to be attached certain statements and things of that nature, but mostly we sat and we listened. And, for example, on the motel room incident, would you have then, presumably in the hour or two before this presentation, they would have had an opportunity to review Deborah Hall's examination by you that was conducted in November of 1989?

Yes.
And so would it be a case of saying okay, well, you put forward this ground on Deborah Hall, here's what she says, therefore, your submission doesn't accord with what she has now said, or was it more of a case of we'll sit and listen and discuss amongst ourselves after you leave? I think on a couple of occasions we may have said, well, what do you make of Deborah Hall's statement to this effect, or there may have been some questions like that, and how does that -- how does that affect the thrust of your presentation in
which she basically said that Lapchuk and Melnyk had lied.

Would it be a fair summary to say that where you had gathered information that questioned in some way the grounds that they put forward, that those would have been put to Mr. Wolch and Mr. Asper for their comment; in other words, how does the information we gathered, being Federal Justice, affect your grounds, please explain, is that general statement correct?

Yes.
If we can go to 333511, please, and I appreciate that this is a communication between you and other lawyers, and I'm not questioning you about any discussions or communications you had, it's one of the few documents I've been able to locate that comments on the materials that were provided, and I think, Mr. Williams, we've been through this, or through the documents, and would you agree that we have been, or you and $I$ have been unable to find a document that specifically identifies the documents that were provided at the meeting; is that correct?

That's fair, yes.
And I do have one -- if we could call up 226165,
it's an index, and -- sorry, I don't know if I gave you the right doc. ID.

MS. BOSWELL: Yeah, you did, it's coming.
BY MR. HODSON:
And this is an index $I$ think from one of the black binders that we have from somewhere. Do you recall looking at a black binder in our office, Mr. Williams, $I$ think to try and identify what might have been part of what was provided? I think this is the index.

A
Yes.
Does this look familiar?
My answer is simply this, I'm not certain, $I$ can't say with 100 certainty that that index relates to the letter that you showed me previously. What I can say is that those are the types of materials that would have been provided to Mr. Wolch at that time and I observe, for example, under Tab L, there's just -- there are portions of the trial transcripts. Now, let me correct myself, those are the types of things that would have been provided, but whether or not that index relates to the other letter $I$ can't say with certainty.

I think you've told us on a couple of previous occasions that any transcripts of interviews or
witness statements that you gathered would have been provided; is that correct?

A
$Q$

A
Q

A
Q

A
Q

A
Q -

And so can you tell us whether the information provided at the October 1, 1990 meeting, is it fair to say that that would have been provided

A
much earlier or was there some information that naturally would have waited until the end of the process?

Well, certainly the statement of Estelle Cadrain only came in a few days before, but we had had some concerns and $I$ think this information was the subject of some type of embargo or undertaking about its further dissemination.

COMMISSIONER MaCCALLUM: What happened with the Ute Frank statement again, please?

The Ute Frank statement became the subject of a Winnipeg Free Press story which essentially said that -- it made two points; one, that this was a statement that the feds had held onto for 20 years and it has now been released, and then secondly, that the statement supported the affidavit of Deborah Hall who testified -- who said in her affidavit that two trial witnesses had lied, and that wasn't our view of Ute Frank's statement. BY MR. HODSON:

And as far as the information that was shown to Mr. Wolch and Mr. Asper, were you prepared to photocopy that or provide them copies?

I believe arrangements were made for copies to be given to them, of the things they didn't have and
requested, yes.
What about the Larry Fisher interview, when $I$ went through your interview of Mr. Fisher there was the condition put on that by Mr. Pick about its use. Do you recall whether or not your interview of Larry Fisher was provided at this meeting? I believe it was, because one of the constraints that $I$ had discussed with Mr. Pick was the use, or the further use of that material and $I$ had insisted that we be permitted to use it in furtherance of the 690 process and certainly the obtaining of counsel's views on that, is the use consistent with its collection, and that is for the minister to make a determination on that, on the 690 application of David Milgaard.

And then what about the polygraph, do you recall -- $I$ think the only documents that we saw would have been your, perhaps a letter from Mr. Robinson and/or a file memorandum, $I$ don't think there was a formal set of polygraph charts. Do you recall what if anything was provided on that? I don't believe we received any, quote, "formal polygraph charts", simply the report that indicated that the results were inconsequential, or the results -- no meaningful results could be
obtained because of the emotional and physical condition of the subject.

Do you recall if Mr. Wolch and Mr. Asper were informed by you or anybody else at the meeting that a polygraph had been attempted on Mr. Fisher and the results?

I believe that there was, that that information was communicated to Mr. Wolch and Mr. Asper.

And I take it, Mr. Williams, you have a
recollection of what was, a general recollection of what was presented at the October 1 meeting; is that fair?

Yes.
And maybe we can go through it this way. If maybe we divide it by subject and go through on the motel room re-enactment issue and the Deborah Hall statement, if you can tell us your recollection of what -- generally if you recall anything that comes to mind about that presentation that either differed from what was put forward earlier?

As I sit here now, sir, $I$ can't say $I$ do. I think a document that would be useful as a starting point is Mr. Wolch's September 10th, 1990 letter which contains a synopsis of the points that they raise.

Okay. If we could call up 004394 , perhaps we can go through it in this order then. Is that an easy way to do it, how he's listed here the companions, or do you want to -- I think the motel room witnesses were under Unsavoury Witnesses.

I'm in your hands, sir. Either way.
We'll go to Companions then, the first point is the Cadrain, John and Wilson evidence, and I think two points, or maybe three points, if $I$ can summarize from the documents, $I$ think one is that Albert Cadrain's evidence at trial wasn't reliable due to mental conditions; secondly, Ron Wilson had recanted his evidence; and third, Nichol John's sworn evidence that was not adopted at trial was not credible or impossible. Is that a fair general summary of what was put forward there? Yes, but there was -- it was a fairly detailed presentation with references, as I recall, to certain aspects, or to certain statements that were made and also to various parts of the trial transcript.

And do you recall whether matters had been raised that you had not previously considered in the review of the statements and your previous investigation? 25

A
$Q$

A

I think there were some facts that had been alluded to that I subsequently checked or double-checked, yes.

And do you recall anything of significance that had been raised about this issue that you had not previously considered or investigated?

No, sir. I think there was one aspect $I$ think and
that was of the Larry Fisher information which,
following the explanation, caused us to
re-evaluate our approach to it, but most of the other points had been considered.

Okay. We'll come back to the Fisher information in a moment. If we go down to the Unsavoury Witnesses, $I$ think this is the motel room issue. Are you able to tell us, Mr. Williams, I mean, at this point you would have provided Mr. Wolch and Mr. Asper with the Deborah Hall transcript; correct?

Yes.
Do you have a recollection as to whether this would have been the first time they were made aware of what she had said or whether that had been communicated earlier?

I don't recall providing them with a detailed synopsis of what Debbie Hall had said, but it's
quite possible that they may have gotten a flavour for it in discussions either with Mr. Corbett or Mr. MacFarlane, I don't know. I do know that as a result of certain accusations about my questioning of Ms. Hall, Mr. MacFarlane was provided both with the transcript and with the tape of the interview and consequently was in a position to -- well, he knew the details of the interview.

Do you recall whether the presentation at the October 1, 1990 meeting was to the effect that the incident didn't happen and that Melnyk and Lapchuk lied about it or whether there was a different position put forward in light of Deborah Hall's evidence to you?

I can't recall, sir.
Okay. Go to the next page, Forensic Evidence, again, do you have a recollection of anything coming out of the presentation that struck you as being different than what you had heard before? No. It was simply a recasting of the submissions that had been made.

And then next the Larry Fisher information, can you tell us, what was your recollection of what was presented with respect to the Larry Fisher ground, and you had mentioned that there was a new
matter that came to your attention?
A
Well, there was greater emphasis placed on the impact that this information about the sexual assaults and Larry Fisher's activity, what impact that might have had on the result of the Milgaard trial had it been presented to the jury.

Okay. And --
Because the initial -- the initial thrust of the information surrounding Larry Fisher was here, we've identified the killer, this is the person, and we looked at it in that context, but the second leg of that argument $I$ guess is had the jury known about this individual residing in the Cadrain residence having done all these things, it might have affected or had an impact, so that was one of the other aspects, and that was brought out I guess with greater clarity.

And $I$ think we identified in some earlier documents that it had been contained in previous communications; is that fair, as part of the broader Larry Fisher issue? Yes.

And are you telling us that at the October 1, 1990 meeting, that it was maybe presented with a bit more clarity and perhaps a bit more weight than it

A

Q
had previously?
Well, certainly it was emphasized and we were able to get the full impact of the submission.

And $I$ think you told us last week, and correct me if $I$ 'm wrong, that that might well be the type of information, namely, that there was a perpetrator out there committing other crimes that were arguably similar to the Gail Miller murder in the vicinity and that information was not known to the defence and not presented at trial and therefore could have affected the verdict and therefore there may have been a miscarriage of justice; is that --

It's the type of information that has the potential to provide a basis to give a remedy, yes.

And do you recall whether there was anything specific about the Larry Fisher information that was new or had not been brought to your attention as far as one of the assaults or the M.O. or anything like that, or was it just the fact that the position was articulated a bit more clearer than previously?

I think the latter portion of your statement is correct, that the position was articulated. It's
one thing to write to make a submission, it's another thing to present a submission verbally and sometimes you have trial counsel feel more comfortable, call it making their pitch, but making an oral argument or an oral submission and that was done.

Do you recall any discussion about the similarities between the Fisher assaults and the Gail Miller murder, was that part of the presentation?

Certainly the facts surrounding the various assaults were brought to our attention. I don't recall whether or not there was a debate on it in the sense of an exchange between ourselves and Mr. Wolch and Mr. Asper. I do recall listening very carefully to what was said.

Do you recall another ground put forward, being the implausibility or the impossibility argument, was that something that was canvassed at this meeting?

Yes.
And what do you remember about that?
What I -- that submission revolves around the argument that if the testimony of two or three trial witnesses is correct, and I'm referring to
the motel clerk, $I$ think he's at the Trav-a-leer Motel, who positions David Milgaard and Mr. Wilson and Ms. John arriving at a certain date or a certain time, and if you compare that with the testimony of the folks who saw, or who testified that they saw people moving in front of headlights in the alleyway shortly after seven o'clock, if you did -- if you tried, and you have to recall also the testimony of --

Mr. Diewold?
I was thinking of the married couple whose name escapes me.

Danchuk?
The Danchuks.
Yeah.
Well, those are some of the three key ingredients, and if you do the time lines, taking the most reliable time line, then it meant that David Milgaard simply didn't have the time to do what the Crown had alleged he had done in relation to assaulting and killing Gail Miller, and, $I$ mean, 15 years later, that's the nub of the submission, but there was a fairly detailed discussion of the various steps as I recall.

Do you have a recollection of any discussion about
the test that would be applied or the test that had to be met for a remedy?

I believe towards the end of the discussion there was a conversation between Mr. MacFarlane and Mr. Wolch about that and we solicited, we being -- the question was asked what was the threshold, what was the test, and Mr. Wolch provided a response, but $I$ don't recall what it was.

And any discussion about if the matter went to a court, what court, things of that nature, do you have any recollection of that?

Not at that time, sir, no.
Okay. Just for the record, Mr. Commissioner, I want to identify a document, it's a new document, 339772 , and back when Mr. Frayer was questioning Mr. Asper, back at the end of August there was a question about notes taken at this meeting of October 1, 1990 , and with the co-operation of Mr. MacFarlane and Mr. Frayer $I$ was able to obtain, or these were voluntarily provided to us. They are, I am advised, Mr. MacFarlane's, or a copy of his notes in his personal possession as opposed to documents that the Federal Minister had and those were provided to me on Friday that have his notes and I've had a chance to review them and Mr.

Williams $I$ had asked to take a look at them. I don't propose to go through them, but $I$ simply want to put on the record that $I$ obtained them, and obviously if other counsel wish to use them to question Mr. Williams about -- we have his evidence about the meeting, but $I$ just wanted to identify these.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: That's 339772?
MR. HODSON: Yes. There's actually a few other dates in there as well, but the October 1 , 1990 meeting is listed in there, Mr. MacFarlane's notes.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.
BY MR. HODSON:
And then if we can go to 162374, this is a letter, the October 3rd, 1990 letter, this is Mr. Wolch's reporting letter to his client about the meeting, I just want you to comment on a couple of items here, and talks about:
"Prior to the meeting we were provided with a number of reports contained in a thick black binder, most of which we had seen before."

Etcetera, and $I$ don't want you to comment on what they had seen or not, but that would be

A

Q
consistent with your recollection, that a volume or volumes of documents were provided? Yes.

And he says:
"Mr. MacFarlane explained that he wished to meet with us because he felt that when one gets a submission on paper you sometime miss the flavour and many questions are not readily answered. He felt that we could provide him with that flavour."

And:
"Also, we wanted to be certain he was being properly briefed by Mr. Williams." Do you recall that being any background to this October 1, 1990 meeting?

Well, certainly the first part, but $I$ don't recall the "also" sentence. It may have been in their mind, but it wasn't articulated at the time. And here $I$ think:
"The situation regarding Larry Fisher was examined fully."

And I think you've told us that that would have been a significant part of the presentation; is that correct?

A Yes.

Q
"We did have certain facts brought to our attention. It is clear that Deborah Hall in her examination by Mr. Williams in some ways corroborated Melnyk and Labchuk."

And then goes on to talk about her comments being sarcastic, and I think you've acknowledged that that would have been the subject of some discussion; is that fair?

A
$Q$
It also makes mention:
"We were also able to see some very unfair and untrue police reports
regarding yourself."
And can you give us some indication, these would be Saskatoon City Police reports; is that correct? Presumably -- let me back up. You would have provided -- to the extent that you provided Mr. Wolch with police reports, they would be the 1969 Saskatoon City Police reports? been one or two reports that found their way onto the police -- the Saskatoon police file from the

RCMP.
Okay. But it would be original investigation police reports?

Yes.
And can you give us any idea of the number or the type of reports that you would have had and provided of the police reports?

I regret to say that $I$ did not review this portion
of the file as closely as I needed to. I just don't recall.

Would it be -- to the extent that police reports related to Ron Wilson, Albert Cadrain, Nichol John, David Milgaard, do you think those would be likely the police reports that you would have had at that time?

Yes.
Do you know -- sorry, go ahead.
And to the extent that there may have been reports of interviews with David Milgaard before he was charged, those would also, would have been provided.

Now, do you recall whether you had the entire Saskatoon City Police file at this time?

No, I do not.
It would be selected reports that you would have
obtained for your investigation?
That's correct.
And what about the Crown prosecutor's file, do you recall if you would have had the entire file at this time?

I recall reviewing the file that was obtained with the co-operation of Mr. Caldwell, I had that. I think that later on there were other portions that had found their way to Regina. I didn't have the entire file. I did obtain copies of portions of the file that were significant to the issues that we were looking at.

If we can go to 062314 . Now, we talked last day about the involvement of the RCMP and I think your evidence was to the effect that by September, 1990, as far as you were concerned, what Mr. Pearson and the RCMP were doing for you in the investigation was effectively at an end; is that correct, other than a few, I think the Estelle Cadrain interview. Is that right?

Yes.
And so here -- now, this is Inspector Evans writing to you saying:
"The aspect of Mr. Fisher consenting to a further polygraph examination is still
being actively pursued; and should he submit to further testing, it should greatly assist in the eventual decision respecting this file." And are you able to comment on what it was -would it be fair to say they were doing this on their own as opposed to with direction from you, being the RCMP?

Well, they were pursuing it because I think Sergeant Pearson was of the view that meaningful results could be obtained and to the extent that they could be, we left that question open. Go to 333518. But you weren't waiting for another polygraph attempt to complete your investigation? No.

333518, and this is a letter from Chief Penkala to Cecil Rosner of the CBC, November 2nd, 1990, and it's enclosing copies of the 1968, '69 and '70 annual reports of the Saskatoon City Police. You can scroll down, a copy to you and receipt acknowledged, attachments have been placed in pocket 5. And just go to 012698 , and $I$ think this is one of the reports -- and go to the next page -- and we saw this earlier with some other witnesses, but this set out a number of rapes and
other sexual offences in '68, '67. Do you have a recollection of receiving this information and where, if anywhere, did it fit in? Was it something you requested or how did it come about? And before you answer, Mr. Williams, I can tell you that $I$ will take you later to a similar issue in 1991 on the second application where you did ask Sergeant Pearson to follow up and get some statistical information, and this appears to be about 10 months earlier. Do you remember where this information fit in?

A

Q
A

I believe that we were taking a look at the Larry Fisher and the sexual assault similar fact issue, and one of the things we wanted to look at was just the prevalence of it and whether we could gather any information from statistical or other sources that would shed some light on the submission that Larry Fisher was Gail Miller's killer, and essentially what it showed was that there were a number of sexual assaults in the city at that time --

And --
-- but, beyond that, $I$ don't believe we could draw too many conclusions unless there was a further breakdown in terms of how the assaults took place,
how many were by knife, the locations, etcetera, etcetera.

If you can go to 217222, please.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Was that because there were quite a number of sexual assaults? There appear to be, sir. Just having the numbers doesn't give you much unless you have a kind of an analysis of the assaults to see any pattern. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh, okay.

BY MR. HODSON:
If we could, this is an article, I think it's around December 2 nd or December 3rd, 1990 -there's not a date on here, but $I$ believe it to be early December, 1990 -- it's an article by Dan Lett and there is a comment here that says:
"Lawyers representing other witnesses have said previously that Williams bluntly told them that he was personally convinced Milgaard was guilty, despite overwhelming evidence to the contrary."

Let me start off by asking; did you ever tell any counsel for any witness in this matter that you were personally convinced Milgaard was guilty?

A No, sir, I did not.

Q right, yeah.

Yeah, there were two Watsons and Harold Pick.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Two Watsons.
BY MR. HODSON:
$Q$
In looking at the record it appears that there would have been two lawyers representing witnesses, and $I$ could be wrong on this, but certainly Kenneth Watson representing Ron Wilson and Reg Watson representing John Patterson. Do you recall having contact with any other lawyers acting for witnesses in your investigation, at least on the first application -- I should say and Larry Fisher, it would be Harold Pick presumably; was there any other lawyers?

Not that $I$ recall, sir.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: So this had to be, at least one might include, Watson, Pick, and who?

MR. HODSON: Reg Watson.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes?
That's right.
MR. HODSON: I'm just trying to identify who might be the lawyers referred to.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yeah, that's

Oh yeah, sorry, Reg and Ken. I didn't -- yeah.

So Ken Watson, just let me start with Reg Watson and Harold Pick, counsel for John Patterson and Larry Fisher; do you have a recollection of any discussion with either of those gentlemen about your views on David Milgaard's guilt or innocence? Sir, my views about the process and my role in it never brought me, or doesn't engage a personal view as to whether or not David Milgaard is guilty or innocent. I have not discussed it with any lawyer, about whether -- and certainly not for the witnesses -- as to whether or not $I$ was personally convinced he was guilty.

Mr. Milgaard comes to the minister and only qualifies for a 690 application on the basis that he's been convicted of a -- of the offence. My views are irrelevant as to whether or not, in fact, he is or is not. The fact is you only qualify if you've been found guilty. My job is to find out whether the grounds you raise are such that it can give the minister a basis to provide the applicant with a remedy.

I have not -- and I, you know, this is the one thing; $I$ have only one client who is entitled to that view, and that's the minister, and I've steadfastly adhered to that primary rule.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: So, needless to say, you didn't tell Mr. Lett either? I certainly did not.

MR. HODSON: I -- there is a reference in one of the transcripts, or another document, that either suggests or imply that this may be Ken Watson, Ron Wilson's lawyer, that -- and, again, I'm not, $I$ can't say that it is or it isn't, but --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Who did Reg -Wilson -- Watson act for?

MR. HODSON: Reg Watson acted for John Patterson, who was the fellow who was an inmate with Larry Fisher, and he is the individual, John Patterson, who was interviewed in early August 1990. We touched on him last week.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: And Mr. Pick?

MR. HODSON: Acted for Larry Fisher, and Steven Carter did for while as well, $\quad$ believe.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: So now we get down to the other Watson is, I'm sorry?

MR. HODSON: Ken Watson acted for Ron Wilson and Reg Watson acted for John Patterson, for the record.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Uh-huh.
BY MR. HODSON:
$Q$
A

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Mr. Watson was a witness -- well he was acting for Mr. Wilson here; wasn't he?

MR. HODSON: At the Inquiry, yes.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes.
MR. HODSON: Yes, that's the same
Mr. Watson.

BY MR. HODSON:
If we can go to 001529. This is the minister's decision of February 27th, 1991. I went through parts of this with Mr. Williams at the start of his evidence because it set out the process. If we can go to the third page, 001531.

And Mr. Commissioner, I can say that in light of Chief Justice Laing's ruling I pondered what questions, if any, I could ask about this document, $I$ raised it with both Mr. Williams' counsel and with Mr. Frayer, and what I intend to do -- and perhaps just to make sure that they are fine with this -- is to ask Mr. Williams essentially two questions with respect to these grounds; and the first question is to have Mr. Williams advise whether he investigated each of these grounds; and secondly, what conclusions he reached with respect to the question of whether each ground established a reasonable basis to conclude that a miscarriage of justice may have occurred.

Now I have asked those

questions as we've gone along with the in -- with various matters, so $I$ intend just to pose that, and perhaps if Mr. Frayer and Mr. Watson -- or pardon me -- Mr. McLeod do not take objection with that, I will proceed? The record reflects two nods of "no"; no objection?

MR. FRAYER: (Not at microphone) .. your
observations with respect to asking these questions in sort of discreet ways throughout is consistent with what you have asked?

MR. HODSON: Yes, I don't intend to do anything different than what $I$ have asked, and certainly, Mr. Frayer, if I stray from that, I'm sure I'll hear from you.

BY MR. HODSON:
So, Mr. Williams, the first question, ground:
"(1) the submission that new evidence from Deborah Hall and Ute Frank, who were not called at trial, contradicts the trial evidence of Crown witnesses Melnyk and Lapchuk".

Let me just pause here. You are familiar with these five grounds; can you tell us or confirm that you investigated each of these issues or grounds in your investigation of the application?

If we can go to 004416 . Now again, and on that, is there anything that you can tell us that does not get into advice or reasons related to, if $I$
can call it, the reaction in the media to the minister's decision?

A
Well the media reaction, $I$ guess in some respects, was predictable, because throughout the application the only, the only side of the story that had been presented was the one advanced on behalf of the applicant, David Milgaard. I think there was a hope or an expectation that, with a fairly detailed letter that sought to discuss the issues that the minister reviewed and a synopsis of the facts that underpinned the decision, that the public would have been made aware of the other side, of the additional facts that had been presented, so that the refusal to grant a remedy would be understood. That, however, did not take place.

And do you have any observations as to why? It's very difficult to discern why someone does not understand what we believe is a fairly clear message. I simply think that we didn't do as good a job as we needed to along the way in terms of refuting a lot of the misinformation that was out there, it had been repeated with such frequency that very few people examined the other side, and it was just ignored.

Q
We have heard some evidence that following the decision, that although the minister's decision was some $I$ think 12 pages in length with some detail, that the concern became the background, the failure, or the fact that the background information wasn't disclosed, that became an issue. And $I$ don't want you to comment on communications with the minister or reasons or that but, from the public's perspective, would you agree that it appears that what came out of the minister's decision was, in addition to her 12-page letter, demands for more information; is that fair?

A That's fair.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Mr. Williams, you told us quite some time ago, I think, that insofar as factual matters reported wrongly, at least in your perception, you were hamstrung by the need to defer everything, at least refer everything to the minister, it wasn't your job to argue the case in public?

That's correct.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: And you couldn't, in fact, take a position on factual matters without having -- without being accused of
prejudging the matter, or judging it at all,

A
which was not your job?
That's correct.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: It was up to the minister. So are you now telling me that, when you say you didn't do a good job in communicating your position to the public, do you mean to say you didn't do a good job in refuting the allegations which were made against the conduct of your investigation?

That's part of it. I think the letter, the minister's letter, needed to be more persuasive because we thought it was -- it should have allayed some of the concerns that had been raised, --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes? -- but it obviously did not. So, hindsight being what it is, there was still that -- there was still the suspicion, there was still questions about the fairness of the process, there was still questions about whether there was prejudgment of it by officials, despite what the minister had written in the first one or two pages, which sought to describe the process.

COMMISSIONER MaCCALLUM: Well, okay, so you
just find the lack of communication to have been at the ministerial level and not from your investigative level whereby you would have, from time to time, refuted suggestions which were being made?

Correct.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: So you still say
that that wouldn't be part of the process as you see it?

We --
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: You just remained silent and do your job?

Yes.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Umm, okay.
BY MR. HODSON:
This is an April 25, 1991 letter from Mr. Wolch to the federal minister following the decision, and it's Mr. Wolch's formal response; I take it you would have been familiar with this document? Yes, I received a copy of it. If we can go to the next page, and I brought this up last week and it's talking about the motel room incident, and in the letter Mr. Wolch writes that:
"According to Crown theory,
in 22 years David Milgaard has never
admitted any involvement in the murder to anyone, other than to paid by the Crown young criminals whom he hardly new. Melnyk and Labchuk could not even agree between themselves as to what was said and done. More important, even to this day we do not know what arrangement was made for them to secure their
evidence. A member of your Department implied to us that they were paid."

And just your comment on two comments here, the: "... paid by the Crown young criminals . . ."
and the:
"A member of your Department implied to us that they were paid."

Do you recall any discussions with Mr. Wolch, or any information that you gathered to suggest that Melnyk and Lapchuk were paid by the Crown witnesses; and secondly, whether anybody in your department may have implied that they were paid?

I do recall a discussion, at or around the time of the October 1st, '90 meeting, which dealt with the issue of a reward, a reward that had been offered for information leading to the arrest and
conviction of the killer of Gail Miller, and at that time my recollection is that $I$ knew that a reward had been offered to Mr. Cadrain. I wasn't certain whether he was the only one that participated in that reward and $I$ was subsequently asked by Mr. MacFarlane to look into that, and I did, and $I$ found that only Mr. Cadrain received the reward. Now it may have been in the context of that discussion that Mr. Asper or Mr. Wolch, or both, got the impression that there was an inference that someone else might have been paid but, beyond that, $I$ had no information about Melnyk and Lapchuk being paid for their evidence. And, just for the record, 002289 . And, again, this is a memo between you and Mr. MacFarlane, and I'm not asking any questions about advice that you gave to him, but it appears to contain factual information that you obtained -- this is three days after the meeting -- about the reward money, confirming that Albert Cadrain was the individual who got the reward; correct?

Yes.
And it was submitted that the claims by the witnesses Cadrain and Wilson were submitted after Milgaard was convicted by the jury as -- instead
of before; is that correct?

A
Q
If we could go to 000901 . This is the August 14th, 1991 second application to the minister, and you're familiar with this document, Mr. Williams? COMMISSIONER MaCCALLUM: Excuse me just for a second. Mr. Wilde, I wonder if you could open all the doors, it's so hot in here it's getting to be unbearable. I saw one of the staff trying to fix the problem and she was unsuccessful.

BY MR. HODSON:
And you're familiar with this document, I take it you spent a fair bit of time with it in 1991? Yes.

I'll ask you a couple of questions here. The document states:
"When we first made our application the suggestion that Larry Fisher was the perpetrator was not the main thrust and we were at that time advised by your Department that there were no police reports available on past offences of Mr. Fisher. Whereas we suggested there was a distinct pattern and although the similarities were never placed before

A
you, we accepted that we were at that time at a dead end."

Would you agree with what's put forward there? It's only partly correct. During the first application, of course, the Winnipeg files, there were some reports from that and there was, I believe, just one -- one set of police reports from the Saskatoon application. But, subject to that caveat, $I$ believe our information, and what we had at the time, was that they could not be located.

Okay. What about the comment that Larry Fisher was the perpetrator was not the main thrust of the first application?

Well you've, you've seen Mr. Wolch's September 10th letter, that is his perception of it. But what is yours? Well certainly after, after Larry Fisher was advanced as the perpetrator, there was an inordinate amount of time, effort and energy expended towards establishing that. It -COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Amount of time spent by whom, sir?

By the Milgaard camp advancing that. I mean Deborah Hall, that was relatively straightforward,
it was a one witness, as is Dale Wilson -- or Ron Wilson, but we expended a significant amount of resources trying to track down Larry Fisher. But that's Mr. Wolch's take on it, so --

BY MR. HODSON:
And what about the comment about the distinct pattern of his offences and the similarities being placed before you; did you look at the similarities of the Fisher rapes and the Gail Miller murder on the first application in your investigation?

Yes, based on the information we had, we did. If we can scroll down. And it says here that:
"Once your decision was
brought to our attention we were
determined to proceed further in
ascertaining Larry Fisher's possible guilt and we were somewhat surprised to learn that there was ample material available, including at least one police report concerning previous victims of Fisher."

At the October 1, 1990 meeting did you provide either a copy of, or access to Mr. Wolch and Mr. Asper of the Fisher rape files that you had at

A

Q
that time, namely the two Fort Garry incidents, the (V10) (V10)- matter, and the (V5)-- (V5)--file, which $I$ think you said you received in mid-1990?

I'm not sure we had the (V10) (V10)- file at that time but, whatever we had, we gave him.

Well I think we saw a document earlier, and I'll show you another one, that suggests you had the (V5)-- (V5)--- file?

I believe we did, yes.
And the two Fort Garry files, then, I think you said you had parts of those, or whatever you had, you provided access to those?

Yes.
And (V10) (V10)- had gone through a preliminary hearing, or Mr. Fisher had gone through a preliminary hearing, and $I$ don't think there was any issue in locating those files; is that correct?

A
 don't believe so, because that was, that -- that offence was investigated by the RCMP in North Battleford and $I$ believe Sergeant Pearson didn't have much difficulty tracking it down.

And if you would have had -- put it this way, to the extent that you, Eugene Williams, had (V10) (V10)- file information on October 1, 1990, did you provide access to that information to Mr. Wolch and Mr. Asper?

Yes.
And would that have included providing a copy of whatever you had?

If a copy had been requested $I$ believe we would have provided it, certain -- subject to a certain embargo upon disseminating that information. If we can go to page 000905 . This would be the table of contents, and $I$ take it that the victim reports -- let's just leave (V14)- (V14)- for a moment -- the remaining seven victims would have been assaults that you had been aware of on the first application; is that correct?

Yes.
And (V14)- (V14)- is new; what is your recollection of that incident and how it fit into what you did and what you concluded?

A
(V14)- (V14)-, I believe, was new in the sense that it had not been the subject of any charges against Mr. Fisher, and $I$ believe Sergeant Pearson at least looked into that matter.

I wonder if $I$ could just have a moment, Mr . Commissioner, just to check a document with Mr. Frayer?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes.
BY MR. HODSON:
If we can call up 010002 . And this is a memorandum dated August 20th, 1991, it's from you to Mr. Corbett.

And I've raised this, Mr.
Commissioner, with Mr. Frayer, and I don't believe he has any objection to me questioning the witness about the factual matters related in this memorandum, and $I$ think $I$ do not intend to question Mr. Williams about any advice he provided to Mr. Corbett or any discussions about that.

But I think, Mr. Williams,
would this memorandum fairly summarize your knowledge at the time, and $I$ think you set out what steps you had taken on the first application investigation relating to the Larry Fisher matter; is that correct?

A
Q And so it's for that purpose that $I$ have some questions. You say here that:
"The applicant submits that the circumstances of Larry Fisher's sexual assaults against his victims are 'striking similar acts that would be admissible in a trial against Larry Fisher and would have been admissible in David Milgaard's trial if the information had been known.'"

And then it goes on to talk about the Centurion information or investigation and then, scroll down, and then $I$ think you set out:
"Also enclosed was the statement of another assault victim, who was unable to identify her attacker."

And goes on to recite what's in the Centurion application, that:
"When she looked at Larry Fisher's picture, she said that it could be him. However, she remembered that her attacker was not as clean-cut as the photo of Fisher and had longer dirtier hair."

And I think those words are taken out of the

A
Q

Centurion documents; is that right?
And I

Yes.

And then if we can go to the next page, you say:
"The applicant has mistakenly assumed that the similarities between the attack on Gail Miller and the Fisher assaults were not brought to the Minister's attention or considered during the first application. This assumption is based on a mistaken recollection of a conversation $I$ had with Mr. Wolch.

I had told Mr. Wolch that the occurrence reports for the 1968 assaults in Saskatoon were not available, and that the quality of the photocopy of the 1970 assault in Saskatoon was poor. However, I had obtained sufficient information relating to the October - November 1968 charges from court documents and considered this information during the assessment of the first application. I had also obtained and considered the occurrence reports from the Winnipeg assaults."

|  | 1 |  | And would that, what $I$ just read you, is that |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 |  | accurate, Mr. Williams? |
|  | 3 | $A$ | Yes. |
|  | 4 | $Q$ | If we can go to 333576 , and this is an August |
| 02:22 | 5 |  | 20th, 1991 memo to file. Maybe just pause here, |
|  | 6 |  | and again, I don't want you to get into any areas |
|  | 7 |  | of advice, Mr. Williams, but can you tell us |
|  | 8 |  | generally what -- was your role in investigating |
|  | 9 |  | the second application similar to the first |
| 02:23 | 10 |  | application, or can you give us a general idea of |
|  | 11 |  | what you did without getting into advice? |
|  | 12 | A | It wasn't similar in a sense that from the arrival |
|  | 13 |  | of the application in August of, August 14 th or |
|  | 14 |  | shortly after, that in 1991 I was the legal |
| 02:23 | 15 |  | officer that had the most information about the |
|  | 16 |  | file and initially $I$ was asked to review or make |
|  | 17 |  | an initial assessment of the application. It |
|  | 18 |  | became clear, however, shortly after the receipt |
|  | 19 |  | of the application, that a decision would have to |
| 02:24 | 20 |  | be made as to who within the department would |
|  | 21 |  | advance or take further steps on this case and |
|  | 22 |  | there was some discussions as to by what means the |
|  | 23 |  | second application would be investigated. Pending |
|  | 24 |  | a decision on those two questions, I was asked to |
| 02:24 | 25 |  | perform specific steps and this is one of them. |
|  |  |  | rtified Professional Court Reporters serving P.A., Regina \& Saskatoon since 1980 Central Booking - Call Irene @ 1-800-667-6777 or go to www.compucourt.tv |

And so is it correct to say that for a time period then, maybe on a bit of an ad hoc basis, you would be doing some investigative follow-up of the second application?

Yes.
And are you able to tell us whether another Federal Justice lawyer ended up performing the formal role that you performed on the first application?

The second application wasn't handled in the way that the first one was. The second application, a lot of what you might call the investigative work was done in an open form before the Supreme Court of Canada and in relation to that certainly $I$ did do some ground work in the sense of interviewing witnesses that had been identified to me to interview, collecting various things and participating in the development of the books or the case on reference that found its way to the Supreme Court, but $I$ did not participate in the reference itself as counsel.

And we've heard some evidence from Mr. Brown and Mr. Asper that at some point within weeks or maybe months of the second application being filed, their evidence was to the effect that they became
aware that the matter was going to be sent to a reference at some point prior to November 28, 1991 and that efforts were pursued in that direction, and again, would that, without getting into advice, does that accord with your recollection, Mr. Williams, that at some point it became apparent, if $I$ can put it that way, that it was going to go to the court?

It became apparent, sir, that the main investigator would not be me.

Okay. But you did do some investigative work prior to the decision being made to send it to the court on November 28th?

I did.
And then after you did some -- or some work in connection with the reference; is that fair?

A
Q Yes.

And so here it looks as though you ask Mr. Pearson to find out:

```
                                    "...statistics to identify the number of
                                    sexual assaults committed by a
                                    knife-wielding assailant in Saskatoon in
                                    1968, 1969, and 1970."
                    "In addition ... the reasons why Larry
```

And:

Fisher pleaded guilty in Regina." Just on that latter point, do you recall, would this have been the first time that this had been brought to your attention, that there may be something of concern with the manner in which Larry Fisher was dealt with in Saskatchewan?

A There was -- there had been some published reports that suggested that the plea in Regina was just part of an overall cover-up to distance -- or cover-ups relating to Larry Fisher, rather than do it in saskatoon it was done surreptitiously in Regina, quietly, and that had received some consideration in the press and we wanted to find out if there was a reason that had been articulated at the time.

Do you have a recollection whether that issue had been something you investigated on the first application, and let me put it finer, that that somehow would be a miscarriage of justice or contribute to a miscarriage of justice, the manner in which the authorities dealt with Larry Fisher's charges?

A
I don't believe that we considered that as a grounds at all. The information that $I$ had obtained didn't signal that there was any evidence
of that, so I don't believe I pursued it. It did come up, there were some other press reports or some charges brought by or on behalf of the Milgaard application that suggested that this was just another incident of a cover-up and we did look into it, or $I$ asked Sergeant Pearson to see what he could find. Ultimately there was some legitimate reasons for it which overshadowed any suggestion of a cover-up. One included the presence of counsel for Mr. Fisher, Mr. Greenberg, to have the plea in Regina.

MR. HODSON: I see it's 2:30,
Mr. Commissioner, I think probably an appropriate time to break.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.
(Adjourned at 2:29 p.m.)
(Reconvened at 2:54 p.m.)
BY MR. HODSON:

Call up 057451 , and this is a newspaper article of August 29th, 1991 and it deals with suggestions that some of the Saskatoon police files relating to Larry Fisher have gone missing, and are you aware of that issue being raised or coming to your attention at this time?

Yes, sir.

And can you tell us, what is your recollection of your involvement in that and the significance, if any, that had in your assessment of matters?

I guess my involvement, $I$ was implicated in two ways. Firstly, in relation to the second application there was a suggestion that some of the files had gone missing and that the reasons for that were as part of a cover-up attempt. Secondly --

I'm sorry, on your part, that you were somehow involved in this?

No, no. That was one angle. The second angle was that we didn't find the files and we should have, so we were a little sloppy, or the accusation was that we were sloppy. What I had learned was that the Saskatoon police had a document destruction policy which meant that they kept files for a period of 10 years of closed cases and after that they were destroyed.

And so back on the first application, $I$ think you told us of the four Saskatoon Fisher rape files, you obtained one file but not the other three; is that correct?

That's my recollection, yes.
And did you find anything sinister about that or

A
$Q$

## 2

## A

$Q$
suspicious about that at the time?
No.
And based on the information that you became aware of in August of 1991 and the months that followed, namely, the investigation and this issue, did you learn any information that caused you to be concerned that files had gone missing in some sinister way or for sinister purposes?

Not for sinister purposes. I'm part of a significant organization and recognize that despite your best efforts, sometimes files do go missing, or misplaced, and particularly when it comes to historical files, not current, operational files.

If we can go to 114627. This is a letter of August 29th, 1991, it's the cover page. If we can go to the next page, this is a letter from you to Mr. Brown August 20th, 1991. I'm not sure if much turns on the date. And you ask here, or you indicate to Mr. Brown:
"I have been asked to examine the issues that are raised in this application. The applicant has requested a new trial, or alternatively, a reference to an appellate tribunal. The grant of any of
these remedies would affect the office of the Attorney-General of Saskatchewan. Consequently, I am writing to invite you to provide any submissions you may wish to make in relation to the above-noted topics."

And I'm wondering, Mr. Williams, is there any -as far as contacting the Attorney General, is there something different with the second application that would prompt you to go to them as compared to the first application?

A
Well, in each of the applications $I$ went to the Attorney General, but just different officers. As you recall, $I$ had made contact with Mr. Fred Dehm in order to obtain access to the files in Saskatoon. With the second application, in the light of the issues and in light of some of the events, $I$ knew that some of the considerations that we were thinking about, it was prudent to engage Mr. Brown and those at the office of public prosecutions that were more at an earlier stage, because we anticipated that their input or their participation in the second application would be much more direct.

Okay. Go to 333582 , please, and this is an August

30, 1991 letter from Mr. Wolch to the minister referring to the statement of (V4)---- (V4)---, and are you familiar with (V4)---- (V4)--- and the statement she provided in August of 1991?

I read the statement at the time and $I$ may have read it since then and it relates to -- Miss (V4)--- was an individual who had accused Mr. Fisher of an assault on her $I$ believe on the same morning that Gail Miller died.

And again $I$ think the record suggests that that would not have been information that had been either part of the first application or information that you had investigated on the first application; is that correct?

I don't believe it was, sir.
And can you comment generally, what was your -did you draw any conclusions from this information, and just to refresh your memory, Miss (V4)--- was assaulted at 7:07 a.m. on January 31, 1969 according to a police report and her statement on Avenue $H$ about seven blocks away, gave a description, gave a statement to the police, and then in August, I think August 11th, 1991 saw a picture of Mr . Fisher in the paper and from that identified him as the assailant, so
that's generally the evidence we've heard, and I guess my question is how did you see that fitting into the Larry Fisher ground, if $I$ can call it that, on the second application?

When $I$ first looked at it, I didn't assess it I guess in any great detail, but some of the observations that came immediately to mind were, one, given the nature of the assault, the distance from the -- from the location of Gail Miller's body, it would take, you know, quite an athletic feat to get over there, and secondly, I observed the nature of the attack and the level of violence certainly was much different from what, that which befell Miss Miller if it in fact had been committed by the same person. It didn't seem to fit into the pattern, but --

If we can go to 333594. Again, this is a September 4, 1991 memorandum from you to Mr. MacFarlane, and, Mr. Frayer, I have the same comment with respect to the earlier memos, I simply wish to ask Mr. Williams about the factual information recorded in here. The fact that it is in a memo to Mr. MacFarlane, $I$ don't intend to ask about any advice discussed between the two, I'm more interested in whether or not this memo
captures the factual information, and I take it, Mr. Frayer, you are fine with that?

MR. FRAYER: I am.
BY MR. HODSON:
Thank you. And --
Having --
Go ahead.
No, I've reviewed it and it does recite my
knowledge at that time.
Okay.
And accurately relates it.
Sure. And $I$ would like to just go through,
because I think, correct me if I'm wrong, but
this memo would set out, at least in September,
1991, your recollection at that time about what
files you had from the Saskatoon City Police, what
files you didn't have and the reasons; is that
correct?
Yes.
And so here you say:
"On March 22, 1990 Deputy Chief Montague
responded in writing to my written
requests of March 1, 1990. In the
interim I had also examined their files
during a trip to Saskatoon. At the time

I learned that the 1968 sexual assault files were not available. A number of older files had been destroyed, as part of their normal file destruction procedure. The 1968 assaults to which Fisher had pleaded guilty had not been microfilmed before they had been destroyed."

And is that your recollection?

Yes, sir, it is.

And then:
"Despite press reports alleging that
Saskatoon police files were lost, recently, the police told me in 1990
that the files were not available. I relayed that information to Hersh Wolch shortly after $I$ had received it."

And:
"The Centurion Ministries report which predates Milgaard's second application also notes that the 1968 files concerning Fisher's attacks in Saskatoon were not available. In my dealings with Saskatoon City Police, I have found no evidence of a cover-up. I saw all
relevant, available files that $I$
requested."

And that would be an accurate summary, Mr.
Williams?
It is.
333600, and this is a file memo of September 6,
1991; is that correct?
Yes, sir.
And this relates to a discussion with the mayor at
the time, Mr. Dayday; correct?
A Yes.
$Q$
And it appears here that you:

> "...outlined to him the background of my
request, the steps taken to fulfil that
request, and the reasons why $I$ did not
insist that a full search of each
microfilm tape be conducted at the time of my initial request."

And then you say:
"I had obtained information from other sources which satisfied my need for information and enabled an assessment of the issues that had then been raised by the applicant."

Can you elaborate on what that relates to? background of my request...", I think that flows from the portion of the Milgaard application which initially identified Larry Fisher as Gail Miller's assailant and at that time we were looking for file information about the sexual assaults which had been -- for which he had entered pleas of guilty. We had gotten some summary information and that summary information was used. To the extent that we -- I recall personally going in in the company of Sergeant Pearson, we went into the files area of the Saskatoon police and did a manual search of the location where, based on how they had -- how they had filed materials, we did look through it. We also were advised that other folks, other members of the Saskatoon police had been tasked to make a search and I had no reason to believe that the search was done except in accordance with a thorough investigation. Okay.

And with respect -- and that's what I meant when $I$ say the steps taken to fulfil that request, and when they came up and said lookit, we don't have this, I didn't press the point because I thought sufficient steps had been taken.

Q

Q
If we can go to 016097 , this is a September 9th, 1991 memo to file of a conversation with Inspector Quinn and you indicate that he advised:
"...called to advise that a portion of (V1)--- (V1-'s file ... had been
located. It contained the statement of
(V1)--- (V1)- and two investigation
reports. The 1970 file of (V5)--
(V5)--- had also been retrieved. He added that the computerized file listing displayed the files of (V5)-- (V5)--and Ms. (V2)---. However, Ms. (V2---'s file had not been located. The search for it was still underway."

And $I$ think we've heard from other evidence that around this time, or within days of this, the Saskatoon City Police, or there was a Police Commission investigation into these files. Did you become aware of that?

Yes, sir.
And can we take it from this memo that on September 9th, 1991, that this would have been the first occasion when you became aware of the (V1)--- (V1)- file being located?

A Yes.

Q 5

I think the evidence we have before this
Commission is that of the four Saskatoon Larry Fisher files, if $I$ can call them that, that we have what appears to be a complete (V5)-- (V5)--file, it appears to be, a partial (V1)--- (V1)-

From the prosecution, yes.
and no file from (V2)----- and no file from (V3)--(V3)------ of original police files.

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
Q Okay.

And taking that as the premise, what I'm trying to identify is to which of those two, the (V5)--- and the partial (V1)-, did you have on the first application and what did you get on the second application.

I had the (V5)--- on the first application and I had the (V1)- on the second application.

Now, I should also point out that in 1993, in the course of the RCMP investigation, some additional RCMP files were located that had copies of the statement of Ms. (V2)----- and Ms. (V3)------ on their files, that they were RCMP files as opposed to Saskatoon police files. Do you recall being aware of the (V2)----- or (V3)------ statements in any of the investigative work you did? No, sir.

And again, 321950, and $I$ don't propose to ask any questions about what may have flowed between you and Mr. Rutherford, but this is a September 10, 1991 memorandum with a transcript of the handwritten statement of (V1)--- (V1)-, and can we take it from this that on or about this date you
would have received from the Saskatoon City Police the (V1)--- (V1)- statement and whatever else was on that file?

A
Q

A
could provide a reasonable basis to conclude that a miscarriage of justice may have occurred in the sense that if it wasn't available to Mr.

Milgaard's counsel and it may have affected the verdict, that might be a basis for a miscarriage of justice; is that correct?

Yes, but as you recall, we also went on further to discuss that in making that determination, the minister would also balance that against the type of evidence that was available to support the conviction.

And I think you gave us your evidence about the conclusions you reached based on looking at that ground in the first application, correct, as it related to Larry Fisher, both the Larry Fisher as the perpetrator and the Larry Fisher information being used in a defence; correct?

I believe, yes, my answer was I didn't find enough evidence there to link Mr. Fisher to the Miller homicide.

In your investigation of the second application, was there anything by way of new information that you did not have on the first application that you reviewed that caused you to reach a different conclusion?

A
The answer to the question as asked is "no" with the following caveat; that in relation to the second application $I$ did not perform the same type of assessment about all of that information, or certainly not in the same degree as I had on the first. There was a review of the information up to a certain point in time, and $I$ think that point in time was possibly mid-September, but $I$ believe additional details became available after that time which $I$ did not perform any type of meaningful assessment of, so -I'm sorry, what was the date again? I think up to about mid-September. Okay.

But there were further investigations, or further information came in, and when that additional information came in $I$ was certainly under the impression that the type of assessment and the type of advice that $I$ would be called upon to provide on the second application would not have the same character, or would not be the same as I had provided on the first.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: What additional
information, sir, was it from -- relating to the Fisher similar-fact evidence you mean?

A

BY MR. HODSON:
Yeah, I was -- maybe, if $I$ could assist you, I think you would have had the second application document which had the Centurion Ministries' interviews and their summaries of information they obtained from the victims, you would have had that information; correct?

Yes.
And, in addition, you would have had the partial (V1)--- (V1)- file; correct?

Yes.
And I --
Sorry, go ahead?
And I believe, perhaps, some more information on the (V10) (V10)- file; is that correct?

Yes.
And so, again, am $I$ correct that, subject to the caveat that you just indicated, that based on that new information, namely the Centurion Ministries information, the partial (V1)--- (V1)- file and the (V10) (V10)- file, that did not cause you to reach a different conclusion than you had reached on the first application with respect to whether
that information may provide a reasonable conclusion that a miscarriage of justice may have occurred?

A

A

A

BY MR. HODSON:

Q
Maybe I can take a different tack. If the information that we had that you received on the second application, namely the Centurion

Ministries information, the partial (V1)--- (V1)file and the (V10) (V10)- information, if that had
been information that you had on the first application are you able to tell us whether that would have changed the conclusions that you reached with respect to that information?

Probably not, I don't think it would have, sir. Okay. If we can go to 114815. And this is a chronology of events dated September 11th, 1991 that has been provided to us, and if $I$ just want to identify it as, number one, being a document that you prepared, and secondly, that it would be accurate; is that correct?

It is a document $I$ prepared, and it was done to the best of my knowledge, yes.

If we can go to 333617. And this is just a fax from you to Mr . Pearson with the (V1)--- (V1)statement and file; do you recall what Sergeant Pearson was doing at this time or what role he was playing?

Sergeant Pearson was assisting us again with respect to making inquiries of some of these victims, and $I$ believe it may have happened in two separate contexts. One, around that time we had asked whether or not the police analysts would take a look at some of the information that had been provided by Mr. Wolch in the second application, and to get their views. I'm not certain whether this was sent for that purpose or whether it was sent to complete Sergeant Pearson's file, because $I$ know that we had been discussing
follow-up interviews with some of the folks. Okay. If we could call up 009190. And this is a fax from you to Mr. Brown of September 18, 1991, and on the next page there's part of a media report, and there's other media reports at the time. Let me just ask this. This says:
"Now, the Saskatoon police have apparently admitted that they haven't given full information to the Justice Department, that really, the Minister was working with just half of the things she should have had, and $I$ find that so difficult."

Would you have been aware at this time, September of 1991, of suggestions in the media that, on the first application, the Saskatoon City Police didn't -- either didn't give you anything or didn't give you the complete set of information, things of that nature?

That certainly was brought to my attention, and I think the reference is to the portions of the (V1)- file and other materials that were located. Okay. And $I$ don't want to ask you about what information was given to the minister, and what the minister received from the Saskatoon City

Police, but $I$ would like to question you about what you received. And, apart from the partial (V1)- file that you identified, do you recall whether there was any other information on the Saskatoon City Police files that was not provided to you on the first application?

Sir, my recollection is they gave me what they had discovered at the time.

And were --
And --
And, apart from the partial (V1)- file, do you recall there being anything else that you would have received on the second application relating to the Larry Fisher matters that you didn't have on the first application?

Yes, there were some additional things, but I can't itemize them from memory as we speak.

Okay. Were they matters of significance; do you recall?

I think there were additional details, perhaps a statement or occurrence report.
$Q$
Related to?
A
Either -- I don't think there was anything on (V2)-----, but perhaps (V3)------.

Okay. If we can go to 333656. And this appears
to be a call September 20, 1991 with you and Harold Pick, counsel of Mr. Fisher?

A

Q

A Yes.

And it appears here that Mr. Fisher is saying "no further interviews, no further polygraph"; is that correct?

Yes.
And can we take it from this that you would have asked Mr. Pick to raise with Mr. Fisher the two new matters, namely the (V4)---- (V4)--- assault and the (V14)- (V14)- assault; is that correct? Yes.

And would that have been something you would have preferred to ask Mr. Fisher in person?

Yes, we didn't have information about those two when we interviewed him in 1990.

If we can now go to 333657 , please. Now I'm going
to go through some documents relating to efforts taken in September 1991 and the following months relating to Nichol John, and in particular attempts to have her hypnotized and to be -- to receive counselling and examination by $I$ think it was a psychologist, is that correct, by Dr. Fleming?

Umm, initially it was Dr. Pulos.

Q
Okay. I'll just go through some of these, but can you give us a general rundown on a couple of matters. First of all, what was the purpose of these interviews, what was -- how did this relate to the second application, and just elaborate on what it was that these medical and hypnotist experts were being asked to do?

In relation to the second application, it became -- I was convinced that Ms. Demyen had seen something that was relevant to the slaying of Gail Miller, however it was clear that while she had this recurring nightmare of the event it could not -- and she couldn't articulate it in a conscious state, it occurred to me that perhaps it would be useful to explore whether her memory could be clarified under hypnosis, and $I$ suggested that to -- as a means of finding out if we could get any information about that, because that had always been an area of concern. I approached her, she agreed, I made inquiries about folks or professionals who were qualified to do it and identified, among that group, Dr. Lee Pulos. And I guess he was particularly attractive as an initial point because he resided in Vancouver, and at the time Ms. Demyen resided in British

Columbia, so it would have been perhaps more convenient for all.

That took place, and upon a review of the tape -- because I did not participate or wasn't present for the sessions, that was in keeping with certain protocols that we wished to establish -- but upon reviewing the tape I had some concerns about the procedure that was used and $I$ had concerns about whether or not Ms. Demyen was in fact or had in fact been hypnotized, if not throughout the entire portion of the session at certain important portions of the session, and $I$ obtained the assistance of another professional in Montreal to review the tape and provide advice to us, on the basis of that advice concluded that we had some real concerns about the hypnosis session that had been undertaken and asked Ms. Demyen whether or not she would undertake another one with, I guess, the preeminent forensic hypnotist at -- and that's Dr. Martin Orne.

The other thing that came clear was that Ms. Demyen was suffering from some type of affliction, perhaps it was post-traumatic stress, $I$ wasn't certain, but we wanted to find
out whether she would explore that, and at the time the department agreed to defray any expenses related thereto. And in that context she was interviewed by Dr. Fleming, and we had his assessment, and steps were taken between them to pursue that if and when Ms. Demyen chose.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Dr. Martin? I'm sorry, I missed his last name?

It was Dr. Russel Fleming, sir.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: No, no, Fleming, but $I$ mean --

Martin Orne.
BY MR. HODSON:
$O-R-N-E ?$
$\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{E}$.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes.

A
It was as a result of his work that some of the protocols were developed and established for the reception of evidence, or from the reception of evidence that was obtained or spurred by hypnosis. BY MR. HODSON:

Now you had mentioned that you had Dr. Pulos' work reviewed by an expert in Montreal; was that Campbell Perry?

A That's correct.
Q
And at the end of the day what conclusions, if any, did you arrive at based on the various examinations and hypnosis sessions that Ms. John or Ms. Demyen undertook?

The conclusion was that Ms. Demyen did not, or could not, provide any additional evidence of what took place on that morning, January 1969.

Hypnosis did not assist in releasing any
additional information or evidence that had not
been presented before the courts at trial.
COMMISSIONER MaCCALLUM: She did not or
could not; which? Which would be right?
Umm, she did not, sir.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.
A
I -- I --
BY MR. HODSON:
Okay. You had started off this line of questioning saying you were convinced that Nichol saw something related to the slaying of Gail

Miller. Did your view change in any way after the work done by Dr. Pulos, Campbell Perry, Martin Orne and Dr. Fleming?

A
It didn't change, but it really -- it was of no assistance to the assessment, --
$Q$
A

And --
-- in the final analysis.
And had you considered doing this on the first application, any of this, these steps?

No, sir, we did not.
333667 , please. And this is your letter to Dr.
Pulos with your instructions; is that correct?
Yes.
And you say:
"I ... wish to confirm my
instruction to you that the Department's only interest is to obtain, if possible, an accurate recall of events that took place in 1969. The recollection of these events had been recorded in writing shortly after the event. However, the witness has been unable to recall these events since then."

And would that be an accurate statement of what you were instructing Dr. Pulos to do?

Yes.
And what were you referring to when you say that it had been recorded in writing shortly after the event?

I'm referring to the statement that Ms. John gave
to the Saskatoon City Police in which she implicated Mr. Milgaard as having an encounter with a woman showing a purse, and grabbed the purse, and that she followed them for a period of time down an alley, --

And --
-- and the facts surrounding that.
And you talk here about the:
"... potential that the witness may be
required to testify about her
recollections at a later date ..."?
A Yes.
Q And can you elaborate on what you were referring to?

Well, in the event that there was a hearing of any type that was occasioned by the second application, one of the things $I$ wanted to safeguard was if anything meaningful or productive came from this, that it would be admissible. And, at the time, $I$ was aware that admissibility of evidence that had been prompted by hypnosis certainly is -- would be the subject of challenge, and that it would be -- the chances for a successful admission would be better if, in the process of hypnosis, certain safeguards were
taken, were -- were followed.

For example, whoever would do the interview would have to be very careful not to suggest a set of facts to the witness, or potential witness, during either the prehypnoic session or during the hypnosis session, and that the entire session needed to be audio and video taped in order to present the clearest evidence of what transpired, and that would be important for the adjudicator or the trier of fact in making a decision whether or not to accept the evidence and, if so, the weight to be attached to it.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Do you mean that in the context of a new trial, sir?

Umm, possibly a new trial, or possibly if it was taken to a reference.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I'm just a little puzzled as to what your objective -- were you trying to gather more evidence against Milgaard for a --

Trying to gather, it could be more evidence against Milgaard or more evidence against anyone who may have assaulted Ms. Miller, we didn't know. She said initially it was David Milgaard, then she resiled from that at trial.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yeah, but that played no part in the trial, we have to take that as a legal position.

A

A

A

A

A
And, secondly, for the purposes of even this application, if she said she had seen David Milgaard, the weight to be attached to that would be very little if the questioner had suggested to her that it was in fact David Milgaard, it would be of little -- it would be of less weight.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.
BY MR. HODSON:

Q

A
Q

A
$Q$

A
A
$Q$

And would it be correct to describe this as being one of the investigative steps, then, in relation to the second application?

Yes.
And since the grounds -- the grounds in the second application, though, were limited to the similar-fact evidence, correct, --

Yes.
-- and that -- and so to what extent would the Nichol John information relate to the Larry Fisher similar-fact grounds?

One of the things that troubled us in relation to the similar fact or similar act evidence of Larry Fisher was finding a link linking Mr. Fisher to that event. Maybe there'd be a description provided of the clothing that might match Mr. Fisher or maybe there was -- there would be something that would solidify it against Mr. Milgaard, we didn't know, so it's in that context. If we can go to 003276 .

But, before leaving that, it's really important to stress that $I$ wanted to highlight to Dr. Pulos that his pre-questioning of Ms. John and his questioning of Ms. John had to fall within certain criteria for admissibility, and that would not
permit any kind of leading questions or would not permit the introduction of evidence to the witness that did not come from that witness.

And did you rely on Dr. Pulos to ensure that that -- proper steps were taken?

I did. Dr. Pulos had been presented to me as someone who had performed these types of interviews previously for Court-related purposes and, in my discussions with him, he certainly signaled that he was fully aware of the requirements.

And then now again, we've gone through this transcript before and $I$ think had a partial video of it, were you present at any of the hypnosis or the interview by Dr. Pulos?

No, I -- I made the introduction and then I left the building.

And do you recall, after returning, what Dr. Pulos told you about what he had learned during the session or what Nichol John had told you?

Oh, Dr. Pulos related his perception was that he felt that, during the course of it, that she had -- she had identified Mr. Milgaard as the killer. That was his take on it.

Okay. And if we can go to 002779, did you
ultimately accept that as being something that happened in the course of his hypnosis and interview?

A

A

A

A

A

A
No, I didn't.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: All right. Okay. Thank you.

BY MR. HODSON:
And is it correct to say that Dr. Pulos viewed
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: You didn't accept that that was what he might have gathered from his interview; is that right? I'm not asking you to agree with Dr. Pulos or disagree with him but, having seen the tape, did you get the impression that that's what she said?

BY MR. HODSON:

$Q$ No, I didn't.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I'm sorry, that wasn't a fair question.

Well --

- I
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certain conduct and statements of Nichol John in a way different than you viewed the conduct and answers; is that what --

A
Dr. Pulos' conclusions about those statements and conduct of Ms. John did not convince me, I wasn't satisfied by his conclusions, and suffice it to say that $I$ thought it desirable to get a second opinion. I just -- it --

Did the Dr. Pulos interview provide you with any information of value in the quest that you had undertaken relating to Nichol John's recall?

A
$Q$ There was some information of value, yes, sir. However, in terms of the crucial question as to identifying the person that Ms. John had seen several times in dreams or -- it did not. On the critical question, it did not.

And here is a letter from Dr. Pulos to you September 26 th, 1991 , and he says:
"After the hypnosis portion of the interview was over she said, and repeated her statement that Dave Milgaard stabbed the victim on the morning of January 31, 1969. I believe you were present at the end of the interview and heard her make that
statement."

Were you, in fact, present and did you hear a statement to the effect described by Dr. Pulos? I heard a statement, but my recollection was that she did not identify David Milgaard by name. Umm - -

What do you recall?
I recall words to the effect that, you know, she saw someone stab the woman in the morning. He attributed it, he inserted David Milgaard as stabbing the victim, but $I$ did not understand her to say that as directly as Dr. Pulos recites in that paragraph.

The next document, just to call up to identify, 114906 .

> And I simply call this
document up, Mr. Commissioner, this is the October 2, 1991 memorandum between Douglas Rutherford and the deputy minister, it's been referred to from time to time. I have concluded that $I$ don't think I can ask any questions about this document in light of Chief Justice Laing's ruling, and I'm simply putting that on the record so that counsel don't think that $I$ have missed it for another reason, so $I$ don't propose to ask any questions on
that.
114920.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Does that mean that $I$ can't read it?

MR. HODSON: Well, I think we've all read it, I'm not sure what Mr. Frayer is going to tell us we get to do with it at the end of the day, but it has been referred to, and certainly with other witnesses. I am just indicating that the --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well that's fair, Mr. Hodson, I'll make my own mind up how far -what $I$ can gather from it, if anything.

BY MR. HODSON:
Q
I was inclined to ask Mr. Williams to tell me whatever he could about the memo without violating the court order, but $I$ wasn't sure that was a fair question, or not the court order, but the principle annunciated in the case.

This is a document $I$ think, Mr. Williams, that you prepared; is that correct? Yes.

And October 8th, 1991, and this would have been based on sort of your review of files and your recollection at the time; is that correct?

A Yes.
Q
And $I$ believe this memo deals with what
information or what files you had on the first application and what new information came out in the second application; is that correct?

That's correct.
And you say:
"During the assessment of Mr. Milgaard's first application, the Department had obtained the police files concerning Mr. Fisher's assaults of (V5)-- (V5)---, (V7)--- (V7)---, (V8)-- (V8)---, and (V10) (V10)-. Also, the Department had a summary of the three 1968 assaults in Saskatoon that formed the basis of other guilty pleas. This summary was obtained from Fisher's statements to Winnipeg police, his interview in July 1990, and court documents obtained by the R.C.M.P."

And again, that would reflect the information you had then on the first application?

Yes.
And then:
"Before this application no one had
tried to connect Fisher to the assault
on (V14)- (V14)-. A summary of Mr.
Fisher's assaults derived from the
police files and from the recent
Centurion interviews is provided below:"
So I take it you then go through the new
information, if $I$ can call it that?
Yes.
Or sorry, number 1 is --
Obtain files, the files obtained by the department, and then we went on to discuss and summarize some of the materials provided to us in the Centurion Ministries submission.

And then if we can go to the next page, I don't propose to go through these in detail, but files that were not obtained by the department, and that relates to not obtained by the department on the first application; correct?

Correct.
And so here you outline the (V1)-, (V2)----- and (V3)------ files, and again, would that have been information that you obtained from some other source then?

A
Yes. That information $I$ believe came from a letter that had been submitted to Saskatchewan

Justice.
Okay. And then down at the bottom you talk about resident (V14)- (V14)-, so again, this would be an accurate memo then as to what files you had and what information you had on the first application? Yes.

002948, this is an October 10th, 1991 memo to file and looks like this is where you started to talk to Dr. Fleming, is that correct, about unleashing memory that has been repressed?

A
$Q$
Yes.
009033, and this is an October 10th, 1991 report from Sergeant Pearson to you that has, it says: "...find attached the requested fact analysis which was recently completed by our analytical unit."

And I think Sergeant Pearson's evidence was that they had their analytical people at the RCMP review the information that had been provided in the Centurion documents in the second application; is that correct?

A
Q
And would this then be information that was gathered for the purposes of assessing the information in the second application?

If we can go to 333823, please, and this is a note of October 23, 1991 from Sergeant Pearson to you, and there's two reports here, number one is the 1968 (V14)- report and two is the Saskatoon City Police report of sex cases from 1968, '69 and '70, and if we can go to just that second one first, go to page 333832, and this is a letter from Constable Gelowitz, as he was at the time, to Mr. Penkala that went through the rapes and sexual assault files for '68, '69, '70, and can you comment on the significance, if any, of this information as far as assessing the second application?

We had asked for that information in an attempt to develop some profiles of the sexual assaults that had taken place in Saskatoon during that three year period and to see what if any conclusions we could draw from it and it was -- it was examined, I don't recall what final conclusions we drew from it, but $I$ believe this information formed part of the package that was presented to the Supreme Court of Canada in the reference. It says:
"...in all occurrences 4 were identified in which a ... (knife) was observed by
the victim."

So that --
And again, was this information that was part of the source of information in looking at the similarity of Larry Fisher's assaults with the Gail Miller murder?

Certainly it was part of collecting some information about sexual assaults and, yes, definitely with respect to Mr. Fisher.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Am I reading that right, that of all those assaults only four could be said to have been committed with the use of a knife?

A

A
Well, $I$ found it a bit surprising. I think there are two points to be made. The first point is that you could say there are only four rapes that rapes was not all that prevalent, at least as far as that sampling is concerned?
took place with a knife or you could say there are only four rapes in which the victim saw the knife, albeit a knife, or the possession of a knife was threatened, or the use of a knife was threatened even though the victim didn't see a weapon itself. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh, I see.

BY MR. HODSON:
If we can go to 030493 , this is an October 24,
1991 letter from Mr. Wolch to Mr. MacFarlane, Department of Justice, that has the Professor Boyd report, and do you have a recollection of receiving that report and reviewing that, the Rossmo/Boyd report?

Yes, I do.
And did you have occasion to review the report? I did briefly, sir. I don't think I spent -- I know that the report tended to favour the position advanced by the Milgaards, but beyond that, I think by October of '91, October 24 th, $I$ knew that my involvement would be quite limited from here on in in terms of assessing that report.

Do you have a recollection of anything in that report that brought information to your attention that you weren't aware of before or caused you to look at any other information differently?

A

Q

A

No, I think in reviewing some of the reports, I was struck by the, $I$ guess $I$ was struck by the recitation of facts which seemed to me at times to diverge from the facts that had been reported on the police reports.

And can you be a bit more specific, facts relating to what?

I think the assault. Some of the, and I'm going by a very hazy memory, but it seems to me that the Boyd report obtained as a basis of its information some of the facts recited in the Centurion report and quite clearly the interview of a victim some 15 or several years after the event will bring about a recitation of the event which may differ from the recitation of facts provided immediately after the event to the police and there were some discrepancies there.

If we can go to 152076 , please, and this is a memo, October 24, 1991. Mr. Frayer, I'm not sure if you have any issue with this memo. I simply want to have Mr. Williams comment on the factual information and the conclusions he's reached in this memo. I do not intend to question him about any advice or the purpose. Are you fine with that?

MR. FRAYER: Yeah, I'm comfortable with that.

BY MR. HODSON:
$Q$

Mr. Frayer has indicated that he's comfortable with that.

And here you set out the
frequency of sexual assaults in Saskatoon and $I$ think this relates to the question the Commissioner asked you just a few moments ago about the number of rapes and other sex offences and the number of weapons, and that would be, $I$ take it, based upon the information you received from the Saskatoon City Police?

That's correct.
And then you say:
"In this regard, it is important to note that these reports were made shortly after the assaults when the incident was fresh in the victim's memory. For example, the Centurion Ministries report said that (V5)-- (V5)--- assailant threatened to kill her by breaking her neck. In her February 21, 1970 statement to the police, Ms. (V5)--- did not tell the police that her assailant
had threatened to kill her. Her
recollection of being struck four or
five times in 1970 became a "dozen times in the face with fists" in 1991.

The most startling divergence between the reports of an assault relate to (V14)- (V14)-. I have attached as Appendix 3, portions of the police file that were retrieved recently."

And then you go on to describe -- sorry:
"In 1968, Ms. (V14)- said that her assailant grabbed her from behind, and ripped the buttons from her blouse while attempting to undress her. She squirmed away and crawled into a cupboard. Her assailant stabbed her in the legs with a sharp object as she crawled toward the cupboard."
"Her screams frightened him and he left. She also estimated that her
assailant was approximately 6' tall. However, she only saw her assailant's legs and the dirty hands "of a white man". As a result of information obtained from nearby residents, the
police began a search for a light green
truck."

Etcetera. Can you recall, what was the significance of -- or did you find differences in the information in the Centurion Ministries statements -- or I'm not sure if they were statements, but summaries of what they said they were told by the victims compared to other records that you had?

Yes, sir.
And were they significant?
Some were, some were not. In relation to (V14)-, the (V14)- description, on the one hand shortly after the event she estimated her assailant to be approximately six feet tall and she assumed that he was Caucasian or a white man. Later on, much later on the height dropped from five-five -- from six foot to approximately five foot four or five foot five and to me that is significant. If it were six foot to five-ten or so, it's in the range, but there's some perception of someone who is six foot tall as opposed to someone who is five foot five.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: And this latter one was five foot four or five and that was the
quote given to Centurion you mean?
A

A

BY MR. HODSON:
If I could call up 321731, I just want to show you
a couple of documents here and then ask for your
comment. This is an October 29th, '91 fax from
Mr. Pearson to you relating to (V14)- (V14)-. If we can go to the next page, he writes:
"Just prior to sending this fax, I received a call from (V14)- and she is currently in a Saskatchewan hospital, suffering from depression and fearful of what is happening in the Milgaard case. (V14) - now tells me she has seen TV and newspaper pictures of Milgaard and believes strongly it was he who committed the offence upon her. She also indicates the photo she was shown of Larry Fisher, by Joyce Milgaard, was not the person who attacked her."

And then if we could just call up 012073, and
this is your file memorandum about your discussion, and it goes on to describe what Ms. (V14) - advised Sergeant Pearson, that:
"...she was upset at the treatment that she had received from Mrs. Milgaard. Initially, Ms. (V14)- had contacted counsel for David Milgaard to secure a photograph of Mr. Milgaard. Ms. (V14)suspected that Milgaard sexually assaulted her in 1968. Counsel had referred Ms. (V14)- to Mrs. Milgaard, and the women met in Regina some time later. Ms. (V14)- attended the meeting believing that she could resolve the suspicions that she had harboured for over 20 years. Instead, the conversation revolved around Larry Fisher.

Mrs. Milgaard produced a photograph of Larry Fisher and asked Ms. (V14) - whether Fisher had assaulted her. (V14)- denied that Fisher was her assailant."

And again, we heard a fair bit of evidence from Sergeant Pearson on this subject. Can you tell

A
us, Mr. Williams, what was your assessment of the, I guess the inclusion of (V14)- (V14)- as one of the Larry Fisher victims and the request to have the similarities of the (V14)- attack included in the similar act ground; in other words, that look at how (V14)- (V14)- was attacked, she was attacked by Larry Fisher and in a similar way to Gail Miller?

Well, sir, it didn't fit in the sense that Ms. (V14)-' view, or at least what she told Sergeant Pearson, contradicted the impression that we were left with after reading the Centurion report, it contradicted it in a couple of key instances; firstly, in relation to the identity of the assailant, and secondly, some of the descriptors of the event. I, quite frankly, I didn't know what to make of it and maybe it was just a mistake, inadvertently it got tossed into the mix, or somebody didn't read it when they put it all together, but it just -Did the inclusion of the (V14)- assault cause you to be -- to view the information, the rest of the information in the second application in a different way? Well, my earlier experience reviewing the various
submissions prompted me to be very careful about accepting at face value the assertions of fact contained in some of the applications.

Now, let's just talk a bit about the other seven assaults. I take it there were eight assaults in the second application, seven of them Mr . Fisher had pled guilty to; correct?

Yes.
I think in all cases he had been convicted and pled guilty. I take it you took no issue that he was the perpetrator of those assaults; is that correct?

No, I didn't take issue with that.
Okay. And then secondly, the information in the second application described $I$ think Centurion Ministries', or perhaps counsel for David Milgaard's summary of what these victims had said to Centurion Ministries in interviews in 1991, correct; in other words, the particulars of the offences?

Did you have concerns -- did the inclusion of the (V14)- (V14)- assault cause you to have concerns about the credibility of that information; namely, the particulars of the seven known assaults?

A been found not guilty by reason of insanity of various offences.

And it appears that you are asking him here: "...to assess Ms. Demyen to determine whether she is suffering from any emotional or psychiatric disorder that has prevented her from recalling,
consciously, the memory of the early
morning hours of January 31, 1969."
And can you just comment on that request?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
Q
Is it fair to say that you had some real doubts about the methodology -- or the process utilized by Dr. Pulos?

A
I had doubts about the process because Dr. Pulos did not video tape the pre-hypnosis session and that to me was quite important. In relation to the, to whether or not she was hypnotized, I had reviewed the tape and $I$ observed that he needed to regress her, to take her back under hypnosis on at least two occasions supplementary to the initial occasion because she appeared to come out of hypnosis and there was some question, at least in my mind as a lay person, in terms of my knowledge of hypnosis, there was some question in my mind as to whether or not she was under hypnosis throughout the entire period and it was important for us to find out what answers came under hypnosis and which ones did not and it's in that context that $I$ thought it prudent to get the views of an expert.

Then go to 031179, and I believe this is Campbell Perry's reply November 12th, 1991, the evaluation report, and if we can go to page 186 , Was the subject under hypnosis:
"In my opinion, she was not in
hypnosis."
And I take it that would have been the bottom line of his -- I mean, the report goes into much
greater detail, but was that your understanding of the report?

A
Q

And she had a, or appeared to have a memory of that on May 24 th, 1969 when she gave the statement; is that correct?

A That's correct.
Q
What about the March 11th, 1991 statement, her initial statement, and in that statement she does not describe anything about encountering either a woman or Mr. Milgaard leaving the car or seeing a stabbing or anything of that nature.

The entire episode is omitted from that statement.
Whether it was done because of an absence of memory or it was done deliberately to perhaps lessen her own potential involvement in it $I$ don't know.

And then if we can go to page 3, and I don't believe the March 3rd statement -- or the March 11th statement was provided to Dr. Fleming was it?

I don't believe --
There is a reference on page 3. If we look at the second paragraph right here --

Sorry. Oh, there, yeah.
-- which appears to have been March 11, 1969. Oh, okay, sorry:
"She did give a statement at this point
which was not available for review but
which might be of interest.
Ms. Demyen's best recollection is that
she initially had no memory of the
events the police were exploring but once they started talking with her things began to come back to her. At this point, she moved back into the parental home..."

Etcetera. So would that have been something then that you asked Dr. Fleming to look at?

Not specifically. His mandate was as set out in the letter and how he fulfilled it was according to his professional view of the techniques that would be appropriate.

BY MR. HODSON:
And again, if you scroll down, he says here:
"In any event, the statement which she then provided on May 24, 1969, however it was arrived at, seems to provide the best recollection and the most detail which she has been able to provide either before or since."

And, again, what was your reaction to that
Umm, I had no particular reaction, sir. I just wanted to, $I$ guess, wait until the bottom line. My appreciation of that was simply that she did not acknowledge or affirm certain portions of that statement at trial, and so it was just another
statement.
If we can go to the next page. And here Dr. Fleming then, $I$ think he then went through what should happen at the preliminary hearing and at the trial, and he says:
"It is possible to think of several hypothetical explanations for the discrepancy between the May 24 th statement and her subsequent evidence at trial. Without wishing to cast a shadow over anyone, one has to first consider that the May 24 th statement was a creative effort on the part of the investigating officers who were evidently attempting to help Ms. Demyen with her recollection of events.

However, there does not appear to be any real evidence to support this hypotheses and Ms. Demyen herself seems to recall that the police seemed to be quite careful in this regard and in spite of spending the night in the Saskatoon women's lock-up, she does not recall
feeling particularly pressured by the investigating officers."

And had that been a ground or an allegation that had been alleged in some form or another in the previous application?

A
I wouldn't say it had been forcefully advanced in the previous application, but certainly there was the suggestion that the police behaviour towards the three young witnesses at trial may have influenced their testimony. That came either directly or indirectly, there was that nuance, and I think it came in perhaps sometimes during some discussions we may have had with either Mr. Wolch or Mr. Asper about the development of the witness' statements, how the initial statements they saw and heard nothing untoward or incriminating but then, as the police had more contacts with them, certainly there were some incriminating statements provided by Mr. Wilson and by Ms. Demyen and then later on by Mr. Cadrain. So there was that suggestion in discussions that, you know, that just didn't happen without some other factor coming in, but in my interviews with Mr. Cadrain, Ms. Demyen and Mr. Wilson, they were unable, or they did not point to any action by the police that was inappropriate.

Yeah. Are these -- and I'll go through the rest
of them, but Dr. Fleming goes through various explanations for the discrepancy between the May 24 th statement and her subsequent evidence at trial; were these hypothetical explanations that he came up with or did you ask him to test any?

A

Q
A

Q I -- I didn't ask him to test any of those. These are -- this is his report --

Okay.
-- based on his experience without input from me. He goes on to say:
"A second explanation might be that Ms. Demyen did purposely and consciously take a different position during her evidence at trial because of a much closer relationship with Milgaard than has been demonstrated or because she may have felt particularly
threatened by him if she gave evidence more specifically identifying him as the perpetrator. There is no evidence that she had any close relationship with

Milgaard in fact the evidence of her having been assaulted by him would be more in favour of the other possibility, that is, that she felt intimidated or

|  | 1 |  | fearful of him. Since she now still |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 |  | denies that fear of Milgaard had |
|  | 3 |  | anything to do with her evidence in |
|  | 4 |  | Court then there would on the surface at |
| 04:19 | 5 |  | least be no reason now for her to |
|  | 6 |  | maintain such a position if it were in |
|  | 7 |  | fact not the case. It would be much |
|  | 8 |  | simpler to say, yes $I$ saw him do it and |
|  | 9 |  | I lied in court, since that would likely |
| 04:19 | 10 |  | have the net effect of keeping him about |
|  | 11 |  | where he is." |
|  | 12 |  | And this appears to be his explanation of the -- |
|  | 13 |  | second possible explanation of the discrepancy; |
|  | 14 |  | correct? |
| 04:19 | 15 | A | Yes. |
|  | 16 | Q | And that would be something that he came up with |
|  | 17 |  | as opposed to you asking him to review; correct? |
|  | 18 | A | Correct. |
|  | 19 | Q | Scroll down. |
| 04:20 | 20 |  | "A third explanation and the |
|  | 21 |  | one having reviewed all the |
|  | 22 |  | circumstances which I find most |
|  | 23 |  | plausible is that Ms. Demyen has |
|  | 24 |  | repressed the memory of certain events |
| 04:20 | 25 |  | for psychological reasons. This assumes |
|  |  |  | Meyer CompuCourt Reporting <br> 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 |

of course that she observed certain
events in the first place and that the
recollections recorded in the May 24 th
statement are true and not themselves
the product of suggestion.

Nevertheless, given Ms. Demyen's past
family history of abuse and the evidence
of her having been a somewhat disturbed
adolescent throughout this entire
period, $I$ think it is quite plausible
that powerful psychological defence mechanisms were at work which could explain her memory difficulties. Add to this the fact that she herself claims to
have been assaulted by Mr. Milgaard
shortly before the episode and that immediately following she embarked on her heaviest use of mind altering drugs. It would be easy to postulate that this was directly related to emotional disturbance in the aftermath of the January 31st trip."

And then goes on to talk about some other matters. Can you comment, Mr. Williams, on what you -- what significance, if any, you placed on
this information from Dr. Fleming and what you understood him to be saying?

A
Up to that point he is signaling that there is a repression of memory, and which has a psychological underpinning, but he's not certain yet. At least to that point he hasn't identified what he thinks it is, but he has certainly considered other options and has, based on his findings of fact or based on the information gathered from Ms. Demyen, has dismissed them as being inappropriate in the circumstances.

Now, if we can just go back to the previous page, down at the bottom what he says is that:
"This assumes of course that she observed certain events in the first place and that the recollection recorded in the May 24 th statement are true and not themselves the product of suggestion."

And would you agree that that seems to, as much as the explanation provides an answer, it also has a pretty important assumption?

A
Q

A

It has a huge caveat --
Okay.
-- and in that he recognizes that the value of

A
$Q$
that earlier recall is only as good as the integrity of the process that prompted it. So if they hadn't -- if the statement were true and not the product of suggestion, then it has some value, otherwise it's of little value. And did you understand, then, that Dr. Fleming had looked at the question or the issue as to whether or not -- that the May 24 th statement that she provided may have been untrue, and suggested to her that that's the reason she couldn't remember in 1991?

Right. And in other words, if she did see something on the morning of January 31, 1969 and can't later remember it, that's one question; why is it that she can't remember. And would you agree a related question is that, if she didn't see anything on January 31,1969 , how is it that on May 24 th, 1969 she said she did and then later says "I can't remember"; is that -That's one of the, $I$ guess, assessments he might go through. In all of that, however, the question
that kept on troubling me was even if she didn't see anything on the morning of January 1969, why would she have the flashbacks or what she described as flashbacks, so --

You'd mentioned that -- the flashbacks before.
What about the, you had also mentioned the map back in June when we talked about that. Can you tell us, again, what was the significance of that piece of information at this time when you're engaging experts to review Nichol Demyen?

Well, unknown to me Ms. Demyen had been presented with a drawing of the scene, but to the extent that her, quote, "flashback" seemed to coincide with a diagram of the location of the body, it lent a certain amount of substance or a ring of truth that she may have seen something, some event surrounding the death of Gail Miller.

And so if she would have had a memory of that morning, and the memory did not include witnessing a murder, would that have been a satisfactory conclusion? Let me rephrase that. If you were able to get her to recall the events of the morning of January 31,1969 , and her recollection was exculpatory to Mr. Milgaard, in other words "I remember here's where we drove, here's what
happened, and I didn't see a murder and these things didn't happen", was that a piece of information that could have been the result of these efforts?

Yes.
At the end of the exercise, then, did you gain anything from Dr. Fleming, then, that assisted you in trying to understand Nichol Demyen's state of mind or recollection in late 1991?

I think what we learned was that she was suffering from an emotional or psychological disorder, that at least his assessment was that this wasn't a ploy, and $I$ think our position was that we would assist her in whatever steps she thought desirable to deal with it.

Probably an appropriate time for a break, Mr. Commissioner.

```
            (Adjourned at 4:27 p.m.)
```

            (Reconvened at 4:43 p.m.)
    BY MR. HODSON:
Call up 334078, please. This is a report from Sergeant Pearson to you dated November 20 th, 1991 and outlines some information. If we can go to the next page Mr. Pearson writes, he says:
"I will await the
developments in Milgaard's Application before deciding whether it will be appropriate to approach the Fisher victims to obtain details as they recollect them. You will recall in a previous telephone discussion, our common concern that, in view of Joyce Milgaard's approach to (V14)- (V14)-, there may be a built-in bias in the details provided in the most recent Application suggesting that Larry Fisher is responsible. Depending on what the Justice Department is doing with the information currently possessed, I am of the view it would be appropriate to talk with the victims to ensure that all details available are in the hands of the Justice Department. I await a response from you in this regard."

And again, can you tell us, does this accurately describe what you and Sergeant Pearson would have discussed and concerns that you both would have had?

A That's correct.

And we had touched on this a bit earlier, but as

Sergeant Pearson writes, that the:
"... in view of Joyce Milgaard's
approach to (V14)- (V14)-...";
can you elaborate, what was your concern about that approach at this time?

My understanding was that Ms. (V14)- wanted to speak with Mrs. Milgaard for one purpose and Mrs. Milgaard turned the interview around to a different purpose. I think, based on what $I$ had heard from Sergeant Pearson, Mrs. (V14)- wanted to confirm whether or not her assailant was David Milgaard, and in turn got in touch with Mrs. Milgaard for that purpose, but was presented with a photo of Mr. Fisher as being her assailant, firstly; and then secondly Ms. (V14)-', or a summary of Ms. (V14)-' assault was submitted as part of the chain of Fisher assaults, so it was a completely different purpose from what the -- from what Ms. (V14)- had intended.

Now $I$ bore in mind the fact
that Mr. Fisher had pled guilty to a number of assaults so that, insofar as the others were concerned, there was no question that he had acknowledged the offences in relation to those victims. What may have been uncertain was whether
the current description attributed to the victims of the assault in fact reflected what they had relayed, or whether it had been embellished, or whether their memory was imperfect or uncertain. Do you recall discussing with Sergeant Pearson the prospect of interviewing some of the victims to test some of what had been in the Centurion Ministries' summaries?

Yes, but at the time I had not -- I basically invited him to hold on.

Okay. If we can go to -- and is it, without getting into advice, would that be because of other developments in relation to the second application?

Yes. More specifically, whether I would have carriage thereafter, or full carriage.

Now this is --
This is on --
-- November 21, --
Yes.
-- this is a week before the minister sends the reference to the Supreme Court?

Correct.
Go to 334136 . This is a memo to file November 22nd, 1991, re:
"The Impossibility of Nichol John's
Statement",
and I'm not sure, do you know what that refers
to, what it is that you are reviewing?

A

Q

A
Q

A

Q
A

Q

A
2
I believe the impossibility of Nichol John's
statement relates to a submission presented on the
second application or it may relate to a
submission by Mr. Wolch.
I think maybe in a follow-up letter; is that
possible?
Yeah, yeah.
And so just if you can tell us generally, what
were you looking at, and what did you conclude?
Sorry, let me add one other thing. Is it possible
that this also relates to the Professor Boyd and
Rossmo report?
It -- it probably -- it possibly could have. I'm
afraid $I$ didn't review this one recently --
Okay.
-- so, in terms of the context in which it was
developed, I'm not certain.
And are you able to comment on basically what you
reviewed and what you concluded?
If I may have a moment?
Sure. Maybe do it in parts. I think the first
part is the Avenue N versus Avenue O .
A
$Q$

A

Well the applicant, the applicant had put some emphasis on Nichol John's statement, because this was by far -- had she, had she adopted it at

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: So what is all
this? Do you know? Can you enlighten me?
trial, this was the only recitation that directly links David Milgaard --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Right.
A

A That's correct.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: So why is
everybody operating on the supposition that the jury did something wrong?

A I don't know.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: They weren't smart enough to follow directions given to them three times, by the judge and both counsel?

A

A

Maybe just a follow-up question on that, Mr.
Williams. I think I touched on this back in June when we dealt with this subject, and I believe your evidence was to the effect that -- I think I put to you two scenarios; one, that if in 1988 or '89 Nichol John said "the reason I did not give evidence at trial consistent with what was in my sworn statement is because $I$ made it up, and $I$ lied in the May 24 th statement, and here's why", and that was credible, that that might be information that would be -- form the basis for a remedy under 690, and $I$ think you said generally yes; is that correct?

That's my recollection, yes.
So now, in fairness --
But --
-- I don't think that was put forward as a ground, but --

No, it wasn't. But, I mean, that and other things could have formed it, again, depending on what the evidence was at trial.

And then, secondly, the converse is that if she said "well, the reason $I$ didn't repeat it at trial is because either $I$ was scared", or whatever reason, "but my statement is true and $I$ have a
present recollection", and that was credible, that that would be information that would be important in your assessment, is that correct, even though it may not have been raised as a ground? That's correct. I mean in September of '91, you know, the applicant knew that we were dealing with Ms. John, and that was a live issue, as to potentially she might -- her memory might be re -might resurface, so that possibility existed. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I -- sorry to interrupt again, sir, but $I$ just am baffled by the use to which anybody thought they could, whether it's the applicant or the minister, thought they could make of such evidence without evidence that the jury had accepted her May 24 th statement for truth of contents. If they didn't, where is the issue?

A
In the 690 context, Commissioner, there was consideration as to whether -- let's say, for example when Ms. John was interviewed by Mr. Pulos, he was successful -COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yeah?
-- and she says "you know, having now submitted to the hypnosis $I$ now recall, and this is my memory as refreshed or recalled under hypnosis", and if

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: So notwithstanding the trial -- I'm sorry to interrupt -notwithstanding the trial, for example if she said "yes, and now I remember, it was John Smith from Regina that I saw" -Okay.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: -- and therefore there would have been a miscarriage of justice? There would have been a miscarriage of justice.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh, okay.

A

A
But what if she had said "oh, I affirm the contents of my statement as true"?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Right.
Then the question would be could the minister consider that, in terms of the second application, as evidence implicating David Milgaard, and in those circumstances the applicants might say "lookit, minister, even though she is now -- says she remembers it" --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Uh-huh?
A -- "it just can't happen the way she said it did". COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.

BY MR. HODSON:
And do I take it from that, Mr. Williams, that
given that at trial Ms. John did not recall certain parts of the morning of January 31, '69, that if later she did recall, whether it be inculpatory or exculpatory, that that would be new in the sense that it was different than what was at trial; is that -- $I$ think you told us, you gave us evidence to that effect, that if it was -- if she had a memory, regardless of which way it went, that would be new because, at trial, she didn't have a memory?

That's correct.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: So that the applicant, then, would be forced into a position of arguing against her the truth of her May 24 th statement because, otherwise, the minister might well conclude that there had been no miscarriage of justice?

A Correct.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yeah.
BY MR. HODSON:
And so with that, Mr. Williams, to the Avenue $N$ versus Avenue O briefly.

A
Briefly, that's just a discussion of some of the points that were raised $I$ think in one of the reports or submissions, and that was my response.

A
Q

A

Q

A

Q

In reviewing the May 24 th statement then, of Nichol John, did you make any, reach any conclusions as to whether what was stated in that statement, if it were assumed to be true, that it was somehow impossible or that -- implausible?

I didn't reach that assessment, I just simply recall that it wasn't evidence which the jury used to convict.

But $I$ suppose, if what she describes in her statement is an event that's not possible, then that might cause you to have some concern about the manner in which the statement was obtained? Yes, not so much as the manner in which the statement was obtained, but $I$ think if there were some facts in there that just couldn't have happened it certainly would have been a point that I should bring out to the minister.

Okay. 157840. This is the Minister Campbell's letter to Mr. Wolch, and go to page 842, is the Privy Council order ordering the reference. Can you tell us, Mr. Williams, once the Supreme Court reference was ordered, what role did you play as far as the reference case?

My role was to assist Commission Counsel who had been appointed, Mr. Fainstein and Mr. Frater, in
the preparation of the case on appeal, and that involved culling the files for material that I'd collected which was relevant, assisting them in preparing them for publication and binding and distribution, that was one aspect.

The second aspect was to
coordinate the, coordinate some of the logistical challenges surrounding the reference, for example witnesses, getting them to and from the hearing. Thirdly, $I$ was asked to follow up on information that had been -- additional information that had been provided by the parties relevant to the issues. For example, witnesses emerged who provided information, for example Launa Edwards, and referred us to additional folks who could support the version of events as recited by Ms. Edwards, and we would arrange to have those witnesses interviewed and their statements forwarded for inclusion in the case on reference. In addition, some of the local witnesses I interviewed, and the results of those went into the case on reference.

So I assisted Commission
Counsel by providing, or by collecting
information, coordinating the collection of
information, so I had a support role.
And it looks like from the documents that you continued on with your efforts to have Nichol Demyen hypnotized with Dr. Orne, or with Martin Orne; is that correct?

We did follow up on that.
And so just 334274 , was this then now for the purpose of having this information possibly available for the reference case, or can you -Solely for the purposes of the reference. Based on Campbell Perry's assessment and based on what we had observed by watching the tape, there was some issue as to whether or not she had been hypnotized and it was still felt the desirable thing to -- the conclusion was, from Cam Perry was no, she hadn't been, and so we said, okay, would we get a result if she were properly hypnotized by Martin Orne, so we tried it. It didn't happen. Okay. Or, shall we say, we did not get a result that was different from that obtained with Lee Pulos. However, we were more confident about the process that was used by Martin Orne because he recorded the entire event. He did have some caveats about the effectiveness of his session because he was of
the view that perhaps certain information had been provided to the witness that might have influenced her views of things, that hypnosis would not -COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Did the Supreme Court get this? I'm sorry, did the Supreme Court see Orne's tape?

Yes, they did.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.
BY MR. HODSON:
002663 , and this is a letter December $20 t h, 1991$ from Mr . Brown, and I take it you would have had some dealings with Murray Brown then in the course of the reference?

I did.
And it looks as though the issue of DNA testing was the subject of a discussion with you, and Mr. Brown says:
"In our view every effort should be made
to analyze the D.N.A. content of all
human tissue samples found at the scene
or on the clothing of the victim. It
seems to us that we at least owe that
effort to Mr. Milgaard."
you comment on that, what prompted at
nt the decision to look at DNA testing
again?
A

The Milgaards did not ask us to conduct DNA testing, but separately when $I$ saw the materials, or saw the issues, I thought DNA would certainly be a conclusive answer, so I explored that separately with Dr. Fourney and with those at the RCMP labs.

Are you talking the second application or the first?

No, I'm talking the first application.
The first application?

A

And as a result of the information $I$ obtained from them, it was suggested to me that it would be preferable to wait until scientific developments which were being researched came to fruition and then sample -- then apply for testing. You may recall that Dr. Fourney and I visited Dr. Ferris' lab I believe in June of 1990 and one of the objectives was to, or at least from Dr. Fourney's viewpoint, was to see what had been done and what was salvageable.

So, I'm sorry, so then are you telling us that DNA testing was not part of either the first or second application, a request for DNA testing? There was -- the Milgaards had attempted DNA testing with Dr. Ferris and that had proven unsuccessful. I wasn't aware of that until I started looking at it separately because they had not mentioned it, $I$ don't believe they mentioned it in their application, but $I$ thought that that would be an investigative avenue worth pursuing and $I$ made inquiries. I found out that given the age and the nature of the exhibits, the existing methods of typing and analysing DNA probably weren't suitable and could not get results and I was told to wait because the research was underway
that might produce a methodology to get meaningful results from the samples that still remained, and I may have communicated that to Murray Brown who said, well, look, two years ago, two years have elapsed since you got that information, shouldn't you at least try it in relation to the Supreme Court reference.

So do you think it may have been Mr. Brown that prompted this review in December of 1991?

It quite possibly could have been, yes.
Okay.
It certainly seems that way from his letter, a discussion that was formalized in a request.

And prior to this, was there any request made by anybody on behalf of David Milgaard then to renew efforts to test for DNA?

Not that I recall.
326514, this is a memo to file December 20, 1991 of an interview with Ute Frank, it says:
"It is being recorded at the request of Ms. Frank..."

And:
"Before we began to record, Ms. Frank had asked two questions: Firstly, what is this all about. Secondly, do I have
any protection in law from media harassment? And she asked what I could do to shield her from the media?"

Do you recall what -- how this interview came about or what happened?

Ms. Frank was someone that we were interested in speaking to but did not have a location for her until she was interviewed in a news piece on the West Coast because she was protesting, she was a protester for the forests, and one of our
correspondents said $I$ just saw an interview with a Ute Frank and there can't be too many people of that name, so you may want to check it out, and we thought that probably she would be one of the people in whom the court would have some interest, so steps were taken to verify that this Ute Frank from B.C. was the same individual mentioned in the testimony of George Lapchuk and Craig Melnyk and we were in fact able to get a phone number and contact with her and $I$ broached the subject of an interview and we discussed several ways in which the interview could be conducted, including questioning with a shorthand reporter and counsel, and Ms. Frank's preference was to have it recorded by tape without the benefit of counsel and without
the presence of a certified shorthand reporter. If we can go to 157226, it's a letter from you to Mr. Wolch, December 23, 1991, disclosing for the purposes of the reference, and you indicate:
"The majority of these documents were provided to you on October 1, 1990."

What was your understanding of disclosure requirements for the reference on both the part of the Federal Justice, Saskatchewan Justice and David Milgaard?

Well, insofar as we were concerned, we were to prepare and provide all of the materials that we had collected subject to any privileges that keep them out of court.

And what was your understanding of what Saskatchewan Justice and David Milgaard had agreed to provide?

A

Q Go to 334337, please, this is a note of a discussion on December 30, 1991 with Dr. Vivian Emmerson of the Home Office's Central Research Laboratory in England; is that correct? That's correct.

And who and why -- who is Dr. Emmerson and why did you contact Dr. Emmerson?

My -- Dr. Emmerson was the head of the Home Office's Laboratory in Aldermaston. My information was that at the time that laboratory was a very good one and was working on a process that would allow meaningful testing of old and less than -- of old and perhaps partly contaminated samples and would still be able to get meaningful DNA results, so I contacted him with a view to trying to interest the lab in performing an analysis of the clothing that still remained in the Gail Miller homicide.

And where was the clothing at this time?
It was -- I believe it was in Queen's Bench here in Saskatoon.

Q And at this time do you have a recollection of what you had understood might be available for testing of Gail Miller's clothing and, in particular, what Dr. Ferris had identified in his
review.

A

Q

A

I believe, based on conversations that we had had, that is, Dr. Fourney had had with Dr. Ferris, there were still a portion, or there was still, there may have been samples on the dress and perhaps on the underwear and some of the other clothing of the victim, Miss Miller, that might yield something for DNA.

Do you have a recollection -- I think Dr. Ferris' evidence here was to the effect that he identified a stain or semen on the panties, but $I$ believe -I don't believe he found anything on any other garments at the time he reviewed it. Do you recall something different from him?

I know that having, that $I$ saw the copy of the exhibits and certainly whatever stains were on the, at least the crotch portion of the panties, that was all cut away and used in an attempt to obtain DNA. The possibility existed, at least from the photos of the clothing, I believe in conversations with Dr. Fourney, he said it might possibly yield some usable material.

Q Okay. So had you ever examined the exhibits yourself by this time? No, I had not.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: $\mathrm{F}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{Y}$ is it?

A

A
MR. HODSON:
If we can then go to 334371 , and this is a letter of January 8th, 1992 to Mr. Barry Gaudette, and can you tell us who Mr. Gaudette was and his involvement in this matter? Maybe go to the next page.

A

Q

A

Q
oversight of the entire operation, so $I$ went to him in that capacity.

So -- and explain for us Dr. Fourney then, what was your understanding of his role and his expertise in the area of DNA testing?

Well, Dr. Fourney was, at the time, still is, a microbiologist conducting research in various forms of DNA testing and extraction and from the research I've been able to do at the time, he seemed eminently suitable to provide advice to us and he did provide me with a great deal of information.

And then as far as the steps you took with respect to the DNA testing and garments, would it be correct to say that you would have relied upon the RCMP lab people to provide advice at least on the technical matters relating to DNA, and, in particular, what to test, what type of tests, things of that nature?

That's correct.
So here in your letter to Mr. Gaudette you talk about, ask for his:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { "...assistance in the collection, } \\
& \text { preparation, and transportation of the } \\
& \text { samples for testing." }
\end{aligned}
$$

You talk about your discussion with Mr. Emmerson, and it appears at this time you are looking at: "...doing the application of P.C.R. based technologies such as short tandem repeat and mitochondrial testing of the samples..."

And those would have been DNA tests that were fairly recent; is that correct?

Those were experimental at that time and those, short tandem repeats and mitochondrial testing were a bit more discriminating forms of tests than what was then in existence or being used, and I'll use the acronym RFLP because $I$ don't remember the scientific word, that was the prevailing test methodology that was then recognized. These were -- the mitochondrial and short tandem repeats, this was taking $R F L P$ to a new level and my understanding was that it would permit the testing of older samples, of smaller samples, samples that may have been partly contaminated, and that was the type of samples that we had. And as far as the RCMP lab, what was your understanding as to whether or not the RCMP lab could do this type of testing at that time? They could not. They were -- the RCMP lab was
experimenting or was doing research on some $P C R$ based technologies, but the information $I$ received was that the lab in was ahead and there was another lab in, $I$ believe it was Houston that was, that had conducted a great deal of research in terms of short tandem repeats and mitochondrial. The Brits and the Americans were ahead in those areas.

Q
And then you've attached here for Mr. Gaudette to look at a draft of your letter to Dr. Emmerson; is that correct?

A
$Q$
Correct.
And then if we can go to the next page, it appears as well you raised the question at least for getting the court, if the court wants to know why a second request for the release of exhibits, you are asking for a short description of the technology:
"...and the procedure that was used by
Dr. Ferris and an explanation of why the procedures that we propose to use may succeed when the one used by..."

Him,
"...did not."
And do you recall if you were ever made aware of
that, as to -- was it just as you said, the difference in technology?

A
An explanation was provided, the details of which I don't recall right now, yes.

If we can go to the next page here in this draft, this is your draft letter to Dr. Emmerson; correct?

Yes.

If we can go to the next page, I just want to show you a couple of documents and get your recollection. In your draft letter to England you say:
"We understand that advances in DNA
testing technology has expanded the scope of materials that may be tested. We have identified six known samples from four individuals to be compared with five unknown samples."

And:
"The unknown samples are blood and semen stains that were found on the victim's underwear."

And then go on to talk about:
"The known samples include hair from the victim's head and pubic area; head hair
and blood from the convict; blood from a third party whom the convict has accused of the crime; and a blood stain from a friend of the accused..."

And so I think if we look at the four individuals, we're talking David Milgaard, Gail Miller, Ron Wilson and Larry Fisher; is that correct?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
And then you talk about five unknown samples and that you say:
"...found on the victim's underwear." And then $I$ want to go to, call up 334378 , and this is Mr. Gaudette's fax back to you of January 9th, '92 indicating that he's marked up your draft letter. Do you see that?

Yes.
"...is generally good. My comments all
relate to page $2 . .{ }^{\prime \prime}$
And then if we go to the next page, he writes here where you say the unknown samples that were found on the victim's underwear, and he writes at the bottom:
"List these separately by garment.
State where and how samples have been
stored. State when known samples were obtained."

And then if we can go to 334382 , I believe this is the January 6th, 1991 letter that was actually sent. If we can go to the third page, that's your signature, this would be the letter that was actually sent; is that correct?

That's correct.
And just go back a page, here you write:
"There were semen stains on the victim's panties, girdle with attached stockings, dress and slip."

And I'm wondering, Mr. Williams, if you have any recollection as to how the -- it appears that the draft talks about semen stains on the underwear and then this letter lists that there were semen stains on the victim's panties, girdle, dress and slip, and do you recall where you got that information from or how this got put in the letter?

A
My recollection is that that information found its way into the letter from one or two sources. One would be my review of the trial transcripts, particularly the evidence of $I$ think Sergeant Paynter, which -- and secondly, it may have come
from information $I$ received from one of the RCMP scientists who examined photographs of those items from the trial, but $I$ think much of it probably came from my review of the trial transcripts. Okay. And would it be correct to say then that the statement here that there were semen stains on the victim's panties, girdle, dress and slip, would you agree that would not have been based on any scientist testing it to prove semen; is that fair?

That's fair.
As opposed to either your understanding of the evidence or someone's visual review as opposed to a test that identified it?

That's fair, yes.
And if we can just scroll up, I think here you identify that Dr. Ferris:
"...was unsuccessful in his attempt to
test the clothing and other exhibits using RFLD technology."

And is that, I think, what you told us earlier?

A

Q

A
$\qquad$
四

Yes.
It's the same technology?
Yes. I says D. It seems to me it should have been a P, but --

Q P, correct.
A Yeah.
Q If we can then go to 334386 , it appears that this is a fax back from -- now, Vivian Emmerson, I understand that's a male; is that correct?

Yes.

Dr. or Mr. Emmerson?
It is.
And saying attaching information. The next page, and this is some information that talks about the polymerase chain reaction, the $P C R$ that has been introduced in casework?

A
$Q$

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

2 2 Yes. If we can go to 334413, and this is Mr. Emmerson's letter back to your January 6 th fax, January 15 th, and he says:
"Currently we are only using the DQa Amplitype system in casework. We would be unable to offer DNA sequencing or short tandem repeats for casework analysis because we have not completed our validation of these new methods." And again, what was your understanding then of what they were telling you?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: What's the date of that, please?

MR. HODSON: It's January 15th, 1992.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thanks. discriminating methods were still in an experimental stage and they weren't ready to be used in actual cases and he wasn't prepared to use them in an actual case until such time as they had developed the research and they had validated it, because it was really too important for them to have this new research released before its time. And is it my understanding -- or my understanding is that at some point they did validate, or some labs validated the short tandem repeat and PCR methodology, but it was only after various testing; is that correct?

Yes, I believe two or three years elapsed before the validation process. Part of the validation process would involve a comparison of the results for, let's say, short tandem repeats with one of the knowns, let's say DQ Alpha.

Q

A
Q

Now, comment on that. DQ Alpha would have been a DNA typing method after RFLP; is that correct? Yes, it's an advancement, one step better than, or more discriminating than RFLP, and that was the information $I$ had at that time.

And do you recall whether the RCMP was doing DQ Alpha at this time?

The RCMP was not. There were labs in the United States doing DQ Alpha, one was Roche Laboratory. In North Carolina?

In North Carolina.
And then $I$ think as well the English lab basically said that the hair from Gail Miller would not be sufficient to get her DNA typed, that they would need a blood stain; is that correct? Yes.

If we can go to the next page, and then it appears -- sorry, 334423 . And this is your letter back on January 16th. Now, this would be the starting day of the reference case; is that right, January 16th?

Yes.
And you confirm that you can provide a control sample from the victim and you say:
"I noted your comments concerning the
use of Dqa amplitype system for casework. I wondered whether DNA sequencing or short tandem repeats could also be used, as a check on the results obtained in the Dqa amplitype system." Are you trying to get sort of indirectly some of the new technology to check the DQ Alpha?

Yes.

334429 , please, and here Mr. Emmerson writes back saying:
"I regret that we can only use the DQa Amplitype system for casework because we have not yet completed our validations using DNA sequencing or short tandem repeats and therefore are not prepared to use these in casework until we have."

And so I take it at this time your options were RFLP or DQ Alpha; correct?

Mostly DQ Alpha, yes.
And why not RFLP?
Based on the information $I$ had received, it likely would not provide meaningful results and we had -by then we knew that RFLP had been attempted by Dr. Ferris and without successful results.

And did that influence your thinking about whether

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
Q

And so the panties, the stockings, the slip, the brassiere, the dress, and the toque I take it would all be garments that you would look for human tissue from the perpetrator; is that a fair
needed to do the DNA testing; correct?
Well, yes, those items had been identified. Meyer CompuCourt Reporting exhibits to the Supreme Court for the reference; does that accord with your recollection?

It does.
And you were now telling Mr. Frater what you needed to do the DNA testing; correct?

Well, yes, those items had been identified. Centrek Boallis 25

A
A
Q
way to put it?
Yes.

334504 . And this is your memo to file indicating you had talked to Dr. Peter Gill in England and they'd:
"... begin to work on our exhibits when they arrived."

And so can you tell us, at this point, what was your plan as to what you were going to send and what testing was going to be done?

The plan was to send the exhibits we'd received over to England for $D Q$ Alpha testing, but in speaking with Dr. Gill he mentioned that it would take a few weeks to complete, and one of the concerns we had was to get the matters tested effectively, but sooner rather than later, but the lab in Great Britain had a, you know, had an inventory of work --

And --
-- that preceded ours.
Yeah. And so 334449 is the January 21 memo. This would be, this list of exhibits, that's what you planned on sending to England to be tested? Yes sir.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Umm, you said you
needed it sooner?

A

A

A
BY MR. HODSON:

Q

A

Q

A
Q
And that would be the panties, girdle and stockings, slip, brassiere, dress, the envelope containing two vials, the toque --

Well, --
I'm sorry?
-- yeah, I'd like to correct my response. Those were the exhibits we wished to have removed from -- or to have transmitted to Ottawa from Court of Queen's Bench. That list was informed by, I guess, partly what materials Mr. Wolch had obtained from Queen's Bench previously, and also from our review of the transcripts.

One of the things that we had planned to do was to have someone knowledgeable in DNA examine these and make a further selection or refinement from them for testing. So this was let's say the full set but $I$ wasn't certain, when I'm requesting that, whether all or some of those would find their way to the testers. Did you consider just sending them to the lab in England and letting them do the testing?

I -- I did, but we thought that it might be more advantageous or more expeditious to have someone in Canada review it, see, identify the garments that had the best possibility of yielding DNA, and just sending those.

So at this point $I$ think this court order simply releases these to the agents of the Attorney

A
$Q$
A

Q

General and you're telling us that you had contemplated, then, a further step of having the garments tested by someone in Canada? Examined --

Yeah.
-- by someone in Canada, yes.
And would that be someone with the RCMP, then, -Yes.
-- the RCMP lab? If we can go to 009437 . And this is a February 17 th, 1992 report of Patricia Alain, if we can just go to the last page? COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Date again, please, I'm sorry Mr. Hodson? MR. HODSON: It's February 17th, 1992.

BY MR. HODSON:
And so we can go back to the first page. You're familiar with Patricia Alain?

Yes. Ms. Alain, at the time, was, I think, head serologist for the RCMP lab.

And I think at the time she was also doing some work, or someone reporting to her was doing some work on the secretor status of David Milgaard; is that correct?

That's my understanding, yes.
And this is her report of February 17th, 1992, and
it says the items were received personally from the clerk of the Supreme Court on February 3rd. Can you tell us, Mr. Williams, did you -- what instructions if any, then, did you give to Ms. Alain -- or, actually, let me back up. What steps did you take to find somebody to do this review of the exhibits for the purpose of identifying stains that could be tested in England?

I think, following discussions either with Dr. Fourney or Barry Gaudette, Ms. Alain was identified as someone who could perform that function. I had taken possession of the exhibits, because they'd been transported via an RCMP craft to Ottawa, I brought them to the Court where they remained until that day, and Ms. Alain examined them.

Okay. So you would have talked to Dr. Fourney and Mr. Gaudette, or one or both of them, about who you should get in the RCMP to test the clothing? To examine it --

To examine?
-- for the purposes of identifying which, which of the garments could possibly yield samples for subsequent testing. 25

Q

A

2

A

Q

A

Q

A

And what was your understanding of Pat Alain's role at the time, and her experience in these matters?

Umm, that she was an experienced serologist who had the ability to identify the types of stains we were looking for that would, or could, produce DNA.

And what instructions did you provide her and in what format were those instructions provided? I -- my recollection is that they were verbal or oral instructions to examine them and to identify garments that had, or could, yield DNA suitable for testing for $D Q$ Alpha.

And do you have a recollection of any specific instructions as far as what garments to check for semen stains?

I don't. I -- I know that there is documentation which signals that she selected some items specifically for semen and other items for others, but $I$ don't have a specific recall of that.

Are you able to tell us what generally, then, what you believe you communicated to her as far as what you wanted from her?

Umm, just generally to examine the items and identify those that contained stains that might
yield DNA.
Q

A
$Q$
BY MR. HODSON:
And do you recall anything else in your discussions, then, with Ms. Alain about the work that she was going to do for you?

Well, apart from that, and to provide assistance in terms of ensuring that we packaged it properly so that whatever results were obtained would be meaningful ones.

Now in her report she identifies the items and then, if $I$ can just draw to your attention a couple of -- exhibit $P .10$ is the dress, 6 and 7 are the panties and girdle, and 13 I think was the
two small green capped plastic vials, I believe
those were the vials that had the frozen semen
from the trial and $I$ think they had basically dissipated; is that correct?

A
Yes, it was dried matter, powdery matter at that time.

And then 35 was the blue toque, and that was the
toque that Helen Gerce found in her yard next to the Cadrain house, correct, that may or may not have had blood on it?

A

Q
I believe so, yes.
And so if we go to the next page, under Purpose, Ms. Alain indicates that purpose:
"1. To examine exhibits 6, 7, 13, and 35 for stains or residue suitable for DNA typing analysis."

And that would be the panties, the girdle, this -- the two vials and the toque.
"2. To examine 8, 9, 10, and 15 ...", which are the slip, the brassiere and the dress and the Gail Miller scalp hair:
"... for stains or samples suitable for
known standard purposes as sources of
'Gail Miller'"
And:
"3. To examine exhibit 41 ...",
which is Ron Wilson's blood:
"... to determine suitability for DNA
typing analysis."
Now do you have a recollection Mr. Williams, at this time, of having any understanding about whether or not Ms. Alain checked Gail Miller's
dress for semen stains as distinct from blood stains?

A
No, sir, I -- I observed her examine the dress but
I -- I couldn't have ind -- I didn't know enough to know whether it would be for purpose number 1 or number 2.

And you say you observed her; what do you recall of that?

I believe -- no -- I recall that the exhibits were brought by the clerk, and there was a library or a large area in the Court area, and $I$ was present when the seals were broken.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: So Ms. Alain did this in the courthouse?

She did it -- did -- that examination was in the, in the Supreme Court building.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: In Saskatoon?
A In -- in Ottawa, sir.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh, in Ottawa?
Yes. At least the initial, the initial one was there, whether she took them back to her offices or labs I'm not certain, but $I$ do know that the initial examination was in the Supreme Court building in Ottawa.

BY MR. HODSON:

Q

A

A

And what do you remember about -- what did you observe?

She used various instruments to scrutinize the documents -- not documents -- I mean the garments. She looked at them, whether she used a magnifying glass or some other instrument, I remember she had instruments that she used to assist her just ordinary vision.

Okay. And what is your recollection of what she did, if anything, with the dress?

I -- I don't recall, sir. She made certain selections but --

And did she take anything with her, then, or what happened to the exhibits when she was done with them?

I'm not certain whether she merely identified certain other exhibits or she made a -- notations as to which ones would be for purpose 1 as set out in that document, and purpose 2 , and left it there, or whether she took physical possession of them. I just don't recall.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: You just don't recall her looking at the dress or not looking at it?

I recall her looking at the, at the garments
including the dress, but whether she was examining
it for the purpose of finding a stain or for the purpose of determining whether it had material suitable for use as a standard for Gail Miller, I couldn't tell the difference between those two types of examinations.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yeah.
BY MR. HODSON:
Yeah. And $I$ think the distinction there, then, is to test the dress for Gail Miller's blood for the purposes of a known match, or her -- and, secondly, to test the dress for semen to identify the perpetrator?

A
Q
A
She looked at the dress, but I couldn't tell whether it was for one purpose or another, -Okay.
-- because I didn't know.
What about, do you have any recollection, you said she had some tools present; did she have any blotting paper or conduct any of the acid phosphatase test, which $I$ understand is to blot part of the dress and put it on blotting paper, spray it; do you recall any of that happening?

A

Q

A

Q

A

Q

A

Q

A

I really don't. The specifics of what she did just didn't stay with me.

Now would you, I think the exhibits were released by the Court to the Attorney General's office, would you then have maintained possession of the exhibits or do you recall if you would have turned them over to the RCMP?

I believe, from the Court, it went directly to Sergeant Pearson when he made a trip to --

Okay, sorry, I'm sorry. At this time, when Pat Alain is looking at them at the Supreme Court, I think you said in the library at the courthouse? In a, in a library-like area. It was a place with large tables and --

And were you present because you were the custodian of the exhibits?

I -- I was present because $I$ was part of the chain of continuity, $I$ had received the exhibits from the plane and taken them to the court, and just to confirm that they were in the same condition as when $I$ had deposited them there.

But once they were removed from the court on the January $30 t h, 1992$ order they were released to the Attorney General's -- Canada?

Yes.

Q

A

Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

I'm just wondering, were you the person then who was the recipient of them and then the custodian, or were they turned over to the RCMP?

Umm, I believe they were turned over to the RCMP, I don't think $I$ kept custody after that. I may be mistaken but that's my recollection.

And so do you think Ms. Alain may have taken some of the exhibits, then, back to a lab or to another location?

Yes.
Do you recall that or do you think that's likely what happened?

I think that's likely what happened. I have no specific recall of it.

And then, if we can scroll down, she says that:
"A positive presumptive test for semen was made on a stain on exhibit 6 ...", the panties, and then:
"Positive presumptive tests for blood were made on stains on ...", the toque, and then a:
"Visual examination identified residue
of unknown source in each vial ..."
And $I$ think, would you agree with me Mr.
Williams, that her results are that semen was
found on the panties and it doesn't say it was found anywhere else?

A

Q

I didn't direct my attention to the specifics of her tests, I relied on her to examine it knowing what our objectives were, namely to identify stains suitable for providing DNA, and I simply semen?
left it up to her to perform her tasks.
And if we could just scroll up. And the reason $I$ ask, in looking at this lab report under Purpose it seems to suggest that four exhibits were checked for semen and four exhibits were checked: "... for stains or samples suitable for known standard purposes as sources of 'Gail Miller'",
in other words number 1. Now, in fairness, Ms. Alain's evidence is different, but just on the report itself seems to suggest that only four items were checked for semen, namely the panties, the girdle, the toque, and the residue, and that the dress was only checked for blood. And do you have a recollection of having that view at the time, or having a different view at the time, or are you able to shed any light on that?

A
$Q$
I am afraid $I$ can't shed any light on it, I -- I just didn't ask -- I didn't specify that breakdown to her, but left it up to her to make whatever decisions were necessary.

And then if we can go down on Conclusions it talks about:
"A single stain ..."
"... diameter was found on exhibit 6
...",
the panties.
"This stain appears to be an
uncontaminated semen stain. This stain
appears to be of sufficient quantity
that a PCR based DNA typing technology
could be attempted. No opinion
regarding the quality of the stain can
be given due to the age of the stain and
unknown storage conditions."
And was it your understanding, after receiving this report, that the panties were the only piece of Gail Miller's clothing that had a semen --
that had semen on them?
I wouldn't say the only, but they were the ones that provided a stain that was suitable for testing by virtue of PCR.

Okay. So, can you elaborate, did you think there might be semen stains on other garments that -that were what?

I didn't discount that possibility, but we were -we were hoping, by then, to get something from the underwear because we knew that portions of the underwear had, had been tested previously, and the
likelihood is, or the likelihood was that whoever donated the sperm that was found on the crotch portion also donated the sperm that was found on other parts of the panties, and so since Ms. Alain had identified a stain large enough that it could provide samples for meaningful results, that's as much as we had wanted.

Okay. So I'm not clear here; did you think that there may have been other stains that she didn't check because she found the panties, or did you think that she had checked everything to try and identify sufficient semen to do a DNA test?

I really didn't address the question as you posed it. We were just happy to get some samples that could provide DNA testing.

Okay. Now paragraph 2 talks about the blood stain on the dress for the known sample of Gail Miller, and I take it that's something that the English lab had --

Yes.
And then the next page, it indicates here that:
"No potential semen stains were
identified on exhibit 7 ...",
the girdle, so it would appear that the girdle was checked and nothing found?

A

Q
and send it to England for DNA testing?

A
Yes, that was the initial plan.
And that would be the DQ Alpha test?
Yes.
Yeah. And so here Ms. Alain writes that:
"Amplified Fragment Length Polymorphism
... Technology ... can only be done on
an exclusionary basis ...",
and only done through Roche Biomedical:
"b. ... (RFLP) technology."

But:
"Since the size, age and quality of the stain are of borderline suitability, the potential successful application of this technology is low."

That can:
"... be done at the RCMP ...",
lab. The next page.
"... DQ alpha analysis. Probability of discriminating with this system is very low. This ...",
is available in England and America. And then STR:
"Short Tandem Repeats ... Probability of discrimination is very good, however
this technology is in its infancy and
has not been sufficiently explored on
old forensic samples."
It then they go on to say:
"Based on the suspect stains and the
available technologies, AMPFLP
technology as done by Roche Diagnostics
is recommended as the best option."
And:
"4. If DQ alpha technology is preferred,
then it is recommended that the known standards be examined first to ensure that they are of different types, prior to examination of the suspect stain." And then, as well, some photographs. So what is your recollection of how this information came about? Had you asked Ms. Alain to address, or to get her advice, the RCMP lab's advice on what type of testing should be done?

It appears as if that request was made, yes, or if it weren't, she provided her views. And based on, based on what $I$ read in number 5 on that page, it appears as if she did in fact, that is Ms. Alain, did in fact take away the exhibits that were released at the courthouse because it -- she states that she transferred two exhibits for photography, and received on a certain date and returned back.

Okay, yeah, 6 and 35 , that's the panties and the toque. And $I$ can check, Mr. Williams, I believe the continuity or the exhibit tags can confirm that those went, but your belief is the RCMP, Pat Alain, took them with her?

A
$Q$
Yes.

Umm, go to 231497. Here is your letter back to

Ms. Alain, and you say:
"In view of your remarks concerning the suspect stain on Exhibit 6 ...", which is the panties:
"... and ... your letter, the Department of Justice will follow the recommendation that Roche Diagnostics be approached to perform AMPFLP DNA analysis on the sample from Mr. Milgaard and the Court exhibits.",
and that you'll go contact Mr. Barry Gaudette to arrange:
"... the testing of the sample and exhibits."

So I take it, then, that you followed her advice and changed course and decided to go to North Carolina with a different testing procedure? Initially, that was what was considered, but I guess after additional consideration a decision was taken to go to North Carolina, not with the AMPFLPs, but with DQ Alpha.

Okay. At this point, it's AMPFLP, I think later on it gets changed back to DQ Alpha; correct? Yes.

But at this point is it fair to say, February 24th, 1992, that, based on Patricia Alain's report of February 17th, 1992, you decided not to send Gail Miller's clothing to England to do DQ Alpha as had been contemplated earlier?

That's correct.
I see it's 6:00, Mr. Commissioner.
I can, for the benefit of the parties, indicate that $I$ have some DNA, basically just to finish off the DNA and Mr. Williams' involvement. I will be done in sufficient time to allow all parties to complete their examination of Mr. Williams tomorrow, how's that for -- and in the event that -- well $I$, we'll see how we go tomorrow, it may well be that we may need to sit a little bit longer tomorrow if we're able to finish up Mr. Williams. Based on my discussions with counsel, I'm hopeful that that will happen, I have Mr. Fainstein here Wednesday morning so -COMMISSIONER MaCCALLUM: Make sure that the support staff is apprised, especially Irene. (Adjourned at 5:58 p.m.)
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