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## Transcript of Proceedings

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

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Good morning. Good morning. If I may have a moment before counsel begins?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes.
A Okay.

EUGENE WILLIAMS, continued:
BY MS. MCLEAN:
Good morning, sir. For the record, my name is Joanne McLean, I represent Joyce Milgaard, and I'm also here on behalf of the Association in Defence of the Wrongly Convicted. So some of my questions are factual, some of them systemic, and sometimes a mix of both. I just want you to keep that in mind as $I$ ask you questions.

Now you told us the other day,
I can't remember what day it is, but you basically start out with a presumption of regularity, that the trial and the appeal process catches anything that went wrong?

A
Correct.

And you started in 1989, primarily, when the
documents had arrived?

A
$Q$

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
A

Q

A
$Q$
A
Q

A

Q

In relation to the Milgaard application?
I'm sorry, yes?
Yes.
And then you were getting some information and documents and assistance from Mr. Caldwell?

Mr. Caldwell made some introductions for me, answered some of my questions, and provided information from his file.

Okay. If we could go to 016105, please. This is a memo to the file from you dated October the $23 r d$ of 1989, it's just about your request to ask Mr. Caldwell to photocopy testimony for you, -Okay.
-- Nichol John, Ron Wilson, and Shorty Cadrain? Excuse me, madam?

Yes?
Mr. Commissioner, I don't have the image on my screen.

It's probably not turned on.
Thank you.
Okay. The next page of that document, if $I$ could --

Madam, I didn't --
Sorry?

A
$Q$

Like, I didn't see it.
You didn't get a chance to see it?
Yes.
Okay. It's not really that $I$ wanted to ask you questions about, it's just your memo to file that indicates that you had spoken to Mr. Caldwell -Yes.
-- and asked him to photocopy testimony, Nichol, Ron Wilson, Shorty Cadrain, and any other things that he had identified; that's what I am interested in?

Yes.
Okay. And the next page is, attached to it, is a letter to you from Mr. Caldwell dated October the 25th, 1989, and he's provided you with a number of documents that were relative to the preliminary inquiry, see it down here?

Yes.
The next page, please. Witnesses required for the preliminary inquiry, that was a lengthy document outlining the case and what various witnesses would say, and that was prepared by Mr. Ullrich; do you remember that?

Yes.
And then you also received copies of the
preliminary inquiry evidence of the three civilian witnesses you were interested in, Nichol John, Dale Wilson -- Ronald Dale Wilson, and Albert Cadrain; and then moving along, down to the trial itself, you received information about the -- a memo with the new witnesses, Lapchuk, Melnyk and Frank, and that would be related to the Deborah Hall information; yes?

Yes.
And then Mr . Caldwell has pointed out that Ron Wilson is the one that had told the police about these witnesses. Number 9 there, you've got the opening address as given by Mr. Caldwell; photographs -- next page, please -- Nichol John's statement of May the 24 th. I don't see anything there referencing the March lith statement of Nichol John; did you get that?

A
$Q$

A
Q Okay. And the closing address given by Mr. Caldwell?

His notes.

Q Okay, his notes of it?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
2
Moving down to the next section, Miscellaneous Material, an index to the statements taken, there's 95 of them, but not the statements themselves; the correspondence between Mr . Caldwell and Mr. Tallis about providing specific statements to him with respect to the Danchuks; David Milgaard's statements; a synopsis about two potential other suspects, Dennis Elliott and Leslie Spence. Number 17, you received David's statements dated March the 3rd and April 18th, 1969, with the notation that: "(Neither of these statements was led in evidence by the Crown as they were felt
to be untruthful in view of our
knowledge of the case overall)."
Clear to you, from that remark, where Mr.
Caldwell stood on the issue?
A
Q

A
$Q$
A
$Q$
And then over into the next page, various other documents related to the forensics; the statement of Ms. Frank as it relates to Deborah Hall; and then a request passed on from you -- via you from Mr. Wolch to see if there were any news clippings or police reports about assaults on other women or nurses, specifically, or anybody using a knife, and in that regard you'd received a report dated February the 4 th, 1969 from Mr. Mackie, and you also received specific statement numbers 38, 39, 40, 63, and 67, and I believe number 40 is the (V4)--- statement in that list there. The notation:
"These are the only statements which I could find relating to other supposed sexual offences or attempts on the Provincial file. None of these episodes involved a knife or other weapon." Okay. If we could go to 11293 (sic), please. Is it -- sorry?

JODIE KENDRY (Document Assistant): We're missing one number, Joanne. MS. MCLEAN: 112393. JODIE KENDRY (Document Assistant): Thank you.

MS. McLEAN: I had it right, I just can't read.

BY MS. McLEAN:
Okay. This is about a week later, and it's another letter from Mr . Caldwell to you. Had you been speaking about the case with him in that intervening week; do you remember?

A
I suspect, based on the first paragraph of the letter, that $I$ was in telephone contact with him. Whether $I$ was acknowledging receipt of materials he'd sent or some additional requests, I'm not certain at this moment.

Did you have conversations with him to give you
the impression that he was quite heavily invested in the case emotionally?

I didn't draw that from his comments. Certainly, it was one of the cases, $I$ guess certain -- during a career, you recall certain cases which perhaps were particularly challenging, and sometimes you can recall a case that developed the law in a particular area, and to the extent that Milgaard was one of those types of cases in terms of the treatment of a witness and the use of section 9(2) of the Canada Evidence Act, I think he felt a certain attachment to it. I'm -- my sensitivity as to his, quote, "emotional attachment", I didn't make that link.

Did he tell you he'd been writing to the parole board in respect of Mr. Milgaard?

Yes, at some point in time he did.
Okay. And did you know that when you first started speaking to him? Like when you say "at some point in time" are we talking 1989 when you began, or in 1991?

A
Shortly, within weeks of contacting him, I -- and during some discussions, he told me that he had written to the parole board.

This -- this letter of October the 31st, at the
bottom here:
"I have also received, and enclose an excerpt from the book
entitled 'Winnipeg 8 - The Ice-Cold
Hothouse ' which ... has a story by
Peter Carlyle-Gordge ...",
it says:
"... concerning the mother of the
accused and her efforts on his behalf."
Did you have some conversation about that article with him, did you know it was coming?

A

Q

A

Q
I didn't know it was coming, but $I$ was happy to receive it, I just -- it came, so there it was. Next page, please:
"You may wonder if you are reading about the same murder currently under review." How did that comment strike you, sir?

I don't recall my feelings at the time. Reading the letter now, it suggests that the account in the book and the excerpt you referred to me may differ from his recollection of the trial record. Next page, please. This is the copy of Winnipeg 8, The Ice-Cold Hothouse, this is the cover page, and handwritten on it:
"This is crap. They don't even have the
facts that are on public record right." What did you make of that comment, sir?

A
$Q$
A

Q

A

Q
A

Q

Q
A BY MS. McLEAN:

The answer is Mr. Caldwell's files. Okay.

MR. HODSON: If you want to call up -- the version you are looking at is from Mr. Caldwell's files. There's two other versions, one from the Government of Saskatchewan and one from David

Q

Milgaard. We're not listing one from, having been received from the federal government, but we'll continue to check.

BY MS. McLEAN:
Thanks. It's very hard to read this document, it's faded, but down at the bottom, yeah, the very bottom, there appears to be a question mark handwritten in the margin there. I just put the line right on top of that.

Yes.
And that's a reference to:
"The only witness, the caretaker of a nearby church, had seen a car parked in the area at about 7:00 a.m. that day. Through the murk he had seen the outline of a noticeably short man walking back and forth in front of the headlights..."

And that would be a reference to Mr. Diewold, we saw him in the documentary yesterday. Do you remember that?

A Yes.
Do you remember seeing Mr. Diewold in the, or somebody pretending to be Mr. Diewold?

Yes, I take your point.
And the one thing there that is not in his trial
evidence is that it was a noticeably short man, and did you understand that Peter Carlyle-Gordge was a journalist who had been assisting the Milgaards in interviewing witnesses?

I later came to realize that that was the case. The next page, please, there's a handwritten note here in the -- or in between the pages, it says "Wrong" and this is, it says "several weeks passed," so this would be several weeks after the murder, and:
"...in the melting spring snow a close neighbour of Albert's family, a block away, found a blood-stained blue toque. A child found another of the nurse's possessions not far from there."

And beside that it says "Wrong". Do you understand from the facts of the case, that Ms. Helen Gerse, the neighbour of the Cadrains, found a blue toque some days after the murder and turned it over to the police on April the 18th of 1969 ?

A
Assuming, counsel, that your recitation is correct, I'm prepared to acknowledge that. I have not looked at the transcript in any detail in a number of years, so my intimate familiarity with
aspects of the evidence is somewhat low at this point.
$Q$
Okay. Just to add another fact for you then, "a child found another of the nurse's possessions," that's the wallet that belonged to Gail Miller that was found by -- well, two people now according to the inquiry evidence, but the trial evidence was Giles Beauchamp?

A

Q

Q Yeah.
A
I have -- I'm not certain what your question is, you know. Whoever writ the article certainly, I guess $I$ intuit by the placement of the question
mark had questions perhaps about the accuracy of the narrative and that's my take on that.

Okay. Could I have document 120 -- yeah, 125206, please. This is your interview of Nichol John, and I'm simply going to refer to her as Nichol John just for continuity, November 7th of 1989 with you and Sergeant Tidsbury, and you told us the other day, what was your purpose in going to interview Ms. John at that date?

Well, certainly at the original application there was, in the original line there was a reference to Nichol John and my recall now signals that there was some question about the accuracy of her testimony, so it was felt prudent to speak with her.

And you are referring there to the original application from Mr. Wolch where he referenced his willingness to outline the difficulties or the impossibilities, implausibilities of Nichol John's evidence?

I think there was such a reference, yes.
I'm sorry, $I$ should correct that, it's not her evidence, it's her statement of May 24 th.

A

Q Yes.

Could I have 106661 , please. This is a report
dated April the 18th, it's written by Mr. Karst, and it references activities in Regina on April the 14 th of 1969. This paragraph here refers to locating Nichol John in Regina and taking her to the city police station where she was interviewed at length. Now, this would be subsequent to her March the 11th interview.
"Further investigation of this girl when she was interviewed gave one the feeling that she was telling the truth and she emphatically stated she could not recall any time while they were in the City of Saskatoon during the morning of the murder at which time Wilson or Milgaard had left the vehicle in which they were driving long enough to commit this offence. She denied that Milgaard had left their vehicle at any time to go to a bathroom or go for a cup of coffee which she could recall."

Did you ask Ms. John any questions about that interview she had with the police?

A
I don't believe I did.
Or about the statement that she had given March the 11th when she first spoke to the police?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
Q 2 ,

No. As I recall now, my questioning of Ms. John focused primarily on her testimony under oath at trial.

Do you recall asking her any questions that would be, that could be construed as challenging the impossibilities of her May the 24 th statement?

I asked her questions dealing with her recall of the events that were the subject of that May 24 th, 1969 statement. However, the questions that you ask sometimes are premised or informed by the response of the witness, both their verbal responses and their emotional condition. Document 125206 again, please. You had made arrangements with Ms. John to interview her and she knew you were coming, right, you weren't a surprise?

That's correct.
After the initial introductions, the first thing that you tell her is:
"The reason I'm here is because David Milgaard has applied to the Minister of Justice looking for a review on a 1969 conviction for non-capital murder. He alleges that he has been wrongfully convicted and has asked the Minister to
review his case. My job is to determine whether he was wrongfully convicted or whether there's any merit in his application..."

Is that a misstatement of your job there, sir?

It's an over-simplification, yes.
"...and it's for that reason that I came to see you because from my review of the transcript you were a Crown witness and you were an important witness in the case in fact. Judicial history was made as a result of your testimony and some of the activities that ah, occurred during the trial."

What was the purpose in telling her that, sir? My recollection is that if you are referring to the last sentence only or if you are referring to the entire paragraph, it was a form of introduction. On reviewing it now, it might have been more artfully put. As a matter of fact, as I understood it at least, judicial history was made in part because of her, shall we say, because she did not recall at trial nor adopt the statement that she had made on May 24 th, 1969 and that the treatment of that situation in a courtroom setting
led to the Supreme Court decision which more or less set out the rules that were followed for many, many years.
$Q$
A

Q
What was the purpose in telling her that?

It was -- there wasn't any specific purpose, it was just part of the narrative.

Okay. Next page, please, 207, you tell her here that:
"...whatever you say to me today --" Sorry, it's this section here I'm talking about: "...whatever you say to me today will be kept confidential and that as result of your talking to me today $I$ do not anticipate that you will be called upon ... in a Court setting to explain or to revisit something which happened twenty years ago, but there are some important questions that $I$ have to ask and it's my job to do so."

A couple of questions about that, sir. When you are saying to her that whatever she says will be kept confidential, does that indicate that you were not intending to share it with the applicant?

I wasn't intending to publicize it. As and when

A
required, it could well go to the applicant or some of what she said might have been used to question other witnesses, but it wasn't a situation in which it would be publicly broadcast.

Okay. Well, I'm not talking about public broadcast --

Disseminating.
-- I'm just asking about your use of --
It would be kept confidential?
Yeah.
It would be kept for the minister. It was possible, the possibility existed that it might be shared with the applicant, but ordinarily when we speak with witnesses, we indicate to them that it will be kept in confidence.

And then you indicate:
"...I do not anticipate that you will be called upon again ... in a Court setting..."

What does that mean, that you don't anticipate you are going to get anything helpful from her one way or the other?

No, I -- at that point in time $I$ wasn't certain where this was going to go, but that was my feeling at the moment, $I$ don't anticipate you will
be called upon, but, you know, anything is possible.

Okay. Same page, $I$ just have to find it. Could I see the whole page, please? Oh, I'm sorry, page 125207 -- to 209, please, I'm sorry. There we are. Now, Mrs. Milgaard had made some attempts to contact Nichol John, I'm just putting this in context for you a little bit, and she had been, Ms. John had been telling you that Joyce had been calling and wanting her to take sodium pentothal, and then you go on and you say to her at 209: "I understand about the time that the statement was taken..."

And the statement you are referring to is the May 24th, 1969 statement:
"...you were also interviewed and spoke with a Mr. Roberts, a fellow who ran a, a lie detector test. Do you remember that?"

And she indicates:
"I don't remember that.
You don't remember..
I don't remember half this statement."
And your response:

```
"I see."
```

And she says:
"I don't.."
So there's a reference there to Mr. Roberts and the lie detector test. Did you know, when you were questioning her, that Mr. Roberts had in fact not polygraphed Nichol John?

I know that Mr. Roberts had questioned her. Whether or not he had polygraphed her I wasn't certain.

Did it concern you that she had no recall of dealing with Inspector Roberts?

I'm not certain that's what she said or that's what she meant when she said I don't remember that, $I$ don't remember half this statement. So you are suggesting it may not have been responsive to your question which was you were also interviewed and spoke with a Mr. Roberts. Do you remember that?

It would have been preferable I guess if I had broken it up into two separate factual assertions.

The first part was $I$ understand about the time that the statement was taken and then $I$ go on to talk about Roberts and she says "I don't remember," and when $I$ say "You don't remember," she says, "I don't remember half this statement."

A

It was one of those conversations in which there was a bit of a disconnect and she was focusing her answer not on the entirety of --Uh-huh.
-- but just on that statement part, "I don't remember half this statement." She had -- she was looking at it at the time.

So you may have had a disconnect between your question and her answer?

Yes. I guess the point I'm trying to make in answer to your question is when she says "I don't remember that," I understood it, or I understood her to mean not that she didn't remember speaking with Roberts, but she didn't remember half the statement.

Okay. And the statement being the statement she gave to Detective Mackie?

The May 24 th statement.
Yeah. If Nichol John was to actually say and mean that she had no memory of dealing with Inspector Roberts, would you have concerns about that given the circumstances surrounding that statement, that interview?

Had that been the case, I'm not certain how I would have reacted, but there would have certainly
been some cause to question and pursue it.
Okay. Page 125212, and again, this is a continuation of Nichol John complaining about Mrs. Milgaard's attempts to interview her, the lengthy dissertation there about what's been going on with Mrs. Milgaard's attempts to contact her, and then down at the bottom of this paragraph here she says:
"...I've had it with this ... I have nothing to say ... what $I$ had to say was said in the trial and $I$ can't remember any more than that, it seems like she's pressing me for more and $I$ don't have any more, and I'm tired of this."

Your response, sir, is:
"Well she's also, through her lawyer, pressing the Department. The difference between you and the Department is that we have to respond."

Sir, do you think a reasonable person hearing or reading this would possibly have some doubt about your attitude towards this application?

A
In what respect, madam? The fact of the matter is Ms. John as a private citizen, was under no obligation to respond to Mrs. Milgaard. The
minister receiving a Section 690 application has a duty to examine it and $I$, in the capacity of, and counsel to the minister, it was my obligation to respond. Now, you may wish to take a sinister approach to that, but that's simply the fact as I understood it.

And you think that was an appropriate thing to indicate to the witness in that context?

Obviously I did because I did.

You think it was now, sir?
It may have in hindsight, $20 / 20,18$ years after the event, perhaps that thought might have been more artfully communicated.

Q

A
Or not at all?
I say in the context of the conversation $I$ said what I said.

Page 215 of the same document, please, you are asking her questions here about her statement to Mr. Mackie. She has already told you that she doesn't remember half the statement and you say to her:
"At the time, Detective Mackie was investigating a murder and he had spoken with you and he also spoke with Ron Wilson."

She just says:
"Uh uhm."
You continue:
"And at that time I imagine it was
impressed on you that it was a serious
thing?"
Nichol's response:
"Exactly."
Your question:
"...is it fair to say that what you told
him then ... would be your best
recollection?"
Her answer is:
"Yes."
"And that you didn't fib or lie?"
"No. Absolutely not."
"Now, what you're saying to me today is
that you have no present recollection of some of it?"

And her answer is:
"Right."
Now, when you are talking about the police,
Detective Mackie impressing upon her that the investigation of a murder is a serious thing, why were you just focusing on the May 24 th statement?

A
Because that's what we were discussing at the moment. My -- my take on the events was as follows: At the time my experience was that it's not unusual for witnesses not to tell all they know when they first, when they are first contacted by the police and that sometimes there is more or less a relationship that develops and a story emerges, that was how $I$ had interpreted the initial, shall we say, denial, and then it progressed, so that the witness disclosed additional details. At the time of the interview our conversation focused on the May 24 th, 1969 statement. That was the statement that contained the information which was the subject of the Milgaard application in the Supreme Court, that was the statement that contained some fairly incriminating information if it in fact were true against David Milgaard, and that's where $I$ was focusing my efforts at that moment.

Did you focus any efforts on how that statement came to be made in the sense that it was a complete 180 from her original statements?

A There was some discussion about it, but $I$ don't recall now as we speak what the line of questioning were.

A

A

At the time you were questioning Nichol John you knew that the police had spoken to her repeatedly in 1969?

Certainly on more than one occasion, yes.
And that they were always investigating a murder? Yes.

And can we assume that it was impressed upon the 16-year-old that it was a serious thing?

Yes.
And probably her best recollection of the events that happened on January the 31 st would have been when she was first spoken to?

Between January and March or April or May one could assume that, provided of course that when she spoke to the police in January she told them all that she knew.

My question was actually what her best recollection would be, the time of her best recollection would be closer to an event or a non-event wouldn't it?

I think --
Whether or not she communicated her best recollection, her best recollection would be closer to the event?

Q

A

Q

A

Q

Do you think it's somewhat suggestive or leading to tell her that she didn't lie in that statement?

It is a leading question, but $I$ put the question directly to her so that she could answer it one way or the other and she did.

If we assume -- let's not assume, let's just go with the known fact, that David Milgaard did not commit this murder. Is there any reason that you can think of why Nichol John would have lied to the police repeatedly from March until May the 24 th -- May the $23 r d ?$

If your question is to ask me whether I can put myself into Nichol's position and conjure up rationale for my behaviour, I'm sorry, I'm not prepared to do that.

216, please, same document. My question is actually going to be about the very first part, so maybe you should go back one page, please, and see what she starts off with saying. You are having a conversation with her about how she doesn't remember parts of her statement later and she says:
"...what I remember ... I put myself
back there many, many, many times."
"Through the whole thing that $I$ went
through."
And then going over she says:
"What can $I$ say, $I$ don't remember the murder supposedly, I was put there, I was placed at that time, $I$ don't remember those things, $I$ only remember certain things that lead up to and after the fact..."

Did that statement strike you as a bit off?
It did, and that's why $I$ wanted to find out more about it and make some sense of it.

Almost sounds like she's saying that she was told that she was there?

A
I think that might be one interpretation.
However, $I$ was focusing more on what she said towards the end, "...I only remember certain things that lead up to and after the fact..." and I was more focused on what she recalled. It's her memory that $I$ was probing. Her use of certain language are displaced at that time, it's more or less in the passive, and $I$ wanted to find out how it is that she turned from the active to the passive. I only remember certain things, so I wanted to take it through to find out precisely what she knew.

Q I'm sorry, are you finished?

A
Q
headlights and with the church, but she didn't re -- she recalled garbage cans, that's what she remembered.

Q

A
$Q$

A
Q
A

Q

A
Q

A yes.

Yeah, but not at her direction, is what $I$ am getting at?

A
$Q$ ,

都 I'm not certain. I assumed that Mackie took her there.

226, please. You are asking a question here at the top of the page, and this is a conversation that she had told the police about on her May 24 th statement, that she and Ron Wilson had discussed that she -- excuse me -- that she knew David had done it. Her answer is, to your question:
"What about the conversation ... between you and Ron?"

And her answer was:
"I don't remember that either."
Did that strike you as odd or troubling?
Forgetful. Not odd or troubling.
All right. Umm, the same page, down at the bottom. You ask her:
"Do you remember a coat? That Mr. Roberts showed you?"

And her answer is:
"No,"
And that would have been a coat, sir, that belonged to Gail Miller after she had been stabbed and left dead in the snow. Did you find it disturbing that she was shown that coat? No.


21
22

24
25

Q

A

Q

A
$Q$
A

Q

The fact that she had been shown it prior to giving any statement describing it would be not terribly helpful for any description that she might have gave; would it?

It would certainly have coloured the description and would have affected the weight.

Did you find it disturbing, at all, that she didn't recall being shown the murder victim's coat?

You use the word "disturbing", no, she didn't recall.

And that didn't bother you?
Many years had passed. During our interview she was struggling with certain emotions and her response was she didn't recall. It wasn't very helpful to me but there wasn't much $I$ could do about it.
125227. You ask her, here, something that's been bothering you a little bit:

> "... I know that some of the cases I've tried there has been pressure ... brought to bear on the witnesses, or potential witnesses and $I$ wondered if
> ... any pressure had been brought upon
> you during that course of time... to
tailor your recollections..."

And she says:
"No.. "
"... one way or the other?"
"No. To, to, maybe to, what can $I$ say,
really wasn't pressure, not at all. I
had ... take your time, take your time, we don't wanna ... put words in your mouth, we don't wanna do this, we don't wanna do that. I remember that. I
would say no, no pressure."
And then the officer interjects:
"You're referring to the police when you say that?"

Her answer is:
"Right."
Is that answer of a great deal of value if she can't even remember being interviewed?

A
$Q$

A

A

A

At this moment, I don't.
Okay. When she was talking about whether or not she'd been pressured, did you attempt to help her recollection at all, by making any reference to the extensive interviews that had been done with her?

What -- what you have on the record is the series of questions and answers that $I$ had at that date.

The answer is "no"?
I guess not.
And no reference to the lack of records that had been kept, or her repeated denials, or the fact that her story had suddenly changed after a night in jail?

Those, those are some of the things that $I$ was aware of, but $I$ didn't put to that witness.

And it was of no interest to you with that witness?

I wouldn't say it was of no interest to me, but $I$ had asked the question, and I guess I had asked it more or less open-ended, and it's the thing that was bothering me as to whether or not any pressure had been brought to bear, and $I$ wanted her perception of that, and she gave it. 36, please, 236. This is a question asked by the
officer that's with you, and it sounds to me, he asks her some questions about a conversation that he had with Nichol in the coffee room, and that's during a break in the interview or maybe earlier, before the interview started. He says:
"... one thing we were mentioning between us and $I$ was asking Nichol in the coffee room ..."
and that's during a break in the interview or maybe earlier, before the interview started, and he says:
"... one thing we were mentioning
between us and $I$ was asking Nichol ... I
was asking her if she experienced any
flashbacks of this incident .. . either
in her sleep or in the daytime and ...
Nichol did tell me that you do
experience flashbacks of the incident."
And then she responds:
"... I have these things that pop into
my head ... I don't know if they're real."

Now, first off, it sounds like you weren't present in the coffee room for that discussion; were you?

A

Q

A

I was not. There was a break, she'd requested a few minutes, and she went with her boyfriend, and they were escorted to another part of the building. I wasn't there.

It's sounds like the officer was the one that was introducing the concept of flashbacks there; is that a matter of concern?

No. What I -- what I learned was that -- excuse me -- what precipitated the break was a, an emotional response by the witness, Ms. John, which didn't -- it was disjointed from the questioning, and she requested a few minutes. She went to the coffee room with her boyfriend and with Sergeant Tidsbury and, while she was there she discussed, I learned later, that she was having a flashback, and it was that became the subject of the conversation while they were in the coffee room. Okay. So that's what you learned later, but my question is when you heard this:
"... I was asking her if she ever
experienced any flashbacks of this
incident ...";
did that concern you when he says "I was asking her that"? Doesn't it sound like he was suggesting to her that maybe she was?

A
Q
I'd sounded as if she'd told him about it. Page number, starting on 125236 , please, talking to her about the flashbacks. Sorry. You say to her -- hmm, hmm, hmm, yup, over to the next page, please -- you say to her:
"... let's play with this one for a
bit."
And you ask her, and she's -- she's already recounted to you this flashback she has of seeing somebody stabbing a woman, seeing somebody take the purse, putting it in the garbage can, and then you ask her:
"Have you seen any movies with that type of scene?"
and she says:
"... for sure."
you say:
"You have?"
"Well, for sure. Have you never ..."
"No, but exactly the scene that flashes
back."
"Never seen a movie like that?"
"Have you ever seen a play like that?"
"Have you ever read a book which had precisely that scene?"
"Has anybody ever told you about that?", And her answer is:
"No."
"No."
"No."
"No."
"No."
Were you trying to create a situation there where she must have been having a real flashback because it wasn't a movie plot?

A

Q
A

Q She's asked to describe the flashback she just had this very minute, she says:
"Could see a woman laying on the ground and a guy straddled over her and he
. . .",
and she's apparently saying there stabbing with a
knife because she's upset and she's crying, and Mr. Tidsbury says:
"Stabbing her with a knife? Okay, can you describe that scene for us?", she's still crying and she says:
"... he's on his knees and he's
straddling over her".
Now, from your answers to Mr. Wolch yesterday, I presume you still think this was a real flashback that she had?

A

Q

A
$Q$
She saw somebody straddling a woman on the ground, and straddling her, and stabbing her?

A
$Q$
Okay. And, if she saw that event, there is no accounting there for how the coat belonging to Gail Miller would be damaged by the knife blade and the dress would not?

A
The -- no, just --
It doesn't account for it?
It doesn't account for it.

Q

239, please. She has this flashback of the man stabbing a woman:
"It's always ...", and then she says:
"It's always the same."
So it's a flashback of a man stabbing a woman, this is the one of the straddling and the stabbing, and she says:
"And I have, and the one with the church all the time, it's just, it's always there, that that one is so predominant in my mind."

And she's talking about the church at the end of the alley. Going over to 43, please, the officer tries to go back to the flashback again, and says:
"Now this flashback you get of the scene, does this coincide with the flashback you've described of this man stabbing, a faceless, a faceless man stabbing a faceless woman?"

She says:
"I don't know, because they never co,
they're never together."
"They're never together, they're never,
you know, it's not like one happens and then the other one happens, it doesn't." She's having difficulty seeing the two scenes together, she sees a separate scene of the garbage cans in the alley, and she sees another one that's a man stabbing a woman. Now you know that the alley and the church are both on the route that the police took her to, as are the garbage cans?

Yes.
And did you make anything of her statements that she can't put the two things together, the stabbing and the location?

No. What $I$ understood her to say was that she -the two flashbacks, the one of, quote, "the stabbing" and the one of the garbage cans, weren't one of a continuous scene, but there was some relationship between them, but they just weren't -- something else may have interrupted in terms of a -- it wasn't, quote, "a narrative", that is one followed the other, it was just two flashbacks she had.

Q Uh-huh. Did you have any concerns there about what her dealings with the police might have been during that two-day period, the 22 nd through to
the 24 th?
A
I did, and in relation of that $I$ had asked her about the pressure, and she had given me an answer.

Page 245, still on flashbacks.
"... not saying ...",
"But you know, like, not saying that ... what was said at that time wasn't true
... I believe what $I$ said at that time
was true, but, $I$ don't remember saying
that stuff."

And then what comes back to her -- sorry, I'm just looking for where it is, yeah -- you say:
"... but what comes back to you is that scene,"
"It comes back repeatedly,"
She says:
"Right. Repeatedly. Through the last
twenty years it's, huh, you know, and
..",
"..and I just, I can remember telling
those police, I remember that church, I
remember being stuck in that alley,"
And it's not surprising that Nichol John would remember the church, that was the landmark that
they were looking for when they were looking for the Cadrain house; right?

I know that they were looking for a landmark church in their efforts to find Mr. Cadrain's house.

And when she says "being stuck in that alley", that could well be a reference to the Danchuk alley, wouldn't it?

I didn't interpret it to be that at all.
I said "could be". It's the only one she'd mentioned in March, an extensive description of being stuck in the alley behind the Danchuks and helping them with the car?

What $I$ observed in relation to this conversation is she doesn't even mention the Danchuk as part of this scene so I didn't associate it, that scene, with being stuck in the Danchuks' alley.

And the Danchuk alley is the only alley that was independently confirmed by independent witnesses, i.e. the Danchuks?

Well, assuming of course Ron Wilson isn't an independent witness, $I$ guess not.
$Q$ You consider Ron Wilson to be an independent witness --

A

Q -- to anything?

A

Q

A

Q

A

Q Q
 (1). The very end of the interview with Nichol John, 249, please. You have a polite goodbye, which is hardly surprising, but -- you appreciate her efforts in coming down -- but what you say to her is:

```
"... it moved me and I'm grateful for
that and if \(I\) can do something in return it, it is just a suggestion that you consider ... counselling ..."
```

and then you go on with a suggestion that she get some professional counselling to deal with her issues. My question is really, when you say "it moved me", had you reached some personal decision and belief that Nichol John had seen the murder
at that point?

A

I think I was moving towards that. I didn't have the, or her recollection didn't provide the details, sufficient details, but it certainly sounded as if she had.

And you still haven't been able to shake that;
have you?
A
I can't say $I$ have. She saw something, whether it was the murder $I ' m$ not sure, but she certainly saw something there.

338056 , please. This is the memo that you wrote on July the 13 th of 1990 regarding your interview with Larry Fisher. Mr. Wolch asked you questions yesterday about the interview itself, your -- your memo about it seems to be very impressed, if $I$ can indicate that on the second page there, the fact that Mr. Fisher had denied the offence, the murder. You've got it underlined and standing in a paragraph all by itself:
"Mr. Fisher denied attacking anyone on the morning of January 31, 1969. He did not kill anyone, nor did he play any role in the attack on the woman who was found in the alley that morning. He stated that he had never been in the alley."

That, sorry, going further down here, I suppose to this paragraph, you indicate there that he couldn't:
"... recall whether there were pairing
knives of the type found in the vicinity
of Gail Miller's body."
at his residence, however you say here:
"Nor did he recognize the type of knife which was circulated by the police. The photo depicted a weapon similar to the weapon alleged to be the murder weapon." I'd like you to take a look, sir, at the document 010358. This is your interview with Mr. Fisher. 010418, please, of that document 010418 .
"At that point in time ...", this is your question:
"At that point in time did you see a poster that looked like this? I'm showing you a photograph of a knife and above the photograph is a writing that's a request by the police for information relating to that fact."

His answer is:
"I've never seen that."
And that would be the poster.
"Okay. Looking at that photo of the
knife have you seen a knife similar to that before?"

Answer:
"Well, yes I have."
"Where?"
"In 1970 when $I$ got picked up on the
. . .",
and presumably that's when he said 'the Winnipeg murder'. So how do we get from that to your memo, sir, that says:
"Nor did he recognize the type of knife which was circulated by the police."?

We don't. Could you go back to the other statement please?

Yup. Page 338057 please.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I thought the one he got picked up with in Winnipeg was -corresponded to the paring knife that she'd lost with the wooden handle?

MS. McLEAN: It is a paring knife, and I believe the evidence is that it came from his residence in Winnipeg, which was a room he was renting with somebody else.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes, but I mean wasn't that a knife with a wooden handle and rivets?

MS. MCLEAN: I'm not entirely sure about that.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I thought some --

I thought that was the evidence, whereas the police were showing him a knife similar to the murder weapon?

MS. McLEAN: And he says in the interview that that looks like the knife he was picked up with in Winnipeg. I'm not responsible for Mr. Fisher's veracity, but that's what he said.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay. Just show me that again, please, so $I$ don't get mixed up here?

A
Could you highlight the passage?
BY MS. McLEAN:
Can we get them both up? Maybe that would help.
No, I just need to see the one on the memo.
The Fisher interview or the memo?
The memo.
The memo is this section here, and the part that starts with:
"Nor did he recognize ..."
That is incorrect.
Okay. And the next part of the memo, Mr. Commissioner, deals with, I think, your question:
"Mr. Fisher said that he had obtained the knife used in the Winnipeg rape from the kitchen of his Winnipeg residence."

Memo, please, 338057 , this same page here.
COMMISSIONER MaCCALLUM: So you are telling me, sir, that he didn't, when you spoke to Fisher he didn't recognize the type of knife which was circulated by the police, that is the one which supposedly matched the murder weapon?

He said he did in relation to the Winnipeg rapes, that's what -- that's what his answer is to my question, at least at that point. I'm not certain if he may have corrected it later, but certainly the two points that counsel put to me, or that portion certainly signals an answer that showed that he recognized the murder weapon and he had associated it with something that happened in Winnipeg. Umm, he may have corrected it later, but if that's the only reference to it on the transcript then the statement in that memo is incorrect.

BY MS. McLEAN:
$Q$
The next part of this memo that you seem to have been impressed with here is down towards the bottom where you've got:

"A check of the Saskatoon police files revealed that the only records of Mr. Fisher's Saskatoon rapes

in existence related to the assault on
(V5)-- (V5)--- which occurred on
February 21, 1970 at 9:00 p.m. behind a dwelling at ...",
a location, and in capitals:

ASSAULT."

Q

# "NO WEAPON WAS USED DURING THAT 

That was the information $I$ had at the time.
Now as of July 1990 -- sorry, could I have 010718, please. This is a document that was shown to you during your examination-in-chief, $I$ believe, and it's a letter from detective -- or Deputy Cory of the Saskatoon police to the Crown prosecutors in Regina concerning Larry Fisher and the Saskatoon offences. You've indicated, sir, that you had that letter; did you have it as of July 1990?

Yeah. First -- this is just a recounting of the information.

Yes.
The informations.
Yeah, there's a second page.
Go to the next page, that's the one that itemizes the offences, this paragraph here, the offences in
relation to --
That's (V1)-.
(V1)-, grabbed from behind and at knife point forced down a lane, forced to remove most of her clothes and raped, knife appeared similar to a paring knife. Down to Ms. (V2)-----.
(V2)-----, yeah.
Sorry. November 13th, 1968, walking along the street, grabbed by a man carrying a knife, forced down a lane where coat and dress were removed at knife point, he raped her. The knife is described as carrying a small jackknife.

And then charge number 3, (V3)------, November 29th, '68, followed by a man, grabbed from behind, forced into a lane, armed with what appeared to be a paring knife, threatened to use it if she failed to co-operate. And then (V5)-- (V5)---,

February 21st, 1970, got off the same bus with her, followed her off the bus, crossed the street, grabbed her from behind, put his hand over her mouth, dragged into a yard, overpowered and raped and there was no mention there at all of a -Of a knife.
-- of a knife one way or the other; right?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

Yeah. I'm not certain when we got that. My sense is had $I$ had that document when $I$ was questioning him, $I$ probably would have put some of the items to him. I do recall requesting a second interview, but that never took place, and it didn't take place because it was refused. 8058 -- despite -- sorry, next page:
"Despite his denials, there are some who disbelieve him."

And that's a reference to people disbelieving Larry Fisher when he denies he did the murder?

That's what he said.

And then under conclusion, you reach the conclusions we've already, you've already discussed, but down at the bottom:
"Further, there may be significance in the fact that Larry Fisher volunteered information following his capture in Winnipeg which resulted in the laying of five additional sexual assault charges against him."

I think it's actually four, but:
"At the time of his arrest he was not... And you've underlined not,
"...a suspect in any of the offences to
which he later entered a plea of
guilty."
And then you conclude that you:
"...have no evidence or reason to
conclude that..."
He,
"...participated in the death of Gail
Miller."
Could I see 093342, please, September 25 th letter, it's a letter dated September the 25 th of 1970 from the police in Winnipeg to the chief constable in the Saskatoon police and it's indicating that $M r$. Fisher has been arrested and charged in Winnipeg with two charges of rape, one of theft by violence and one of an offence of possession of an offensive weapon, that weapon being a paring knife. They were unable to find any records of previous convictions on him and since he used to live in Saskatoon they want any information that they are able to provide about his background, and then it says:
"I will also briefly outline the
offences allegedly committed by the
accused, in the hope that it may help to
clear up any similar offences that have
occurred in your jurisdiction."
And then it goes on to outline the offences in Winnipeg where he had followed the girl home, attacked her, raped her, robbed her of $\$ 15$, and then again the one where he had been caught in the act, he was armed with a paring knife and had raped another girl that he had followed.

The next document -- I'm
sorry, did you have a copy of that letter, sir, when you were working on the case?

A

Q
A
$Q$

A
At some point in time $I$ had got a copy of it. I'm not certain $I$ had it at that time, at the time of the interview.

Okay.
I had some information about the Winnipeg attacks, yes.

Okay. 002019 , another letter from Winnipeg -COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Excuse me, you had some information about the Winnipeg attacks, but did you have information that Winnipeg was making a request of Saskatoon relative to those attacks? I think $I$ knew that, yes. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay, thank you.

BY MS. MCLEAN:
Okay, this is a letter of October 20 th again from

Winnipeg to Saskatoon and this is one where there's an intervening letter which doesn't seem to have survived the last 36 years, from saskatoon to Winnipeg, and that letter would have been dated October the $15 t h, 1970$, so you see that this letter here starts off with:
"As requested in your letter dated October the 15th..."

A
$Q$ letter of October the 15 th.
"...members of our Department..."

And this is Winnipeg,
"...attended at the jail and interviewed
the above named accused. He denied any
knowledge of the offences committed in
your area."
So that would be a denial by Mr. Fisher of any Saskatoon sexual assaults. Yes?

A Yes.

Q
"I am sorry that $I$ could not have had better news for you..."

But that's our report.

002032 , please. The next day
Mr. Fisher is charged with two, what are now
called sexual assaults, including one in which he was caught in the act and he's cautioned and gives a statement and in response to the caution he says:
"I want to clear up three more things, the first one was in Saskatoon sometime around this spring."

And I believe that is Larry Fisher's account of the (V5)-- (V5)--- rape, and the other one he refers to here:
"The second one was also in Saskatoon, near the University."

Dragged her into a back alley, tried to rape her, and I think that may be the (V3)------ assault, and then he admits to another charge in Winnipeg that is subsequently laid against him. It doesn't really seem like Mr. Fisher volunteered his guilt on offences without being a suspect, does it, given the circumstances, he had been questioned at the request of Saskatoon police, denied it?

A
He denied it and then for some odd reason he had a change of heart.

Uh-huh. I don't think we need to bring them up, but for references and for your information, sir,
the next day, 010721, Mr. Karst from Saskatoon took a statement from --

A Mr. Fisher.
-- Mr. Fisher in relation to the (V3)------offence, and at 012111 he took a statement from Mr. Fisher recounting Fisher's version of the (V5)-- (V5)--- assault. And if we could have the Corey letter again, please, 010718, the second page of it, and this letter is being prepared -sorry, third page of it -- this letter is being prepared from Larry Fisher's guilty pleas which have taken place in Regina and the Deputy Chief Corey sets out:
"During October $22 \ldots$ Members of our
Force interviewed Fisher while he was
confined to cells... Fisher admitted
being responsible for the rape of (V5)--
(V5)----- (V5)--- ... and also the
attempted rape of (V3)-- (V3)------...

Fisher was questioned about the offences committed on October 21 and November 13, 1968, and denied any knowledge of same." And he subsequently pled guilty to those two offences, it was part of the package deal he got where he got no time. So these offences, the
additional two he plead guilty to, although when questioned about them initially, he denied any Saskatoon offences?

Correct.
When questioned later he admitted to two, but denied two apparently, and then ultimately pled guilty to four; yes?

Yes.
Mr. Fisher is somebody that initially denies an offence and then eventually, for whatever his reasons are, comes around to entering guilty pleas?

It appears so. Despite my request for a second interview, $I$ didn't get a chance to get him to fess up to anything else.

MS. McLEAN: I'm going to be about -- the next part is about 10 minutes. Should we break now or in 10 minutes?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: You are only going to be another 10 minutes?

MS. McLEAN: No, no, the next part is 10 minutes.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh, no, we'll
break now.
(Adjourned at 10:27 a.m.)
$Q$

BY MS. MCLEAN:

Just to finish up some Fisher documents, I should have also put to you document 004374 at 378 , this is your memo, your report, August $28 t h$ of 1990, and $I$ should just point out that you have put in here about Mr. Fisher:
"Additionally I examined his prison records and the available occurrence reports relating to his convictions to determine whether the circumstances of the crimes for which he entered pleas of guilty, bore any similarities to the circumstances surrounding Ms. Miller's
death. They were not similar."
And that's all you have to say in your report about that; correct?

On the August, '91, yes.
I'm sorry?
Yes.
Could I have 333474, please. This is your memo to file dated July the $9 t h$ of 1990 and it references your interview the proceeding month on June 14 th of Mr. Karst. Was the interview with Mr. Karst taped?

It was not.
Okay. So the record of it is as outlined in your memo here of July the 9th?

Yes.

Now, speaking of tapes, you've got here that:
"Detective Karst indicated that the May 21, 1969 conversation with Ron Wilson was taped. However, the tapes have been lost. He also said that during his interviews with Mr. Wilson the conversations were conducted in a normal tone. He advised Wilson initially, that he was also under investigation."

Do you see a problem there, that the very time period when the witnesses were changing their story we don't have -- we don't have any notes, we don't have any tapes and we don't have contemporaneous records even?

We don't some many years after the event. If we were in a trial context and disclosure had been requested of that and they were lost, I would have taken a different view, but having regard to, among other things, the file destruction policies and archiving and the problems associated with archiving, it's regrettable that they weren't

A
Q A
A
available, but that was the situation.
And there's not even anything in the reports that really covers the type of questioning or the questions that were asked or suggestions that were made to the witnesses? Like, you know the report that Detective Karst prepared.

Assuming that there were suggestions, there's nothing about that that remains, so if you wish to speculate as to what may have occurred or what may have been there, that's for others to do.

Okay. And then you've got:
"Specifically he noted as follows:

1. There was no truth to the charge that the police manipulated Wilson." Mr. Karst of course could only speak to occasions when he was present?

And did any of the police that you spoke to tell you that there had been a setup of equipment in the room next door to Inspector Roberts at the hotel and that people were monitoring the conversations, and by people $I$ mean police officers, sorry.

Okay. Those facts seem familiar. I'm not certain when $I$ learned of them and who provided that
information. It's possible that they may have, but $I$ just don't recall.

And would it have been -- okay, without -- without trying to put it in the time period of necessarily '88, was it '88, '89, '90, '91, was it in the time period prior to the Supreme Court reference? I believe so, yes.

Yes?
I think so. I'm not certain.
Okay.
I just don't know.
Can you be certain that it was before this public inquiry which started in 2005 that you learned of that?

A
Q
And did anybody ever, or did you learn that the proceedings with Mr. Roberts had been taped by virtue of equipment used in the room next door?

A

Q My recollection was that they had been taped and $I$ believe that the tapes went with Mr. Roberts and I thought $I$ was trying to pursue that with him when I spoke with him, but --

I'm not talking about any recordings that Mr. Roberts might have done in his own interview, I'm just speaking of any recordings that were made
from the next room. Do you know anything about those?

A
No, I don't.
333476 , please, this again is your memo, you say here that:
"...Mr. Wilson re-visited Mr. Roberts."
This after he had made the statement number 1.
"Arrangements were made with Detective Karst to obtain a supplementary statement the next morning. May 24, 1969, Mr. Wilson gave the supplementary statement... He added the conversation with Milgaard about the car getting stuck and the conversation with Nichol John when they were alone together in Calgary."

Do you think a really significant point of the May 24 th statement was that Mr. Wilson had added that $I$ forgot to mention that $I$ left the car too? Do you think that was a significant thing that he had left out of the May $23 r d$ statement?

A
Q
And that doesn't seem to have made its way into your memo does it?

I'm not certain that $I$ understand. "He added the
conversation with Mr. Milgaard about the car getting stuck and the conversation with Nichol..." The details of it aren't there, but $I$ understood what that meant.

And that you've -- I think this may have been covered with Mr. Wolch, but Mr. Wilson, in May 23 rd and 24 th, has told about a supposed confession from David Milgaard in the bus depot in Calgary and a claim that David Milgaard had told him that he put the purse of the woman in the garbage can and that he fixed her, and those are certainly confessions if true?

Well, they are certainly incriminating.
Uh-huh. Is it your position today, sir, that those statements were made to Mr. Wilson by Mr. Milgaard?

A

Q

A
$Q$
I don't know, in light of Mr. Wilson's various testimonies, whether it is a fact or not.

It seems pretty preposterous, doesn't it, given that Mr. Milgaard did not attack Gail Miller? Whether the statements related to Ms. Miller or to someone else, $I$ don't know.

Are you aware of any other assaults on the morning of January the 31 st apart from Ms. (V4)---, any other offences of assault on women in the general
vicinity?

A

Q

A
Q

A

Q
A
Q

A

Q Yes, okay, but you are not suggesting that in that period, that he was attacking a woman and later confessed to Ron Wilson about it?

A
Q

A

Q
A
$Q$
A
Q

A

Q

A
$Q$
I'm not.
It's just a lie that Ron Wilson told at trial
isn't it?
That's your view. That's something that the jury
had to contend with.
Is it your view, sir?
That he lied at trial?
Yeah.
I don't know.
475, the paragraph says:
"The next morning..."
We're speaking of May the 23rd,
"...Art Roberts interviewed Wilson and
performed a polygraph test. Mr. Wilson
was truthful except for two answers
which he admitted were lies."
Was it your understanding when you wrote that,
sir, that Mr. Roberts had polygraphed Mr. Wilson
on any of his statements?
I was under the impression that he had polygraphed
him with respect to the statement that was taken
the day previous.
With respect to the May 23 rd statement?
Yes.
Okay. So he had been asked questions specifically
dealing with the May $23 r d$ statement and he had answered yes or no on a lie detector test, that was your understanding?

Well, he had undergone a lie detector test to determine whether or not the statements contained, or whether or not the facts recited in it were true.

That was your understanding?
Yes.
Just running through the dealings with Mr. Wilson and Ms. John -- or sorry, Mr. Wilson and Mr. Roberts, $I$ don't see, and you can take my word for it on this, there's no reference in here, in this document to Nichol John and Ron Wilson being put together at any time and discussing their evidence. Is that something that was unknown to you, is that why it's not in the memo?

I recall that they were together at some point in time during that weekend. Whether or not -- and there may have been discussions about it, but it's not in the memo.

Q I know it's not in the memo, but is it something that you were unaware of at the time you wrote the memo, is that why it didn't make it in?

No, I was aware that they had been together. I,
however, was under the impression that the statements were taken separately.

Okay. But it would be important, would it not, to know whether or not two witnesses had been put together and were given opportunities to discuss their proposed statements before making them? Well, if that were the case, that's a factor, yes. It's an important fact?

It's a fact that could weigh on the weight to be given.

Must weigh on it wouldn't it?
Well, yes.
Well, if you are going to argue that -- or if anybody is going to argue that one statement corroborates another.

Yes, and $I$ think that was a live issue at trial. Could I have 001477 , please. This is a statement of Kenneth Cadrain that was given to sergeant Pearson on July the 18 th of 1990 , the first record of Ken Cadrain speaking about the events that happened when he was six. Ken Cadrain has testified at the inquiry, and $I$ believe he was also called as a defence witness at the Fisher trial, his statement here says, at the bottom of the first page:
"I cannot recall if $I$ saw blood on Milgaard's clothes or if his clothes were ripped."

Mr. Pearson referred to this document, or this statement in his report, and that is 002369, please, and $I$ don't have a number, it's the fourth page, this report dated I believe August 28th of 1990, and he's reporting on the statement, it starts off:
"The most significant development in this investigation since last reporting regards our locating and interviewing one Kenneth Cadrain..."

And then he goes here, recounts a conversation that he believes or says he remembers between David and Albert Cadrain, and it says:
"Ken Cadrain cannot recall if Milgaard had blood on his clothes or if

Milgaard's clothes had been ripped." And that's the same as what's in Ken Cadrain's statement; yes?

A
Yes.
Q
004374 , please, and at 390 . This again is your report dated August the $28 t h$ of 1990 , paragraph 2:
"Kenneth Cadrain was interviewed.

Although he was 6 years old at the time, he recalled seeing blood on Milgaard's pants." Where does that come from, sir?

A

Q

A

Q

A please.
"When Milgaard first came into the house and he was talking to Albert, Albert said something like "what happened to your pants" and Milgaard replied something like "I screwed a virgin" or
"I was with a virgin."
Didn't know what that meant. Does that have any bearing on your interpretation of what he said?

A

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thanks.
A
It may have been my inference which found its way into the August memo.

BY MS. McLEAN:
Thank you. 988000, this is your memo dated June the 16 th and it refers to your interview on June the 15th of 1990 with Albert Cadrain.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Are you sure the number is right?

MS. KENDRY: That number doesn't exist.
MS. McLEAN: Actually, I think I'm looking at -- yeah, the number is stamped upside down, so try 000836. Yeah, there it is.

BY MS. McLEAN:
Okay, this is your memo June the 16 th referencing your interview on June the 15 th with Albert Cadrain. The same question about this, was the interview with Albert Cadrain taped?

It was not.
So the record of that interview is as contained in this document?

Correct.
You invited Mr. Cadrain to review the statements that he gave to the police and you had them read them aloud to him asking if he had recollected
anything, you hadn't asked him anything about the evidence he gave. How come?

A
Well, I did.
Did you?
I asked him about his trial transcripts. I didn't question him -- I didn't question him intensively about his trial transcripts because at that time Mr. Cadrain was, shall we say, a very difficult witness. He was clearly agitated and I wanted to find out in a general way whether or not he had told the truth at trial and that was specifically addressed.

Yeah. If we look at the bottom here, you've got:
"Mr. Cadrain responded emphatically and affirmatively..."

Both underlined,
"...when $I$ asked him whether he had told the truth when he was a witness at the trial."

And then you go back to:
"While reading the statement..."
I don't see any reference in here, sir, that you actually discussed the specifics of his evidence with him as distinct from the two statements he had given.

A
Q

A

Q
$Q$
A
$Q$

A

BY MS. MCLEAN:
I wasn't sure if it was "proud" or "cry".
No, he --
Yeah, we have had the benefit of Mr. Cadrain's utterances on occasion. But my question --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: But I thought counsel was asking you, sir, whether it was the trial evidence you put to him in regard to his truthfulness, --

Yes.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: -- or whether it was his statements? That says there, your memo refers to the statement?

A
Well --
Is it your recall that you did discuss his evidence as opposed to the two statement?

Oh, yes. I underlined emphatically and affirmatively because when $I$ broached the subject he affirmed it with a stream of words that would make a sailor proud and he continued for some period of time.

I'm sorry, I missed it, I've got --
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: That would make a sailor proud. My memo refers to the statement, but I also put to
him whether or not, what he testified at trial, whether he wanted to resile from any part of that, --

BY MS. MCLEAN:
$Q$
A

Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

Okay.
-- whether or not he told the truth, and $I$ was met with a stream of words, some of which were colourful.

Okay. We're kind of at crossed purposes here. I can understand that you specifically asked him words to the effect "did you tell the truth when you testified at trial". My question is did you discuss the actual evidence that he'd given? Mr. Cadrain gave me a summary, a very highly-agitated summary, of certain points and he said "I told the truth then". He also indicated that he had been approached on several occasions questioning the veracity of his trial testimony, and that's my synopsis of his response, yes. Did he talk about evidence that he'd given in respect of a grilling that he'd had in Regina about being a murder suspect?

No. He talked about a grilling he had gotten in Saskatoon.

Uh-huh?

A
But, in Regina, I think there were different issues.
$Q$

And you recall that his evidence had been that the bloody clothing, which, incidentally, he'd never described, went into a suitcase that went in the car with him, and then there's some sort of

A
$Q$

A

Q

A
$Q$
exchange with a truck driver and --
I don't remember those details.
You don't remember his testimony like that?
I don't remember the details, no.
And do you know that Albert Cadrain's real, apart from the claims of the Virgin Mary and the Mafia and various stories that he has told, and threatening to kill Nichol John, David threatening to kill Ron Wilson, the only thing that Albert Cadrain really had of importance to say at this trial was that he saw blood on David Milgaard the morning of Gail Miller's murder; is it not? That's your take on it. I also believe that his testimony about the events that happened in the car on the way to either Calgary or Edmonton certainly confirmed some of the events later on. Umm - -

As regards to whether or not David Milgaard killed Gail Miller, would you not agree that the most significant thing he had to say was that there was blood on David Milgaard's pants right after that murder?

It was quite significant, yes.
Okay. And that when he's telling, some 20 years later, a different story about what happened to
those clothes?
It occurred to me that that may be enhanced recall or confabulation, but it was what it was.

Are you aware now, sir, that in 19 -- I believe it was 1993, Kenny Cadrain started telling the story about David Milgaard running out to the garbage truck with bloody clothing?

In 1993? I wasn't aware of that.
Uh-huh. Were you aware that Kenny Cadrain and Albert Cadrain had spent some 20 years as brothers and Albert Cadrain had frequently discussed the case?

It wouldn't surprise me.
You certainly learned that, in discussions with Dennis Cadrain, if nothing else Albert was constantly what we could call 'obsessed' with it? Albert had a number of issues and Albert had suffered, and he had had some psychiatric assistance and help.

So did --
Insofar as some of the other facts that you have recited to me, I specific -- I don't recall Dennis specifically bringing them to my attention as you've framed it.

In terms of one witness -- and what's the word --
corroborating -- sorry -- one witness
corroborating another, we'd have reason to be concerned about corroboration that emerges after some 20 years of contact within a family, and discussions, that there might be some absorption of information from one person to another? There could be some exchanges, yes, -Yeah.
-- and that could colour the weight to be attached to it, yes.

Okay. If we could go to 003561, please. This is a document that you prepared on June the 19th of 1990, and it was as a result of your failed attempt to interview Mr. Wilson on that June the 18th. You then prepared what is a nine-page memo discussing Ron Wilson's statement, the allegations made within it, and contrasting it to various things in his evidence at trial or his statements to the police; correct?

Yes.
And the conclusion you reached was that the recantation of June the 4 th was completely unbelievable, --

If I can --
-- unreliable?

A
$Q$
A
2

A

Q


If you can refer to the conclusion?
Sure. I was just trying to summarize it for you. At the very end:
"In these circumstances, little if any weight can be given to the unsworn allegations contained in this recent statement."
And it sets out why.
Okay. So if we go to 3562 , please. You've got a
summary of police contacts with Ronald Wilson
March to May 1969, and your summary, what you set
out here is meant to show that there was nothing
intensive about the police contact with Mr.
Wilson; wasn't it?
It was meant to describe the contacts as I
understood them at the time.
All right. 3563, point number 4:
"In Saskatoon, Wilson was
taken on a drive of the area to
determine if he could identify any
landmarks. Then he was brought to the
police station where accommodation
arrangements were made."

Those accommodation arrangements were a night in jail; were they not?

A

Q

A
Q

A
$Q$

A
Q
Yes, and at trial, I believe.

Umm, I think you probably did that later. Well you've certainly got references to the trial, I don't know that you set it out with that kind of detail. 3565. And you've got what can only amount to an assessment, here, where you've got THE RECENT ALLEGATIONS VS THE HISTORICAL AND

EVIDENTIARY RECORD. The first point here: "... April 25th, 1969, the Saskatoon police knew that Ron Wilson had type 'B' blood and thus was not ..."
her:
"... assailant. Although they believed that he was withholding information, he was not considered a prime suspect." Did you have any information whatsoever that Ron Wilson had been told that, and by that $I$ mean do you have any information that he'd been told that his blood type excluded him from being her assailant?

I'm not certain what the details were that he had been told. My understanding was that he more -he had been told that he was no longer a suspect, whether it was because of the blood type or not, I think I may have been mixing two --

What --
-- sources of information.
And what was the source of your information that he had been told that he was no longer a suspect? I believe that it came from one of the police officers that I interviewed, I'm not certain which one.

Q
Okay. Next page, please. You've got paragraph c), a recitation of Ron Wilson's criminal record, referencing the preliminary inquiry where he gave it, and you've indicated:
"His antecedent behaviour is not consistent with that of a frightened 17
yr. old youth."
You appear to be suggesting there that because he'd been a, let's see, he'd been a car theft, joyriding, stolen property, break and enter, breach of probation, theft, and that he had had police contacts and convicted of six previous offences. That doesn't make him a match for police on a murder charge; does it?

A
I'm sorry?
Well if he's a 17-year-old juvenile delinquent, we'll call him, breaking into places, stealing cars, that certainly doesn't make it unlikely that he could be intimidated if questioned by police on a murder charge?

A
-- from which, on several occasions, he had been charged --

Q
Uh-huh?
A
-- and that he had served time in jail. Given the nature, the number of contacts, without more, there was some basis for me to say, lookit, here's
a kid who's been around, and it seemed to me that the nature, frequency, and the number of contacts signaled a familiarity with the process that suggested that perhaps it -- you know, merely being interviewed by the police wouldn't frighten him or intimidate him necessarily.

And if he was merely interviewed on a car theft or a break and enter or something that may well be true, but wouldn't it be different, don't you think, if he was being questioned as a suspect in a murder?

I think a lot would depend on how the questioning occurred, the circumstances of it.

And we have no records whatsoever of that; do we? Umm, apparently not.

003567 . You've got c), that Mr. Wilson had:
"... described the knife during the preliminary inquiry ...",
and then you've added:
"It is interesting to note that Nichol
John who also said that she saw a knife on Milgaard during the trip, gave her statement after Mr. Wilson had completed his statement."

Is your meaning, there, that one corroborates the
other?
I'm not sure what $I$ meant at the time, but $I$ note that I have underlined 'after'. It may simply signal that, when Wilson made his statement, there wasn't a previous statement from Ms. John to the same effect to put to him. That's all, I guess, I can re-interpret this several years after the event.

And you've also got -- and $I$ just, I'm very confused about this, this is something that you testified to the other day:
"That the police planted the story that Milgaard confessed ...",
your opinion of that is that that allegation could not be true because it contained facts that only Mr. Wilson could know, and that's the -- the Heather Beaton telephone call where Mr. Wilson took advantage of a situation where he and David Milgaard were together, and that would be the time that he phoned Heather Beaton and inserted in that a claimed confession of having hit a girl and put a purse in a garbage can. Now why would the police have to know Heather Beaton's name in order for Mr. Wilson to insert a false confession into that story?

A
Quite frankly, they wouldn't, but it -- the level of detail, the type of detail was a factor that $I$ considered at that time, and at that time was in advance of my -- my discussion with Mr. Wilson. But that, that was, that was my thinking pre-interview.

Okay. So if somebody had, had given a detailed account of something that truly did happen, all right, there would be no need for the police to know anything about it. Like if Ron Wilson had truly called Heather Beaton, all right, at a time that he was truly with David Milgaard at a bus depot in Calgary, that statement could be extremely detailed; --

Yes.
-- could it not? And if one were to simply insert into that occasion a confession, "while he was with me he told me this", that wouldn't require the police to have any detailed knowledge of Heather Beaton at all; would it?

It would not. However, the context in which Mr . Wilson had framed his June 4th, 1990 statement was that the police had planted the story, and to me that signals an infusion of information and facts, firstly in terms of date, time, and place, and
some of the contextual colorings to give it an air of reality, and it was from that vantage point that $I$ was focusing on the detail. And keeping in mind that this was my initial thinking, which took place before the actual interview. Page 3568, just about paragraph c), you've referenced the May $23 r d, 1969$ statement where Ron Wilson says that he and Nichol had a discussion in Calgary where he tells her about this alleged confession, and she says she already knew. And then he says:
" I might also add that I am sure
Milgaard killed that nurse, Gail Miller."

And then you've put:

> "Contrary to his recent allegation, Mr. Wilson was convinced of Mr. Milgaard's guilt before charges in this case were laid."

That statement, sir, assumes that his statement given May $23 r d$ was true; doesn't it?

It does.
And paragraph c):
"Mr. Wilson's allegation was denied categorically by Mr. Karst, whose
version the writer prefers to the bare allegation of Mr. Wilson."

And then you've got a discussion, again, which I guess is a reference to your Heather Beaton theory, and you've got:
"Further information received from Nichol John confirms that they had a conversation about David and the girl. Ms. John however, does not now recall the details of that conversation." And that, again, assumes that that May 24 th statement given by Nichol John is true? Yes.

Last page, Conclusions and Recommendations, you've said here that you've:
"... also learned that Mr. Wilson is distraught about this episode in his life and is only prepared to entertain questions before a judge."

And that, to you -- sorry, it's here -- that, to you, raised several questions about the manner in which the statement to Mr. Henderson was taken. "... it was reported that at least 8 hours of questioning was involved in the taking of this seven page document."
and:
"... it raises several questions about the accuracy of the statement."

Did you have the same concerns about the statements taken from Mr. Wilson in May $23 r d-M a y$ 24th, 1969?

I had some concerns, yes, which I tried to explore with him when $I$ spoke with him, and which I tried to explore with Mr. Karst.

Okay.
The difference between the Wilson statement in June of 1990 is that this was a -- this was an event that was 15 days, that occurred 15 days previous. By comparison, the earlier statements taken by police detectives in Saskatoon and Mr. Roberts took place in 1969, almost 20 or 21 years prior. The inability -- the unavailability of the eight hours of questioning certainly raised some questions for me, because yes, in both instances there was a -- there was not background material. On the one hand, however, it was a fairly recent series of questions, whereas on the other we knew from previous attempts to access the file that some of that material had gone missing.

But in terms of the raising the questions about
the manner in which the statement was taken, a statement that took several days of questioning, or hours and hours and hours at a time that spread out over a period of days and involved numerous police officers, give you concerns about the manner in which the statement might have been taken, given that it's an about-face to what he had been saying?

I had some concerns, and $I$ raised them with the witnesses when $I$ interviewed them.

Okay. And that -- could we have 003560 , please. This is a memo from Mr. Corbett written June the 19th, same day, --

Yes.
-- and it appears that, after talking to you, Mr. Corbett got on the phone to Wilson's counsel himself --

A

Q
-- and confirmed that he was unwilling to speak. And what he's got here:
"Mr. Wilson is not interested in having his client provide evidence of perjury on oath."

A
$Q$
"His client is in a highly emotional state ... Providing the statement is a turning point in his life ...", doesn't know:
"... where he stands ... He wants to see
this all out in the open and is prepared
to tell his story to a judge and get
things totally off his chest."
Does that sound unreasonable to you, sir, that somebody who is exposing themselves to a perjury charge doesn't want it out there as just evidence but, rather, would like to give it in a Court proceeding?

A
Q

A
Doesn't it sound unreasonable that --
Yeah? That, it sounds like good legal advice, doesn't it?

Well I -- I can appreciate the dilemma, however, it's one of his own making because he had given a statement which was tantamount, or could be considered perjury.

The second point I acknowledge
is that, given the Charter, the likelihood that that might be used on a -- you know, was probably quite slim.

You know that in 1991-'92-'93 there was some

A

Q
A
$Q$

A
Q
A

Q

investigations into whether or not Ron Wilson could or should be charged with perjury as a result of the evidence he gave at the Supreme Court?
here, moving through THE RECENT ALLEGATIONS VS. THE HISTORICAL AND EVIDENTIARY RECORD at 383, and you've inserted some other things as a result of your interview, but your basic opinions had not changed; had they?

A

Q

That's correct.
Okay. 381 of this document, please, point 4. You've got Lieutenant Karst interviewed Wilson on May 21st:
"... who admitted that Milgaard had left the car ..."

Now that should actually be six officers interviewed him in Regina -- or I'm sorry -- four officers interviewed him in Regina while he was in police custody for an unspecified length of time; correct?

I'm not certain of that, no.
Okay. 384, you've got Mr. Wilson confirming for you what is, $I$ say, sir, your misunderstanding:
"...that the polygraph questions related to the facts contained on his May $23 r d$, 1969 statement."

I'm sorry, madam, where are you reading from? Okay.

At the time you wrote this you didn't have the

A

Q
11:41
benefit of Mr. Roberts' evidence at the Supreme Court in 1992?

I did not.
So Mr. Wilson simply confirmed your
misunderstanding that the polygraph questions related to the facts contained in his May $23 r d$ statement?

Mr. Wilson said what he said and I tried to repeat
it.
Yeah. Okay, 385, this is something -- number (c):
"At trial Mr. Wilson said that he implicated Milgaard in the death of Gail Miller before he was questioned by the polygraph..."

Operator. Now, did you understand at the trial Mr. Wilson didn't even know what implicated meant, he had to have it explained by the judge?

I used the word implicated because that is my description of my observations of his statement. Okay. And that's a term that you used in your -In my report.

Yeah.
Because it signals I guess my assessment of his actions, but I'm not, in paragraph (c), purporting to recite what Mr. Wilson told me.

Q Yeah, that's fine.

A
And in the sense of attributing that word implicated to him.

No, it is your word.
It is my word.
Go to the document if you need to, but just for reference, it's 333474 at 475 , and it's simply you stating that a review of the occurrence report of May 25th, Wilson then implicated Milgaard and accepted an invitation to return to Saskatoon. It's your use of the word implicate.

Yes.
And that's the kind of language that finds itself into the minister's letter. 067278, please, the February 27 th letter, at 285, the minister writes in dismissing David Milgaard's application: "In June 1990, Mr. Wilson also stated that he began to implicate Milgaard after lengthy interviews by police authorities. However, in July 1990, he acknowledged that he had forgotten that he had implicated Milgaard in Regina before he arrived in Saskatoon, where he was interviewed by police. I consider this oversight by Mr. Wilson to be very
important in assessing the allegations of police coercion and manipulation that he advanced to explain his incriminating statement of May 1969, and his trial testimony."

It features again in this statement, sir -- not this statement, this letter, at the next page, 286, she's questioning his account of the polygraph session which also appears, by the way, to have been confirmed by Mr. Roberts at the Supreme Court the next year, but in disbelieving his account she's indicated:
"This is underscored by Mr. Wilson's admission that he had forgotten that he implicated Milgaard in Gail Miller's death before he went to Saskatoon, and not as a result of the questioning in Saskatoon by police and the polygraph operator."

And again on the next page, referring to Mr. Wilson:
"His suggestion that he implicated Milgaard only as a result of a "sweat session" in Saskatoon is negated by his admission that he implicated Milgaard
before his visit to Saskatoon." Quite important that, the use of that word implicated, sir?

A

Q
It seems, in my view, to describe the circumstances, yes.

003349 , please. I suggest to you, sir, that the only thing that Mr. Wilson did in Regina was provide an opportunity for David Milgaard to have committed the offence.
"At 2:00 PM --"
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Sorry, what is the suggestion?

BY MS. McLEAN:
All that Mr. Wilson did in Regina on May 21 st was provide an opportunity for Mr. Milgaard by saying that they were separated, and if we look at the document that's prepared by Mr. Karst on the 25 th of May, it's the document that you've been referencing in your reports:
"At 2:00 PM, May 21st, Ronald Wilson was interviewed at the Regina City Police station, the following officers being present, D/Sgt. Mackie, Cst. Walters and Cst. Dike..."

And I believe it's Dyck,
"...of the Regina department, along with myself."

The author being Mr. Karst.
"This conversation also being taped and presently in my possession."

And no longer in his possession as $I$ understand it.
"During this conversation with Ronald Wilson, he admitted attending in Saskatoon with Milgaard and Nickey on the early morning of January 31st..."

And that's the same as he had said in every signal statement he had made and every interview. "...in contradiction to his original and other interviews, he admitted that Milgaard had left the car when they became stuck at approx. 6:45 that morning, while looking for the Cadrain residence. All Wilson would state at this time was that Milgaard appeared to be puffing and running, slightly out of breath when he returned to the vehicle, and he admitted that he had since thought that this was the time that Milgaard was probably involved in a
murder."
That seriously strikes you as implicating Mr. Milgaard in a murder?

A

Q

That's the first time that Mr. Wilson made the suggestion and connected Mr. Milgaard with the murder and $I$ viewed that as an implication with a murder, yes.

But we don't know from this whether or not Mr. Wilson made the statement, or made the suggestion or somebody made the suggestion to him, we don't how long he spent with these four police officers, but it says he admitted Milgaard had left the car. Now, that creates the first time, sir, an opportunity for Mr. Milgaard to have committed the offence because prior to that Mr. Wilson had been insisting that they hadn't been separated. You understand that?

I understand that Mr. Milgaard had not been separated, yes.

Okay.
Or prior to that he had not admitted being separated from Mr. Milgaard.

Okay. Let's say he had not said it.
He hadn't said it.
All Wilson would state was that he?
"...appeared to be puffing and running, slightly out of breath ... and he admitted that he had since thought that this was the time that Milgaard was probably involved in a murder." That's rather a bizarre thought to have if there's no other evidence, isn't it, it's bizarre?

A
It was certainly something that the police wanted to investigate further, but I've used the term implicate to describe Mr. Wilson connecting Mr. Milgaard with a murder.

Well, there's no connection there, is there? Well, he thought that this was the time that Milgaard was probably involved in, quote, "a murder".

Q
I mean, no indication of what made him think that, no indication that it was followed up by anybody in Regina, any questioning that took place, anybody asking him what in the world do you mean by that, why would you think just because he's away from you he's involved in a murder.
it, that's the only time he could have done it?

A
$Q$

If we could go to 001327 , please, at 387.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: This being what?
BY MS. McLEAN:

This being the interview that Mr. Williams had with Mr. Wilson on July the $20 t h$ of 1990 , and you David Milgaard with a knife is it? Certainly not on that occasion, no.

are asking him questions, sir, about the stop in Craik, the break and entering place, the theft of a flashlight from the elevator, and then you say: "I suggest to you that you told them at that time that you and David left on the trip you ate at Champ's?"
"And you told them about Champ's in the context of where they might look to find the knife you saw with David -- on David?"

And he says:
"I don't know."

You say:
"You don't know. It's possible?"
And the answer is:
"It's possible."
I mean, that's not really an accurate rendition of that conversation is it? He hadn't said that there was a knife; in fact, he denied that David had a knife. Aren't you putting to him sort of a situation that suggests to him that he said that, that he had a knife?

A
Not exactly. Can you flip back to the preceding page, please?

Uh-huh.

A Next page.
Q Forward or backward, sorry.

A

Q
A

Q
A

Q
Yes.
You are correct in setting out that on the 21 st he did not say he saw a knife. He did, however, on the subsequent day, say he saw a knife, and it's a question of putting two sets of events, --Uh-huh.
-- one on one date, one on another date, which furthered the narrative in that question. 004374 , please, at 387 , please, this is again your theory about the Heather Beaton detail being an indication that the police were not planting a story of putting the purse in the trash can or getting a girl in Saskatoon, and then you have at the bottom, you've got, when you interviewed Mr. Wilson:
"...he denied that he spoke to Ms. John
in Calgary about Milgaard killing a
woman in Saskatoon. However, Ms. John
is adamant that the incident took place, although she has no present recollection of the conversation."

Problem with that?
There's a problem with that in that Ms. John is adamant that she told the truth to the police in her statement, although she no longer recalls independently the conversation, and the recitation by Ms. John in her statement is that she did have a chat with Mr. Wilson in Calgary about Milgaard killing a woman.

Uh-huh.
Although she had no present recall.
If we can go to, on the Heather Beaton issue again, if we can go to 001395 , this is where you are cross-examining Mr. Wilson on July 20 th, 1990 on the Heather Beaton issue, you are asking:
"How would they know about Heather
Beaton to put the story in that context?"

And the answer is:
"Because it all fit in that way, that's
why. Sure I told them about probably
Heather Beaton and everything else and
needed a place to put it someplace.

That was a good place to put it."
That's a perfect answer isn't it?

A
$Q$

A

Q
A
Q
A

Q

A
$Q$

It's a pretty good answer, yes.
And a month later when you write your report --
But I also go on to probe a bit further on question 667 and thereafter.

Uh-huh.
Can we see that, please?
Sure.
Okay.
All right. Your opinion, August the 28th, 1990, hadn't changed from what it was in June before you had ever spoken to him had it? It's there at 4387 of your report.

Certainly on that point it had not.
4388, point number 8 at the bottom:
"The writer learned on August 1, and 2, 1990, that Wilson had told two of his acquaintances in 1969, that he (Wilson) had seen blood on Milgaard's hands, (or on a wallet in Milgaard's hands) when Milgaard came back to Wilson's car, after they had each separately sought help in freeing the snowbound car."

Why is that in there?

A
$Q$ the 6th of August, 1990:
"Mr. Lapchuk noted that he spoke..." Sorry, it's at the second page of it:
"Mr. Lapchuk noted that he spoke with Ron Wilson after the trial. Wilson told him that he saw blood on the clothes of David Milgaard when they were in Saskatoon."

That's all we have on that isn't it?
Yes.
You really attach credibility to that statement made 20 years after the event?

I'm not certain what $I$ attached to it. I put it in because it was information that was obtained. About as valuable as the information from Kenny Cadrain and Ron Stickel?

A
It's there because it was presented. The weight to be attached would be measured in terms of when it was given and the circumstances of its giving.

|  | 1 | Q | In July of '90 when you were wanting to explore |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 |  | Mr. Wilson's allegations with him, you didn't ask |
|  | 3 |  | him how many times the police had talked to him, |
|  | 4 |  | any specifics of what they had said, you didn't |
| 12:00 | 5 |  | give him any documents to review, didn't ask him |
|  | 6 |  | where he had been spoken to? |
|  | 7 | A | Well, perhaps we can go one at a time. |
|  | 8 | $Q$ | Uh-huh. |
|  | 9 | A | When I interviewed Mr. Wilson, with the exception |
| 12:00 | 10 |  | of the statements and some of the police notes -- |
|  | 11 | $Q$ | Yeah. |
|  | 12 | $A$ | -- there were very few matters left in the file to |
|  | 13 |  | put to him. |
|  | 14 | 2 | Uh-huh. |
| 12:00 | 15 | A | My questions responded to his allegations and, to |
|  | 16 |  | the extent that I had information on those |
|  | 17 |  | questions, $I$ put it to him. |
|  | 18 | $Q$ | Okay, maybe I can ask it this way. I'm going to |
|  | 19 |  | suggest to you, sir, if you are trying to find out |
| 12:01 | 20 |  | and you are trying to assist a witness, you are |
|  | 21 |  | trying to explore an allegation that he had been |
|  | 22 |  | intimidated and coerced by the police some 20 |
|  | 23 |  | years earlier when he was 17 years old, that the |
|  | 24 |  | appropriate questions might be to ask him not just |
| 12:01 | 25 |  | did they talk nicely to you, did they yell at your, |
|  |  |  | $\qquad$ Meyer CompuCourt Reporting ertified Professional Court Reporters serving P.A., Regina \& Saskatoon since 1980 Central Booking - Call Irene @ 1-800-667-6777 or go to www.compucourt.tv |

but to ask them how many people were around, what circumstances did you speak to them in, were you in jail at the time, how did you feel, what did they tell you was going to happen to you, did you think something was going to happen to you, don't you think questions like that would elicit perhaps a more enlarged response?

Certainly those questions are excellent follow-up questions when you have some indication, some stronger indication. Based on the witness' own recital of the circumstances, yes, those are questions that may have been asked, but in light of the fact that his answers, his preceding answers didn't signal to me asking them, I did not.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: That is the statement of Wilson didn't -- was generalized and not specific?

Yeah, and so $I$ would ask him -- now, keep in mind that when Wilson is questioned, he's an adult, how did they do it, what did they do, I wanted to get it from his words what he perceived what had transpired.

MR. HODSON: Sorry, I don't mean to
interrupt, Mr. Commissioner, I'm wondering, it's

12 o'clock, $I$ know a couple of people may have commitments and $I$ think there might be a desire to continue until 12:30 or break and I'm just -I'm fine either way, I just thought $I$ would raise it because I know there's a couple of counsel that would like to know if we're going to sit until 12:30 and maybe, Ms. McLean, maybe I can get your views or where you are at.

MS. McLEAN: One page to go. Maybe 15 minutes. Don't hold me.

MR. HODSON: And then if we break at that time, if we break at that time until 1:30-- if we go now until 12:15, 12:30 and then break at 1:30, I think we have Ms. Knox and Mr. McLeod and Mr. Frayer. Does that work satisfactory? I don't think it does for -- and Mr. Loran may. It doesn't work great for Mr. Williams's 2:30 flight I know, but --

There are other flights.
MR. HODSON: I'm sorry to interrupt, but maybe if we just -- I think if we can continue until Ms. McLean is done and then break?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: That might be best if we can all manage it.

MS. McLEAN: Unless there's somebody that
needs to get away that can slot themselves in for 15 minutes?

MR. HODSON: No. Carry on.
BY MS. MCLEAN:
The end of the report of August the 28th, 1990, 004391 , Deborah Hall has no new evidence to offer, conclusion in Dr. Ferris' report doesn't do anything to advance the case for Mr. Milgaard, nor do the other reports of Markesteyn, evidence of Linda Fisher doesn't help, Gail Miller's death circumstances aren't similar to Mr. Fisher's offences, Dale Wilson isn't believable, Nichol John continues to have nightmares of a scene in which a man is sitting astride a woman, doesn't appear further investigation beyond the interview of Mrs. Cadrain is required to determine whether there was a probable miscarriage of justice in this case. Nothing that was presented to the minister that you reviewed was sufficient for you to recommend or to believe that a remedy should be granted; right?

A
Q Yeah, as of August 28th.
A That's correct.
That's correct. Now, I want you to look at this
from the perspective now that you know David Milgaard is innocent, and from what you know of the evidence in the case and the materials that are available, is there anything that could have been presented to you that would have caused you to reach a favourable conclusion?

Had some of the facts, had we been able to get the DNA at that time --

Yeah.
-- that was one of the first avenues that $I$ considered exploring. That certainly would have done it.

Yeah.
Had some of the information with respect to Mr. Fisher been perhaps a bit more detailed or in existence at the time of my interviews, we may have been able to pursue that a bit further. We had conducted a number of inquiries concerning Mr. Fisher and his whereabouts. Regrettably, we found that some of the information had been destroyed just months before.

Larry Fisher's, and the ground
surrounding Larry Fisher, was the ground that
ultimately proved to be the strongest and proved to be the ground upon which a remedy was granted.

The other grounds did not have the factual foundation required and, to the extent that they did not, $I$ so reported.

Okay. I know it's difficult to do this because you didn't have DNA then, David didn't have DNA evidence to produce. Given the situation he was in and given the state of the knowledge of everything at that time, is there anything that he could have put in there that would have caused you to reach a favourable conclusion?

It's not a question of what he puts in that prompts me to reach a favourable conclusion, it's a question of what we're able to discern and what potential facts exist. It's not a question of -certainly when you put in an application, if a decision had been made in, let's say, September of 1989 on the basis of Linda Hall (sic) and Dr. Ferris --

Uh-huh.
-- there wasn't the factual foundation to give a remedy even though factually he may have been innocent.

Q Yeah, okay.
A
It's really important to put the 690 process in the context of our process for adjudicating guilt
and innocence and $I$ think it would be, it could put the administration of justice into disrepute if a decision of a court confirmed on appeal having been convicted on the basis of truth beyond a reasonable doubt is vacated on the basis of a witness whose perception of the evidence of two others is that it was a lie but whose description of events mirrors that which the jury heard. Secondly, it would put the administration of justice into disrepute if you vacate on the basis of an hypothetical, an hypothetical opinion from Dr. Ferris who, when it's put to him directly with respect to contamination, says it doesn't
exonerate. Therefore, when you say is there anything that he could put, $I$ think he put as much as he did because perhaps it wasn't anything until science caught up with our ability to deal with it.

Okay. So just --
And I guess, in relation to the other ones, you know, we -- we have to look at it, and look at it in terms of getting that factual basis. Where a factual basis exists, there is no hesitation in saying "this needs to be addressed".

Okay. What $I$ am talking about, sir, is really the
future David Milgaards that don't have DNA. You get to that point where there's -- your concerns are with the bringing the administration of justice into disrepute if you vacate a conviction, but we are talking about referring something back to the Court, so it's not a free pass; okay? It's not a free pass, but in that respect the courts have set up certain thresholds in which they expect the Minister to respect, and I'm talking about the fresh evidence in Palmer and Palmer and the cases flowing from it.

Well, the courts decide their own issues on fresh evidence, and the minister decides what their threshold is for referring a case; okay?

Yes. But the minister, in making the decision to refer, certainly has an eye on what the courts accept.

Even if it results in innocent people being in jail because they don't meet the threshold? That's an unfair assertion in this context. It's not an assertion, it's a question. Even if it results, you said "even if", take back the "if"
--
A
If the facts --
Yeah?

A

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

If the facts don't meet that threshold, until such time as they do, it may, unfortunately, have that result.

Yeah.

Yes.

So if we take, if we just took David's case, if the situation of the Ferris and the Hall thing, that they aren't enough --

Yes.
-- in the opinion of the Justice Department, but yet we know he really is factually innocent - We now know that, yes.

Well, some of us have known a lot longer than others. Yes.
-- but if you take somebody else in his position who's factually innocent, the way this system operates, that factually innocent person would stay in jail?

Until such time as facts emerged, yes.
And - -
It's not a perfect system --
Right.
-- but it's the one we have.
The last thing $I$ want to talk to you about is the
memo you wrote in November of '91, it's document 334136. 334136. It should be the -- no, that's not the right number -- yeah, the memo to file November the 22 nd of 1991 from yourself. And it's addressing:
"... appendix 1 under the heading: The Impossibility of Nichol John's Statement".

And I assume, from that title, that it is something prepared by Mr. Wolch and submitted on behalf of Mr. Milgaard, and you address the submissions in the appendix. You've written here -- this is about the Avenue O/Avenue $N$ discrepancy?

Yes.
You've written:
"The submission also ignores the possibility Gail Miller may have exited her residence via the back door. Ms. Nycazi, a resident of the rooming house testified that she exited by the back door. Had Gail Miller used the rear door she would have been situated between Avenue 'N' and Avenue 'O' and equidistant to the bus stops at Avenues
'N' and 'O'. Therefore, the testimony that places her on Avenue 'N' can not be dismissed because it's not plausible because the route to the bus stop on Avenue 'N' was also a direct route." Lots of $N^{\prime} s$ and $O^{\prime} s$ in there, but firstly is that not speculative, sir?

It's a theory that was advanced. You could call
it speculation, but it's a possibility, yes.
No, but $I$ mean your speculation here, it ignores the possibility had Gail Miller used the rear door, $\quad--$

Each --
-- testimony can't be dismissed?
I'm not saying it --

Uh-huh?
-- is -- it is a commentary on a theory that had been advanced and it's fair, in relation to that commentary, --

Q

A
Uh-huh?
-- to also set out other possibilities in just the same fashion that counsel had set out a possible theory. The jury heard evidence on that, -Okay.
-- they heard argument about that.

But the jury did hear evidence, sir, and it's Ms. Nyczai's at 005536, and it's at 624 . Ms. Nyczai testified at 624 she was living in the rooming house -- umm, 293, three pages long, 689, try at 27, please, 28. And that -- sorry, my references are coming from the bringing it up as an electronic document, so it's about three pages in from 524. She's testifying about going out to her car, or going out to the car, can we just scan it?

MR. HODSON: Do you want to go back earlier?

MS. McLEAN: I'm not sure. Go back. Okay. So here she is saying that she herself was home, she left early in the morning -- next page -she'd seen Gail Miller -- carry on, carry on, next page please, next page, okay -- she says she left herself for university about $7: 30$, she was getting a ride from somebody else:
"Q ... which way did you head out from the house with him? ?"

And she says:
"A The car was parked at the rear of the house ... and we headed south towards 21 st Street, turned left ...", etcetera, and her directions. So the reason she is going out the back is because the fellow who is giving her a ride is parked out the back; do you see that?

Yes.

Okay. And, ahead from this about four more pages, she testifies to her own walking route down at the bottom of that page there:
"Q ... as I understand it your usual route is out the front door and down south on Avenue "O" ..."

Over to the next page:
"Q ... do you go out the front door to get to the car at the back or do you go out the back door?

A We went out the back door.

Q ... do you know how Gail usually got to work ...

A ... I believe it was usually the bus."
occasionally taxis maybe. Can $I$ see the whole page, please? Next page. Describes where the bus stops are there, Avenue $O$ and Avenue N. Next page, please, repetition:
"Q As I understand it, your usual route
then to catch the bus would be out your front door and straight down Avenue 'O' . . .",
full page, please. Next page:
"Q And if you came out the front door your usual route would be to walk straight down 'O'?"
"Q And if you came out the back door - if you happened to come out the back door which way would you go to get to a bus?

A I'd probably go down 'O' again.
Q You would walk back to 'O'?
A Yes.
Q Why wouldn't you come straight down through these lanes here?

A I wouldn't do that.
Q Why?
A Well, I just normally take the street, I wouldn't go down the alley.

Q You just don't like going down alleys?
A No."
And these are questions by the Court, and the Court says:
"THE COURT: I see. Thank you; I don't blame you."

Do you think what you've written in your argument there on November the 22 nd is really a fair characterization of Nyczai's evidence? The document is 334136 .

A
stupid to go wandering off to look for help when you hadn't even tried to get your car unstuck; wouldn't it?

A
Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
And it is certainly open to the interpretation that you are desperately trying to hold onto a conviction on November 22nd, 1991?

On November 22 nd, 1991 this case was headed to the Supreme Court. Whatever I said was merely there for an intellectual exercise. It would not rely on my views, my opinions, it was headed for the Court and the minister would be guided by the Court's advice.

Q

A
$Q$
A
Q

A
In --
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: 690 what?
BY MS. MCLEAN:
696.1.

It codifies practices that, I guess, were a follow-up from those that took place during the Milgaard inquiry.

With I believe two exceptions, they are simply a codification of existing practice at the time, the two exceptions being the annual report requirement and the power of compulsion?

A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A
Uh-huh. Okay. You will be happy to know I have only one more question.

What is my name?
I'm sorry?
What is my name?
Not quite. Section 696.1 of the Criminal Code contains some amendments which, in effect, codify existing practice in the years before; correct?
$Q$
A
$Q$ No, I beg to differ.

Uh-huh?
You're quite right, there is the annual report, there is the power of compulsion.

Uh-huh?
However, what $I$ think is quite important is that

Q
A

2

A
in setting out, in setting out, by way of regulation, what an applicant needs to submit, --Uh-huh.
-- what the test is, --
Yeah?
-- what the process and procedure is, that goes a long way to informing the applicant so that they have, I would call it, a reasonable expectation. In addition they, Parliament, has seen fit to set out a test, a statutory test, and it has also seen fit to identify with, $I$ think, greater specificity the types of things that qualify for a Section 690 review.

And what $I$ am simply meaning
by that is this. It clearly states 'if you are applying, make sure that you've got fresh evidence, don't expect that the 690 process is just another form of appeal", and that goes a long ways towards assuring some certainty in the process.

But it's simply a codification of the existing practice is my question? It may very well, by being in the Criminal Code, make it --

It codified and went further, yes, but when you say the existing practice --

Q
A

Q

A

Q

A
$Q$
A
$Q$
A
$Q$
A
Q
-
-- in some documents that were released, but they have enacted as law "do what you have been doing with these additions" in whatever year it was,
696.1?

A
$Q$

A

Q

A

Q

A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A
Q

A
have to meet and the type of evidence that they'd have to bring.

Q
A

Q

A
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Q
A
.
-- as additional information came up. Certainly those would have assisted us and might have added to the knowledge.

Compulsory powers with respect
to gathering evidence and gathering information, we now know that there were a number of other documents that were out there that could have informed the questioning of some of the witnesses had they been provided --

And what --
-- with the initial application. Those are my views.

Well, certainly not, sir. The documents with respect to Larry Fisher, okay, are there; you had them?

A
2

A
Q
A

A
$Q$

A

Q

A
compel the attendance of Mr. Wilson. We lost a month or more --

Uh-huh?

Thank you. Those are my questions.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Mr. Williams, does
the power of compellability in the amendments extend to agents of the provincial Crown?

I suspect it does. I hope that we would not have to use it in relation to a provincial Crown

A

Q
agency, but that -- it would be an interesting, interesting exercise to have one Crown agency trying to compel information from a provincial one. I don't know, Commissioner. Ordinarily, we haven't had any concerns, or while $I$ was in that chair I didn't have any concerns about getting information from the provincial Crown agencies, but it's certainly an interesting question that $I$ would have to research before $I$ could give you an informed answer.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well $I$ was just wondering, to take an example, there are some provincial police forces like the QPP, the OPP, and so on. If they, for some reason, resisted, could you compel them?

That's what $I$ understand.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay. Do you know?

I think it's, $I$ think it can be done, but $I$ would have to research that.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay. Until 1:30. (Adjourned at 12:32 p.m.)
(Reconvened at 1:35 p.m.)

## BY MR. LORAN :

Good afternoon, Mr. Williams.

I believe so. If we could scroll down just a bit more, $I$ think he provides a result of his inquiries.

If one looks -- let's go back to the previous page. I'm interested in this portion:
"I was advised these files were
destroyed in 1974..."

A
$Q$

A Yes.
Q
When in the late ' 80 s you asked for files from the Saskatoon police regarding the Fisher rapes which had occurred back in, well, nearly 20 years before that and you found that portions of some of those files had been destroyed, you didn't draw any sinister inferences regarding their motivations from that either?

I did not.
Halfway there. I'm going to ask now for document 025659 to be called up, and at page 660 -actually, I'm going to ask to go back to the previous page just to help with identification of this document. This document is sent to Murray Montague who was the deputy chief at that time, it's dated March 1st, 1990. Do you recognize the document?

A
$Q$
It appears to be a copy of a letter that $I$ wrote to Deputy Chief Montague on that date. Thank you. Perhaps we can go back to page 2 and again the second paragraph. Thanks. Is it fair to characterize this letter -- well, I guess would
it be fair to say first of all that you thought the Saskatoon Police Service would likely be criticized by the Milgaard camp if they took any
part in the investigation of Larry Fisher?

A
$Q$ Yes, it would certainly raise a perception of a conflict of interest if the role of the Saskatoon police was a fairly active one, particularly if there were allegations of police misconduct by or on behalf of officers or former officers. It would be akin to them investigating themselves. And there had in fact been experiences you encountered which probably led you to believe that this would have been a likely outcome had the Saskatoon police been carrying the investigation. Would it be fair to say that?

Yes.
Your experiences with Mr. Caldwell in particular are what I'm thinking of. You had approached him for information regarding the original prosecution
and your inquiries were characterized by the Milgaard camp and reported in the press as a matter of Mr. Caldwell being asked to investigate his own conduct in the original prosecution. Is that sort of a fair analysis of what you perceived to have been reported?

Yes.
Under the circumstances, would it be fair to say you thought it likely that the same criticisms
would be made of the Saskatoon police for any role they played in investigating Larry Fisher?

A

Q

Yes. I also wanted to give them a heads up as to the nature of the things $I$ would be asking for and
to more or less introduce the notion that Rick Pearson would be coming around to see them.

Okay. And Mr. Pearson's reports to you regarding his contact with the police, they worked out well?
And, two, that it would be appropriate for them to step back from the investigation in light of issue number one and the risk that was involved that their actions might be characterized as inappropriate?

A Yes. He reported that he received full
co-operation.
Thank you. I have no further questions, Mr.
Williams.
Thank you.

## BY MS. KNOX:

Mr. Williams, for the record, my name is Catherine
Knox and you know that $I$ am counsel for the former trial prosecutor T.D.R. Caldwell?

I do, yes.
I have a brief number of areas to canvass with you primarily arising out of questions asked by Ms. McLean this morning and by Mr. Wolch in his cross-examination of you, and if $I$ could start perhaps with this morning.

Ms. McLean asked you if my
client, Mr. Caldwell, had told you that he had been writing letters to the National Parole Board, or he had written a couple of letters, you indicated that he had, but you couldn't turn your mind to when in time, you thought it was early. I ask if we could have brought up a letter from Mr. Caldwell to you dated June 16th, 1989. The document number is 332496 , and if we could centre in on the first paragraph of that, please.
As I indicated -- and I had the staff gloss over, the date of this letter is June 16th, 1989, and it's a letter to you from Mr. Caldwell telling you he's finally been able to obtain copies of the two letters that he wrote to the National Parole Board and he's providing them to you, so would you agree, based on the date and the language of this letter, that certainly in advance of June 16th, so relatively -- within six months of you getting the application or the department getting the application, not only had he talked to you about it, but he had tracked down copies of the letters for you?

That's correct.
Okay. Now, sir, you were asked some questions as well by Ms. McLean about a letter that Mr. Caldwell sent to you in October of 1989 where he, in response, $I$ believe, to a delay in your making a trip to Saskatoon, he went through the file and copied a fairly large volume of material and sent it to you?

Yes.
And that letter, again just for the record reference, the date of the letter is October 25 th, 1989 as identified by Ms. McLean and the document
number is 016106 , $I$ don't think we need to have it brought up, but, Mr. Williams, some questions were asked of you yesterday with respect to the length of time it took you to process the application and how that upset the Milgaards, and in fairness to you, there was a document in Mr. Caldwell's file, the document number, Mr. Commissioner, is 332490 .

Mr. Williams, I'm not sure if
you would have reviewed this, but this is a note prepared by Mr. Caldwell on the $26 t h$ of September, 1989 and if you can't read his handwriting, he's recorded that he had a telephone conversation with you, that you had had a communication from Mr. Wolch's office about some news clippings on files or things to do with a knife-wielding assailant or attacks on nurses?

A
$Q$
Yes, $I$ see that.
And he indicated or he documented that you were asking him to go through the times, so although he didn't reply to you until his October 25th letter, his records show you had actually communicated that request to him a month earlier, September 26th, 1989?

Yes.

Okay. And with respect to that, do you have a
memory of calling him as the person that could assist you in finding that information from his file given his obvious familiarity with the file? Yes.

Okay. At any point when you called him, did he appear to offer any hesitation or any resistance to accommodating your requests for information or getting file access for you or anything of that nature?

There was no hesitation whatsoever. Mr. Williams, when you first make contact with him after the application came into your hands sometime after December 28 th, 1988 , did you realize that no one on behalf of David Milgaard through the Wolch -- Mr. Wolch, Mr. Asper, had made any request of him to be allowed access to his file?

No.
Okay. Did you realize that in fact he had given access to his file to a previous counsel for Mrs. Milgaard in 1981 and in fact invited him to come look at the file, to partake in the file? I'm thinking of a lawyer by the name of Gary Young. No .

Okay. Did you realize at that early stage that
not only had he given access to Mr. Young and invited him to come and review his file, but that he had given access to Peter Carlyle-Gordge, to the CBC and, from all indications, whenever he was asked by appropriate persons for access to the file, he gave it?

I've since learned that, but I didn't realize it early.

Did he ever communicate to you in any manner whatsoever to suggest that he would have resisted a request from Mr. Wolch or Mr. Asper to have access to his file?

No. Based on the conversations I had, he was quite open in providing access to whoever saw it. And, sir, Mr. Asper testified at various points in time at this inquiry, and $I$ don't have the exact document, page dates from his transcript, but essentially when the application was sent to you, we've determined that no contact had been made with Mr. Caldwell to get access to his file on behalf of the law firm, no contact had been made with Mr. Tallis to get access to his file, no contact had been made with Gary Young to get access to his file, and no contact had been made with Tony Merchant, who you may recall also
briefly represented Mrs. Milgaard, so no contact had been made with any of those agencies.

Additionally, we know that no contact was made with Saskatoon Police Service despite the fact that then Chief Joe Penkala in 1987 extended an invitation to David Asper that his department would assist him in his quest to do this application, so there was no contact there, and did you at any point in time receive any request from Mr. Asper or get any understanding from him or Mr. Wolch that they expected it was your job to get that file information for them, that you would go out and they would, you would get all that for them because that's just the way it should work?

A
I never got that impression from them.
Mr. Asper said that basically they expected they would walk hand in hand down a path with you, you would give them everything. Did he ever, ever, ever communicate to you any impression that that's what he thought your role was, to go out and find all that stuff out for him?

A
No. On occasion $I$ received requests for specific bits of information and when I did I relayed them. But would you agree, sir, in terms of the specific
information bits that you were requested to get, like the Ute Frank statement, information on Deborah Hall, that knowing now or what was in Mr. Caldwell's file, that was all information they could have gotten themselves?

Yes.
The (V4)---- (V4)--- statement that Mr. Wolch asked you about yesterday, statement number 40 , he asked when you got it and when you disclosed it, that was sitting on Mr. Caldwell's file, they could have had it any time from 1986 forward had they bothered to go in and ask for it?

So it would appear, yes.
Uh-huh. Sir, Ms. McLean referred you this morning to a copy of a chapter from a book, The Ice-Cold Hothouse, that was sent to you by Mr. Caldwell, and the copy drawn up at that time had handwritten notes on it. You indicated that what was sent to you had no writing on it?

I don't believe it did.
Mr. Commissioner, with the assistance of the staff, I'm advised they found a copy of that portion of the book that was in the federal government files, the number is 332295 I'm advised. If we could have that brought up,
please. Now, the cover page clearly has no notations on it, Mr. Commissioner, I don't think it's necessary for us to go through it, but just for the record I'm advised that this has no writing on it at all and it would appear that this is likely the copy that Mr. Williams had because it does come from federal government files. Mr. Commissioner, as well I can indicate from Mr. Caldwell's file that that chapter that he sent was copied from the book, he had physical possession of the book, not just a photocopy. That book is in my possession, I can produce it to the Commission if you wish, but his copy has none of the handwriting that appeared in the text that we looked at this morning, but $I$ do have the physical book itself in its original form as it was sent to him.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thank you.
BY MS. KNOX:
Sir, yesterday in the course of his cross-examination, Mr. -- and I'll be a little bit all over the board here, but $I$ don't expect to be very long -- Mr. Wolch, through his own questions and through the language used in a video clip he showed you, referenced the fact that Mr. Caldwell
had failed to disclose certain information that should have been disclosed to Mr. Tallis at the time of the trial. Do you recall generally being questioned in that area?

Yes.
And as I understood your answers, it was your perception, and Mr. Tallis has testified, that the disclosure he received at the time was in accordance with the practices of the day, and I'm not sure that you are aware of it, Mr. Caldwell has testified that in hindsight there's some things that should have been turned over knowing now what he didn't know then, so he takes no issue that, like you, some 40 years later, if he had to do it over he would do things differently, but one of the questions put to you and one of the statements in that video tape was that there were certain statements about the route that Gail Miller took, whether it was Avenue $O$, Avenue $N$, that were not disclosed, and reference was made to two roommates, Betty Hundt and Ann Friesen? Yes.

Do you recall that area of questioning, sir? Yes.

Now, I know that you've read many years ago the
transcript of the preliminary inquiry. Do you remember that in fact in the cross-examination of the other roommate, Adeline Nyczai $I$ think is the pronunciation, at the preliminary inquiry, Mr. Tallis questioned her using the name of Betty Hundt and Ann Friesen, asking where those ladies were at the time of the preliminary inquiry in 1969 ?

I have no specific recall of that portion of the transcript.

Mr. Commissioner, it's found in the transcript, and I've referenced it before, in the pages of the transcript in the preliminary inquiry, it's between pages 97 and 103. The document number for the transcript again is 007421 . Ms. Nyczai at that time in the transcript told him that Betty Hundt was in Whitehorse and Ann Friesen had moved and was living in B.C. on the record, sir. Now, sir, given that he was able to ask those questions, would that indicate to you this was not a case of the statements of these young women not being disclosed?

Certainly that's an inference you could draw, how would he know about their existence unless he had been told.

Q

Q He had the names, he used them?
A Yes.
But are you aware, sir, that Mr. Tallis testified that it was a practice, or a courtesy that was extended to him, that he often read file materials even though he wasn't given copies of it and he believes that the prosecutor, the city prosecutor, before Mr. Caldwell took over the file, even may have given him an opportunity to read the file? I wasn't aware of that, but in my conversations with Mr. Tallis, he indicated that he had received full co-operation and his requests had been satisfied.

Q And the fact that he might not have gotten copies of something doesn't mean that we can or should conclude he didn't have the information; is that your understanding?

Well, disclosure in the early days didn't necessarily mean turning over copies, it did mean providing access.

Okay. Mr. Williams, Mr. Loran in his questions to you referenced the next area that $I$ want to go to and it's the fact that my client became vilified, victimized in the media with accusations of things that he did do that he shouldn't have done or
things that he didn't do that he should have done, and you are familiar with some of that publicity, including the allegation that he was in conflict because he was giving you information from his file?

Yes.
Okay. Sir, Mr. Caldwell has testified about some of the impact of that on him and his family and yesterday in his questions Mr. Wolch asked you -so I can get this right -- whether -- and, Mr. Commissioner, I'm referring to the transcript from yesterday's proceedings, at transcript page 39490, and at about line 7 when Mr. Wolch was asking you some questions about the role of the media and that the media played, you responded at line 7 saying:
"A I think we're embarking on a whether or not the ends justify the means."

Mr. Wolch responded by say:
"Q No, no, I'm just suggesting that the media is the only place to turn, and the media are intelligent people who will not champion a bad cause?"

Your response:
"A That's your view, sir."

And then Mr. Wolch continues:
"Q You think they would? Have you ever heard of anybody who has been wrongly convicted, allegedly, that the media sort of went to bat for that didn't turn out to be innocent?"

And then he goes on, and I'll come back, I'll just go through the whole passage and then ask you some questions, his question at line 19: "In your experience of having 690 applications can you think of one..." Case,
"...where the media didn't agree with your decision and they were wrong?" You respond to that, and if we go to the next page, Mr. Wolch says, or the question starts at line 1, Mr. Wolch in his question says:
"Q I'm not quarrelling with your response. We'd like to have a system that's fair and works, we'd like to have a system where the applicant knows what's going on and is heard by somebody, but I'm suggesting to you that the media is the only place to turn when you don't know what the investigators are doing and it

A
Q

A
$Q$
$Q$
looks like they are biased."
Do you remember that series of questions and answers from yesterday?

Yes.
Sir, did you realize, or have you been made aware that on the very day that David Milgaard's application was forwarded to the Minister of Justice, December 28th, 1988, a letter went to the CBC sending them a copy of the application the very day that it was sent to your department? No.

Mr. Commissioner, $I$ ask if we could bring up document 163061. Sir, this is a letter under the signature of Mr. Asper, it is going to Sandra Bartlett who is a producer at the CBC, you see at the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in Regina, and I'll allow you a moment to read it since you haven't seen it before. You hadn't seen that before?

No.
The tenor of Mr. Wolch's questions, as I just put them to you, and they were brought up on the screen, suggests that the resort to the media has to be had when there's delays or there's an indication of bias. Would you agree with me that
this letter is not in keeping with that question, this was a letter that went out before the Justice Department even got -- or got the application in their hands?

The same day, yes.
Okay. Mr. Commissioner, I wonder if I could ask the staff to bring up document 182097 , if we could bring out the -- sir, this is a document dated September 2nd, and although it doesn't have a year on it, the records indicate that it would be September 2 nd, 1986 which would be two years, three months in advance of the application, and it's a memo to Hersh Wolch from David Asper, and it's about the -- they are in the relatively early stages of the preparation of their application, but my summary of the content of this is that effectively what Mr. Wolch is telling David Asper is that, if you look at the last sentence, is that:
"Our opinions appear to be in a 617 application but it seems to me that if we can get a T.V. show done first to get some support we would be far better off."

A Yes, I see that.

Q

Well in advance of the application ever being filed, well in advance of contact with the Department of Justice, but certainly indications that the media campaign didn't get generated because of frustration at how long you were taking to do the file or the fact that there was information coming to them suggesting bias on the part of you and others in justice does it?

It does not. It would appear that the resort to the media was part and parcel of an approach to get a result. The reference to 617 application is a reference to the predecessor section in the Criminal Code which later became Section 690. And keeping in mind this is September 2nd, 1986, the use of that section numbers makes sense, does it not, because it would have been 617 in 1986 ? Yes.

Six -- nine months, sorry, they were retained January 16th, 1986 , this memo is written September 2nd, 1986, so within months -- and I can go through the record with you, but this would be long before contact, much longer before any indication being made or any feedback to them from the government because the government had nothing to give them feedback on in 1986 did they?

A No.

Q
If we could jump forward in time, the application is filed on December 28th, 1988, CBC is given a letter December 28th, 1988, to January 5th, 1989. If $I$ could have document number 182100. This is a memo to Mr. Wolch from David Asper, seven, eight days after the application is put into the mail to the minister. In addition to the letter written to Sandra Bartlett on the $28 t h$ of December when he sent out the application to her, he's in conversation with her within eight days, January 5th, 1989?

Yes.
Okay. And now if we could go forward to February 10th, 1989, 333285, this would be five weeks later, this is basically the first correspondence or the first documentation with respect to the application being received at your department and some direction being given with respect to starting some work on it, but this would be several weeks after it's in the hands of CBC; agreed?

A
Yes. What's on the screen is my memo to Mr. Fainstein of February 20th -- of January $20 t h$. It's approximately two weeks after, or three weeks

```
after it's in the hands of CBC.
```

Okay.
Umm, the memo signals that the application is not complete, and I've drafted a letter setting out the materials required to complete the application.

Okay. Sir, if $I$ could bring up 004868 , please. This is a February 16 th letter, 1989 , that the minister sent back to Mr. Wolch listing all the things that needed to be sent in before the department could even start to take a look at this?

Yes.

So, again, well in advance of even, you know, the basic materials being forwarded by Mr. Wolch's office to your department they have engaged in an in-the-media strategy that built to the point that we know it to have evolved as a result in this Inquiry?

So it appears, yes.

I wonder if the staff could help me. There is a February $10 t h, 1989$ letter that Mr. Wolch wrote to David Milgaard that $I$ have the wrong document number for. The date of the letter is February 10th, 1989, it's Hersh Wolch to David Milgaard, I
made an error in copying it down. Sir, if we could bring this up, this is a letter written to David Milgaard by Mr. Wolch. The date is, as I've indicated, February 10th, 1989, and if you could take a -- a quick read through it. And if you could take a quick read of it, have you seen this letter before?

Okay. Sir, again, this is a letter that was written ten days before the minister wrote Mr. Wolch and said "where's your stuff, where's the transcript, where's the lab reports". Would you agree the tenor of that is a confirmation that this application wasn't about getting the media involved because it started to go south on them, but that the strategy he outlined to Mr. Milgaard in this letter is to use publicity, he says "responsible publicity", as part of the process that they would -- they saw the two operating hand in glove?

A The -- yes.

Q

A
$Q$

A

Q
A
Q Okay. And, sir, I -- I have many pages of other kinds of media overtures being made before the file material was complete, the transcripts were received, talking about when CBC didn't do a Fifth Estate program that they were hoping for. If we could bring up a memo March 13th, 1989, 182102. And this is a March 13th memo to Hersh from David Asper, being David Asper, and the suggestion in here being that since they are not getting a -the show out that they had hoped for with CBC they would like to consider plan $B$, go public with someone else; do you see that?

A Yes.
Q

A

Q

A
$Q$
A
$Q$

Okay. So we move from Sandra Bartlett, when that didn't gel as it was hoped, they start looking at the possibility of using other media outlets? Yes.

And if we could bring up 163025, a May 18th, 1989, and I don't know that we need to go through the content. The recipient, Winnipeg Free Press, Dan Lett, referencing telephone conversations with him and sending him consents to get access to David Milgaard's records, psychiatric records, -Yes.
-- through the prison system?
Yes.
So we've got CBC, we've got Dan Lett, and it continues on. If we go to September 6th, 1989 -and $I$ won't bring it out -- and copies of the application sent to Southam News September 18th, 1989, a copy of the application sent to CTV National News, but just a continuing increasing amount of media attention. And would you agree all of this would be well in advance of the expressed concerns about bias or delay on your part?

Yes.

Q

A

Q

Indeed, all of that would be well in advance of contact being made, or much of it was well in advance of basic materials like transcripts and the like being forwarded to you; wasn't it?

I believe I received the transcripts in May of that year.

So around the time Dan Lett was getting consents to get into file records?

So it would appear.
Sir, I just have one other area to touch on, I think. Well just, actually, two areas to touch on.

Now were you made aware, prior to Mr. Wolch and Mr. Asper becoming involved, that Mrs. Milgaard/David Milgaard, had initiated contact with the press as well and in fact in December of 19 -- or sorry -- in January 1986, when they hired them, they were already working with the Fifth Estate about doing a program on David Milgaard and his story?

No.
Okay. Just so that the record is clear, there's some correspondence from David Milgaard to the minister in fact, and $I$ raise it to inquire whether you had seen it, saying that he thought
the Fifth Estate was going to be doing a program about him when he made his own initial contacts with the minister, and that when Mr. Asper was following up with Sandra Bartlett she had already had some lengthy involvement in the file through the Milgaard family? I'm aware that, before the receipt of the December 1998 application, David Milgaard had written to a -- the then-minister of justice, I'm not sure if it was '85 or ' 86 , and there had been a response to him. But insofar as the CBC Fifth Estate, I'm not -- not aware of that communications as we now speak.

Just for the completeness of the record, I had asked you earlier, the CBC went and saw Mr. Caldwell in about 1987 because they were working on a story that never did air, but you were aware that he gave access to the CBC to his file, I believe? Because it was through Sandra Bartlett, the CBC gal at that time, seeing his file that the request came to you about the other nursing attacks and knife-wielding assailants; do you remember being told that she said she saw news clippings or something on Mr. Caldwell's file? A Yes.

So there was some involvement in the public media before Mr. Wolch and Mr. Asper became involved, but they certainly paralleled it and built up on it as part of their strategy on his application, as evidenced by some of the documents $I$ have shown you; would you agree?

Yes.
Okay. Sir, going back to the portion of transcript that $I$ referred you to for -- where Mr. Wolch was questioning you yesterday at page 39490, he asked you the questions about whether you were aware of any time that the media had advocated for a person that he was innocent where they'd turned out to be wrong?

I recall that exchange, yes.
Okay. Sir, during the lunch hour today $I$ asked, with the permission of your counsel, you to review some materials.

And, Mr. Commissioner, I'm
referring to a media blitz that occurred on and about January 12th, 2006 .

And are you familiar, now,
with the name of a Roger Keith Coleman?
Yes, I am.
Okay. And, for the record, can we agree that

Mr. Coleman was the gentleman who was executed on death row in the United States in 1982 -- '92, sorry; that there was a protestation, a huge media campaign advocating his innocence that involved Centurion Ministries, the Pope as it turns out, the cover of Time magazine, and multiplicity of media resources claiming that he had been wrongfully convicted, lots of castigation of the state and state authorities, but it turned out, with DNA results that were arranged through Mr. Lockyer in Toronto and the efforts of the Association in the Defence of Wrongfully Convicted, that the media got it wrong?

MR. WOLCH: Mr. Commissioner, if I may, my friend is making a number of comments as fact. One is that there was a media blitz, the media supported, $I$ haven't looked at what she has there but I'm going by memory.

My memory is that the issue
in that case was that there was an effort made to do DNA testing and the state was resisting. The media, as $I$ recall, was arguing that the DNA testing should be done, they weren't advocating innocence, they were saying that there should be DNA. If I remember it right the governor said there should be a polygraph, and did that. I don't believe that's a case that supports my friend's contention that the media was backing anything. My memory is that parts of the media were saying there shouldn't be DNA, the evidence is overwhelming.

I believe that's the case of the fellow who was alleged to have raped and killed his sister-in-law, he had a bad criminal record too. But, $I$ mean, to boldly assert that the media was championing a cause, they were reporting what they were being told, that should there be DNA or shouldn't there be DNA, and I don't know of any media championing.

MS. KNOX: Mr. Commissioner, if it would assist Mr. Wolch, I'll read an article in The American spectator. This was published on the 17th of January 2006 , and there is much reporting about media, CNN, the cover of Time magazine, the
protestations by this gentleman on the night that he was taken to the death chamber that that "time will show that an innocent man was put to death", a press release from Reverend McCloskey saying that he had believed them, and to find out that he was wrong was like being kicked in the gut with a horse.

But one paragraph, if $I$ may,
from The American Spectator -- or, sorry, two paragraphs:
"As late as Thursday morning, Senator ... Leahy was throwing the case in Judge Alito's face ...",
they are talking about cases in Virginia now where:
"... it appears the possibility that a number of innocent people were executed.

Then the results came back -astonishing, perhaps, only to those TV reporters who, in their usual 'in-depth analysis,' had no idea what they were talking about. The Coleman case is in fact one of the most bizarre episodes in the history of American journalism, escaping notice probably only because it
is indistinguishable from so many other cases. It's a perfect example of how the wandering moralists of the media overrun established institutions with their crusading myopia and staggering naivete."

And it's going through, then, a list of all of the various Time magazine that proclaimed his innocence, books, TV documentaries, The Phil Donahue Show, and I can provide all of these printouts to Mr. Wolch and to the Commission, but certainly they talk about an apoplectic media reaction with responses all over the world, including an intervention from the Pope to try to stop the execution of an innocent man.

MR. WOLCH: This is a view of The American Spectator?

MS. KNOX: Oh, I also have the Toronto Star.

MR. WOLCH: Saying that the media went wrong or --

MS. KNOX: Yup.
MR. WOLCH: Mr. Commissioner, my memory is they were -- if a man on death row says "I'm innocent" and the media reports that, why is that
media pushing a cause, they are just reporting what they were told.

MS. KNOX: I was reviewing the articles in response to the question framed by Mr. Wolch yesterday because of a comment Mr. Henderson made in his testimony here.

MR. WOLCH: No, --
MS. KNOX: But, certainly, all of the documentation, $I$ think last night when $I$ did an Internet search $I$ got like 77,000 hits, we can debate whether it was a media frenzy or what, but I have the examples $I$ took from the Canadian papers because they had good summaries. I'm prepared to provide them to Mr. Wolch and to provide them to the Commission.

MR. WOLCH: My --
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: That's okay, Mr. Wolch. This simply arose from your challenge to the witness to name one instance where the media championed somebody who turned out to be guilty, and $I$ don't think the witness was prepared to come up with anything on -- from the top of his head, and this is a reply through Ms. Knox indicating that, well, there you are.

MR. WOLCH: Mr. Commissioner, my question
to the witness was "have you come across in your experience", I didn't say in the broad world. But if my friend wants to go to the broad world, then to say that that fellow was championed by the media, the media gave both sides of the story and the real issue was should there be DNA testing. The government was refusing to do DNA and that was the real issue there.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: No, I think the real issue as far as this Inquiry is concerned, as $I$ recorded it, was the media don't lightly champion people --

MR. WOLCH: That's right.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: -- unless they are convinced of his innocence.

MR. WOLCH: That's right, and they weren't championing that fellow.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: And here they did, they went wrong, that's what $I$ heard.

MR. WOLCH: No, they were only reporting what they were being told.

COMMISSIONER MaCCALLUM: "The wandering moralists of the media", whose quote is that, by the way?

MR. WOLCH: The media's quote.

MS. KNOX: The American Spectator.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: The Spectator writer made that?

MS. KNOX: Yes. The Spectator article is an 11-page article that is a good review of the history, that's why I copied it. But, as I said, I also have the Toronto Star, the National Post had an article, and others that $I$ can provide to - -

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: It's all right, I mean $I$ have the picture perfectly well. The idea that the media are infallible, of course, is a stretch in anybody's --

MR. WOLCH: No, oh no, I'm not suggesting that. But I'm saying that there's a big difference between championing a cause and reporting somebody else championing a cause, they are two different things.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well, we're going to hear evidence on that subject from a media expert.

MR. WOLCH: I appreciate that.

MS. KNOX: I will provide my articles to Mr. Wolch so he can see them.

MR. WOLCH: I'll be happy to see them.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes.

MS. KNOX: There was much media
championing, there was much media championing of his innocence, according to the --

MR. WOLCH: I don't know of any reporter who said he was innocent.

MS. KNOX: I will make sure that $I$ put his mind at rest, that $I$ 'm not trying to mislead the Inquiry.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Please do.

MS. KNOX: And I have no further questions for Mr. Williams. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thank you.

## BY MR. FRAYER:

Mr. Williams, I'm David Frayer, and I'm representing Justice Canada. You and I know each other --

A Yes.
-- and have known each other for a number of years.

Just a couple of areas I'd
like to touch with you and go over with you. The first of them relates to a document that was produced yesterday by Mr. Wolch, 152076. If I could have that, please, 152076. And this is this
memorandum from you to Peter Lugli, the special assistant to the Minister of Justice, dated October the $24 t h$ of 1991 , and $I$ particularly want to draw your attention to the information that appears after the introduction and the first heading, The frequency of sexual assaults in Saskatoon, 1968-1970. Now what you have said here is that you have attached, as appendix 1, excerpts from the annual report of the Saskatoon Police Department for the years 1968, 1969, and 1970 . And while I'm going to this particular document as there was a suggestion by Mr. Wolch yesterday, which you agreed with, that this particular information wasn't shared with the applicant; do you recall him asking you that and you saying "no it wasn't"?
$A$
Yes.
Essentially so? With respect to the annual report of the Saskatoon Police Department, while I'm not certain that you can answer this question, would I be correct in saying that those are public documents?

A
Yes.

They can be obtained by any citizen, upon request, --
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A
Q
A
Q

A

I believe so.
-- to your knowledge?
I believe so, yes.
Okay. And you went through the statistics collected over the course of those three years and you arrived at this particular analysis that you were providing to the special advisor to the minister, and this was work you did directly, was it?

Yes. I was simply putting in, into that memo, some of the information contained in the report, just --

Okay. And you have a descriptor at the paragraph below the statistical data where you say:
"The bracketed numbers represent the number of assault and rape files that were located and analyzed by Saskatoon police in August, 1991 to determine the kind of weapon used by the assailants." So, just so that we can put this to rest, Mr. Wolch or Mr. Asper, or anybody else on behalf of David Milgaard, could have gone to the Saskatoon Police Department, or to some other source, and obtained what are public documents?
$Q$ had criticized the length of time it had taken to come up with this result and, as a result, it was felt that at least the folks in our communications section, and certainly the public, should be made aware of the events or the significant steps in
the application process that might inform them and explain why it took as long as it did.

Thank you. Now I'm gonna go through this not in much detail because it's a document that was referred to you by Commission Counsel in part, but I'd like to touch upon some of the salient parts of this chronology, and especially so where it appears that certain information has been placed in brackets after a certain date and then describes something that you did or didn't do as a result of information you received. I think it's safe to say that this, in a way, supports the suggestion that you've made throughout your evidence that, when you were receiving information from the applicants, it was essentially in installment form?

A
Yes.
That every time you would receive something new, that would require you to stop your investigation at that stage and to go out and to do something, essentially, further in order to follow up on the information you were being provided with?

A

Q
and Ms. Knox already drew to your attention the document of February the 16 th of 1989 , that was doc. ID 004868. And when $I$ refer to the doc. number, unless you request that it be put up on the screen, I'm simply going to put it in the record and not ask the staff to put it up. Are you comfortable with that?

Yes.
Okay. Thank you. Now the next event appears to be -- and this document, of course, speaks for itself -- but the May 8th of 1989. It was as a result of that letter February the 16 th of 1989 that was previously shown to you that the trial and appellate record were sent by counsel for Mr. Milgaard?

Yes.
And then, on August the 29th of 1989, the: "Affidavit of David Milgaard ..." was:
"... forwarded by counsel for the applicant; also, counsel for Milgaard sought information from the Department."

A Yes.
So the affidavit of David Milgaard, that $I$ believe was sworn back in 1986, was produced as part of

A

Q
this application to you some almost eight months after the application had been filed?
am 1 correct in saying that, with respect to that family presentation, that it was asserted as something that was going to be forthcoming and was going to form part of the application?

Yes, both -- yes.
In other words, I believe it to be your view that
nothing would be done with respect to a final decision on the application until such time as the investigation had been completed to your satisfaction, and you had received that family presentation?

A
Q

A
$Q$

A
Q完 $\square$ event, it shows the activities November 6th to 8th, 1989, your interview of Deborah Hall, Justice Tallis, Nichol John, and Dr. Emson. And then you have in brackets your observation:
"(A preliminary Departmental report was prepared in November/December, 1989. It was not pursued due to the events described below.)"

And if we could just scroll up on that, please,
these are the -- and I'm not going to go through all of these, but if you read them, Mr. Williams, these essentially set out the key points in the chronology.

The January 10th, 1990 letter from counsel for Mr. Milgaard, that was the wish, to develop the evidence further, to refine the submission, the request for some form of financial resources to do so.

Then, on January the $23 r d$ of
1990, again a letter from counsel for Mr.
Milgaard, additional information was provided.
And then the very important
event of February the 28 th of 1990 when you
received information from David Asper with
respect to the identification of Larry Fisher?
A
$Q$
Yes.
And this for the first time, despite the fact that
you were in a position, at least with a
preliminary report, to proceed to do your report to the Minister of Justice, that this particular information stopped that process; am I accurate in that?

A
$Q$
Yes.
Okay. And you've recorded here:
" (The department pursued this aspect of the investigation. On March 1, 1990 the RCMP were asked to investigate these allegations ...", that's the obtaining of the work of Sergeant Rick Pearson, and you made a request separately to Saskatoon police; and what did that relate to --

A
$Q$

A

Q

A
Q Umm, ---- in the general sense?
-- there were some inquiries, I -- and it was contained, $I$ believe, in -- or discussed briefly in my examination by Ms. Knox in which we requested some information.

And then we have the entry March 3rd of 1990:
"Joyce Milgaard, mother of the applicant, forwarded material to the Department."

I believe that to be the video?
Yes.
Yes. If we can go over to 76, please. Then again we have -- and $I$ won't go through all of these -sort of a chronology of what occurred. And we get to April the 17 th of 1990 and we have:
"Sgt. Pearson sent his report that outlined his investigations of Larry

Fisher."
Again you've got in brackets and parentheses:
"(In April, 1990 the Departmental report
to the Minister was once again prepared
in draft, but was abandoned due to the events described below.)"

And those events that are described below again, now, are information relating to the retention of Dr. Markesteyn by counsel for David Milgaard, and then the events that followed the providing of that report, and so on?

A

Q
That's correct.
And then on June the 6th of 1990 you have:
"Counsel for Milgaard advised that he had identified another witness that would assist him in the application, Ronald Wilson."
Ronald Wilson."

A

Yes.
So these are the -- these are characterized as an application by instalments, as each thing is identified, it required you to take the action as you've outlined there in this chronology? Yes.

Okay. And this is a summary, I appreciate, of your activities, it's much more in-depth than what
this reflects; am $I$ accurate in that?
A
Q

Thank you. And if we can just -- and then there's all the events relating to Ron Wilson and so on. If we can move on to 78, please. 337474, you've got early September of 1990 , final submissions
And you testified at considerable length as to the efforts you made to get these from the reports from the Saskatoon police service? Yes.
And you observed, in brackets and parentheses:
" (July: The Department sought,
unsuccessfully, to obtain all of these
reports.)"
in obtaining Saskatoon Police Department
files concerning the person identified as the real killer."

And you observed, in brackets and parentheses:
(July: The Department sought,


sought by the department, September 10 th, final written sulomissions received from counsel for Milgaard, and then there's further investigator reports, and then there's a meeting of October 1 , 1990 which you've given evidence of in some detail, and then you've got the activities that followed that, and if we can just scroll onto the next page, please, 79, you have the proceedings leading up to the minister's letter of February the 27 th of 1991?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$ Yes.

And then you have what occurred with respect to the second application, I won't go through that other than to verify that it was on August the 14th of 1991 that the second application relating specifically to Larry Fisher was provided to the department?

That's correct.

And it goes on. I don't think it's necessary for me to go through any of what follows there, there's a chronology that would appear to be, on its face, fairly reflective in a general sense of your activities during the period of time from December the 28 th of 1988 until this document was prepared shortly following the Supreme Court
reference?
Yes.
MR. FRAYER: Thank you, sir. Those are my questions.

BY MR. MCLEOD:
Mr. Williams, as you know, my name is Ken McLeod, I'm your counsel.

Yes.
I have a few questions for you, although you'll be pleased to know that some of the areas $I$ was going to canvass with you have been covered by other counsel.

I would, though, like to start off with the document, please, 152076, that My Learned Friend Mr. Frayer asked you about a few moments ago, and this is -- you recall being asked about this yesterday by My Learned Friend Mr. Wolch?

I do.
And at one point he said to you, this is -- I don't think we need to look at it precisely, but at 39335 of the transcript:
"I'm wondering why you wouldn't share
this with the applicants."
Do you recall that question?

A Yes.
Q
And although despite what Mr. Frayer said a few moments ago, $I$ think when one looks at the transcript surrounding that question, you are basically uncertain if it had been shared with the applicants, but that if it hadn't been, you would take responsibility for it?

Yes.
Mr. Commissioner, this is not so much a question $I$ think Mr. Williams can answer, but $I$ just want to clarify the record in this respect. As I understand it, and perhaps Mr. Hodson or Commission staff can help me with this, there were eight versions or copies of that document provided to the Commission; that is, there were eight sources for that document, and one of those sources was in fact Mr. Wolch's office, and I think it important that we clarify that for the record if we can.

MR. HODSON: I believe Ms. Boswell checked yesterday for this doc. ID and there were eight versions and the one version that had the handwritten notes on it, if $I$ 'm thinking of the same document, was the version that we received from Mr. Wolch on behalf of David Milgaard.

BY MR. MCLEOD:
Q
Perhaps while we're checking it, I can ask another question of Mr. Williams related to that, and you will recall the discussion that you and Mr. Wolch had with respect to the last page of the version of that document, the memo from you to Peter Lugli
that was presented to the Commission that had
handwritten notes, and $I$ think you said
essentially you didn't recognize that and couldn't
account for it?
That's correct.
MR. HODSON: Sorry, if I can, I can confirm
that this version of the document with the notes the Commission received from Mr. Wolch on behalf of David Milgaard, there are eight other versions of the same memorandum. None of those memorandums have the handwritten notes after it. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I seem to have in one place seven copies and --

MR. HODSON: Sorry, there is nine in total. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Nine in total?

MR. HODSON: I misspoke, there's this
version and eight other copies; correct?
MS. BOSWELL: Yes.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.

BY MR. MCLEOD:

Q

A

Q

A
Q

A
Q

So having heard that, Mr. Williams, if Mr. Wolch were to say to you today, "I'm wondering why you wouldn't share this with the applicants," does that refresh your memory?

It would appear that $I$ did share it.
And does it also account for your inability to recognize or identify the handwritten notes that were appended to the document?

Yes.
If we could please look at 004374 , and it would be -- that's your August 28th, 1990 memo to Bruce MacFarlane?

Yes.
If we could please turn to 004380 -- I hope I have the right page -- and if we look at the paragraph down towards the bottom of the page, do you recall
this morning My Friend Ms. McLean asking you a series of questions about particularly the phrase,
"implicated Milgaard," and you see the second
sentence in the first full paragraph that's shown on the screen now:
"Stating that he was weakened by this
intense questioning, Mr. Wilson now asserts that he "implicated Milgaard in
the murder by telling them the things they wanted to hear"."

Do you see that there?
I believe that phrase comes from his June 4th, 1990 statement.

And in order to refresh your memory about that, as
I appreciate or understood the question this morning, it was to the effect that those must have been your words rather than Mr. Wilson's?

MS. McLEAN: Excuse me, I think the witness understood me this morning, but perhaps his counsel didn't. The reference was to Mr. Wilson having implicated Mr. Milgaard in Regina prior to coming to Saskatoon and it was the use of the word "implicated" as regards Regina and what took place in Regina. Do you follow? I think the witness understood it this morning.

MR. McLEOD: Okay. Perhaps maybe I didn't appreciate that, but --

COMMISSIONER MaCCALLUM: Neither one has a corner on the word "implicate" obviously. BY MR. MCLEOD:
$Q$ I understood some of the concern to be, Mr. Williams, and perhaps you did not, that you were effectively putting a gloss on what Mr. Wilson had
said by in part attributing to him the word "implicated"?

A

BY MR. McLEOD:
If we could please have document 124983 , and this is the transcript of your interview, Mr. Williams, with Ronald Wilson on July 20th, 1990?

Yes.
And if we could turn to page, or to 125040, please, and my understanding of this passage is that at about line 564 you are quoting from the

Henderson interview of Mr. Wilson?
A
Q
And that is a quote of the words of Mr. Wilson as they were recorded in the Henderson interview:
"Finally I began to implicate Milgaard
in the murder telling the police the things they wanted to hear."

I believe those were the words contained in the statement. The statement speaks for itself. I don't think $I$ misread it, but, you know, there is a record of that statement.

And then if we turn to --

MS. McLEAN: If we could, just before
turning to the next page, if you carry on there, you see what my point was, is that the suggestion was made to him that he had implicated Mr.

Milgaard and his answers are that that's what I've been told, that's what $I$ see in the transcripts, and what $I$ had pointed out to Mr. Williams at the outset was that when Mr. Wilson agreed at the trial he didn't even understand what the word implicated meant and he had to have it explained to him, so this has been put to him as a contradiction in 1990 when it really wasn't, that was my point.

BY MR. McLEOD:

Q
Perhaps if we could, just to complete the matter, go to 125042, please, and again, Mr. Williams, if you look at the passage starting at line 574, this is your continuing questioning of Mr. Wilson, you see at line, or just at the end of that paragraph, these are his words apparently in response to your question:
"...that's the only way $I$ could see that he was implicated the day before."

A
$Q$

A

2 2 Mr. Williams, I'll take you to another matter, and this arises out of some of Mr. Wolch's questions yesterday with respect to whoever former Justice Minister Campbell's book, and you'll remember that he read you substantial passages from that book and, if $I$ understood you correctly, your general response to that was that you were not consulted
or had no input, at least so far as you
understood, in that chapter in that book. Did I understand that correct?

A

Q
Yes. I mean, I certainly didn't review any drafts or was consulted with some of the factual assertions in there.

And there were two assertions that Mr. Wolch yesterday was concerned about, the one, former Minister Campbel's assertion that you were at one time a defence lawyer, and the second with respect to her understanding of Nichol John's evidence at Mr. Milgaard's preliminary inquiry?

Yes.

All right. And although no objection was taken, Mr. Wolch indicated to you that he felt he could not ask you whether or not you misled former Minister Campbell with respect to either of those matters. Do you recall that?

Yes.
Let's take them one at a time. With respect to the assertion in the book that you had at one time practiced as a defence lawyer, did you at any time advise Minister Campbell or others who might have told her that, that you had practiced as a defence lawyer?

A I did not.
Q
So did you in any way mislead her with respect to that matter?

A

Q

A
I did not. As you will recall, there was a passage in the book that described the materials that she actually had on her table. Among those materials were the preliminary hearing transcripts and it contained the testimony of Nichol John. The minister in the book also indicated that she had reviewed the transcripts and my only speculation at this point is that -- all $\operatorname{l}$ can say is that the raw material of the transcripts, and particularly Nichol John's, was there. The minister reviewed it. Whether between the time of the review and the time that that chapter in the book was written or drafted her memory failed or there was some incorrect reporting of the facts, $I$ don't know.

A
A
$Q$

A

Q

Just with respect to the minister's, the former minister's description of the pile of documents on her desk, $I$ understood you to, at least to infer, that part of your duty was gathering up what you might call the fruits of your labour, your investigations?

Yes.
And is that something that was passed on by you that likely ended up as part of that large pile of materials on the minister's desk?

And just to go back to where we commenced this discussion, Mr. Williams, am I to understand that at no time did you ever mislead the then minister or any other departmental official with respect to those two items Mr. Wolch identified yesterday, Nichol John's evidence at the preliminary inquiry or your having acted as a defence lawyer at one time?

I did not, and each of those areas is quite easy to check, the transcripts are there and my CV was
certainly well known to my employers.
You had said a moment or two ago that you cannot tell us what occurred with respect to former Minister Campbell's recollection of the events between her decision on the first application in February, 1991 and the publication of that book in 1996. However, Mr. Williams, can you tell us whether or not, so far as you have reviewed the matter, the minister's letter of February, 1991 reflects the facts as were brought to you and you uncovered them in the course of your duties as counsel with the department?

A
The portions of the letter that contain a summary of the facts certainly reflect my understanding of them.

MR. McLEOD: Mr. Commissioner, I note the
time, but $I$ do not have a great deal more to go through, so I'm content, subject to the wishes -COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: You can finish, sure.

BY MR. MCLEOD:
$Q$
In response to one of My Learned Friend Mr.
Wolch's questions yesterday, Mr. Williams, you indicated, and $I$ believe, if anybody wants to check, I don't believe we need it, it's at page

39442 of the transcript from yesterday, you indicated more or less that Kim Campbell, at least your understanding was that Kim Campbell had said, and this is with respect to what former Justice McIntyre had:
"Mr. McIntyre had all the evidence available to the government or the Justice Department."

Do you recall giving that response more or less?

I believe that was a quote or a portion of what Mr. Wolch had read.

Now, does Ms. Campbell's commentary in that respect accord with your own recollection or understanding of the informational component that you assisted in putting together, I think you told us, in the latter stages of 1990?

A
2
And, in particular, so far as you understood it, did all of the products of your labours, witness statements, transcripts, that sort of thing, go into a package that was to go to former Justice McIntyre for his review?

A Yes.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Sorry, just state your question again? I got mixed up between

McIntyre and the minister. Did all the products of your labours go to --

MR. McLEOD: -- Justice McIntyre or former Justice McIntyre for the purpose of his review.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.
MR. WOLCH: Mr. Commissioner, I'm not sure what factual findings you will be able to make out of that. It really isn't clear how the witness can say that he knows it went to Justice McIntyre unless that's explored. I mean, is it something he was told, something he saw, something he did, we don't know that, and I don't know where we go from there with that kind of evidence. I'm not going to belabour the point that we still feel we should know what went, but how do we take comfort in a witness saying I understand it went, $I$ know it went, $I$ saw it go. Where do we go with that, if $I$ can sort of ask that question?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes, Mr. McLeod?
MR. McLEOD: I'm content to ask another question about it and I thank My Learned Friend for that. If there's a gap, I probably should fill it.

MR. WOLCH: Thank you.

MR. McLEOD: And anything that remains following the evidence, of course we're all free to make our submissions about it.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.
BY MR. MCLEOD:
Q
Mr. Williams, I understood at one point you were requested to put together a package of materials at least with respect to the work you had done that was to go to Mr. McIntyre?

Yes.
And did you put together that package and did it include, in a sense, your file?

Yes.
And at about what time did that occur; do you recall?

I think late November, 1990 to early December, 1990.

This morning --
MS. McLEAN: I'm sorry, this issue is of vital importance to the Milgaard family, they've been trying for a long time to find out what Mr. McIntyre was doing, what Mr. McIntyre received in addition to this report. My Friend's question says did you send him in that sense your file or did you put together in a sense your
file. Is he asking the witness did you make a photocopy of all of the materials in your file to be delivered to Mr. Milgaard or did you give him -- I'm sorry, not to be delivered to Mr. Milgaard, to be delivered to Mr. McIntyre -- did you send him copies of the entirety of the file, reports from the file? "In a sense" doesn't really help us, if $I$ can ask My Friend.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I didn't hear you say "in a sense". Did you say "in a sense"? MR. MCLEOD: I probably framed it a couple of different ways, sir, and $I$ may have used that phrase. I'm cognizant of the restriction on, well, two fronts, $I$ suppose the ability of this inquiry to look into advice or communications as between counsel within the department or counsel retained by the Department of Justice, so I appreciate that there is a limitation to the extent which Mr. Williams can tell us about that activity there, and so my question was necessarily broad in order to, $I$ hope, respect that limitation.

MR. FRAYER: Mr. Commissioner, I have no difficulty with the broad scope of the question being asked, and Mr. McLeod is very mindful of
the fact that he shouldn't be encroaching on the limitations as set out by Chief Justice Laing. I don't want to be perceived to be taking a different position with Mr. McLeod than I did with Mr. Wolch yesterday and, so it's clear, I have not risen to object to those questions up to this point, but as long as it remains in the general sense -- I use the word sense -- in the way that it has been framed, I'm comfortable with that. If it gets more particularized, then $I$ will have to rise again and say it's limited by what Chief Justice Laing has said. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: It has become a question of weight. If I'm not satisfied with the answer, that the answer truly describes the totality of what was given to Justice Laing -- or to Mr. McIntyre, then it's up to me to find out or to comment on it. I don't think more should be said.

MR. FRAYER: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner.
MR. McLEOD: Thank you, sir.
BY MR. McLEOD:
$Q$ Mr. Williams, you'll recall this morning my friend was, Ms. McLean was asking you, towards the end of her questioning, more or less what you thought the

Milgaard team could have done to have, in a sense, brought an answer to their application sooner? MS. McLEAN: A favourable answer.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: What was that?

BY MR. McLEOD:

A favourable answer?
Yes, I recall that question.
And you provided a couple of examples of things that you felt might have accomplished that?

Yes.

In addition to the items you mentioned this morning $I$ think you've told us, and the effect of what Mr. Frayer was saying or asking you about earlier, was that Milgaard's application proceeded, effectively, in instalments?

Yes.
Bearing in mind my friend Ms. McLean's question from this morning, had the application been brought, in a sense, all at once, had everything that they had been given to you from the outset, could that have had a bearing on the timing of a favourable outcome on the application?

It -- it's possible, but $I$ couldn't go any further than that.

Mr. Williams, you've, $I$ think in some detail at
various points in your testimony, told us about your understanding of your role, your duties as counsel on this particular matter. I'm not going to ask you to go through that again, but bearing that in mind as a sort of a background, you have at various times also expressed -- I think these are the terms you've used -- 'disappointment' or 'dismay', and you used those terms to describe your reaction to certain things that occurred during the course of this application. Having regards to your role or duties in this matter can you elaborate on your disappointment or dismay that you felt at different times?

Yes. I had used the term "disappointment" in response to Commission Counsel's questions about how $I$ felt when there were published reports that were critical of our behaviour, and quite often -and in particular there was a published report quoting counsel for Mr. Milgaard, I think at that time Mr. Asper, as referring to departmental officials as 'The Three Stooges'. Disappointment, I guess, stems from my realization that when $I$ entered the practice of law although, in dealing with counsel opposite whether in a civil or administrative matter or in my role as Crown and
in their role as defence counsel, the relationship between us was always one of respect. And to be characterized as a stooge in a publication which gets widespread dissemination is terribly disappointing, because it signals a complete change in the way in which counsel and professionals deal with each other, and it was disappointing. In -- and there were a number of other things like that.

It is disappointing when --
and in relation to Court applications you make your pitch to the judge, not to the press, and there were a number of incidents like that, and we saw a repetition of that, and that was disappointing because it put us in a -- put us, being the department, in a very unenviable position of having to defend it publicly when we didn't have the facts.
"Dismay", dismay came after
the minister had ordered a new trial and Saskatchewan had, and there were a number of serious allegations against public officials, and the seriousness of those allegations and the potential impact that it may have on their reputations in situations in which no one's
liberty was then at stake, signaled to me that the utmost care be taken to ensure that the factual underpinnings of those accusations were accurate, and based on what $I$ knew at the time it -- that did not appear to be the case. That type of activity, $I$ felt, was dismaying, and it's in that context that $I$ made those remarks.

Can you, in a very brief way, relate that back to how you perceived your role in an application of this kind?

My role, $I$ wasn't the enemy, $I$ was simply the person who went out to ascertain whether the grounds advanced had a factual foundation, and to the extent that we used or relied on the defence and on the Crown, so be it. It was not an adversarial process as we saw it, and consequently where there appeared to be an adversarial approach taken by representatives of the applicants, indeed that was disappointing because it seemed as if the message that we were trying to convey wasn't getting across.

Thank you very much, Mr. Williams. I think, Mr. Commissioner, those are my questions.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thanks, Mr. McLeod.

|  | 1 |  | MR. HODSON: I think that is all. I do not |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 |  | have any further questions. |
|  | 3 |  | If I can thank you, Mr. |
|  | 4 |  | Williams, for your cooperation, and of your |
| 03:13 | 5 |  | counsel and your previous counsel for your |
|  | 6 |  | cooperation. |
|  | 7 |  | I think it's probably |
|  | 8 |  | appropriate to break. Our next witness is |
|  | 9 |  | Mr. Fainstein. |
| 03:13 | 10 |  | COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes. Mr. |
|  | 11 |  | Williams, thank you very much for coming. |
|  | 12 | A | Thank you. |
|  | 13 |  | COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: You're excused. |
|  | 14 |  | (Adjourned at 3:13 p.m.) |
| 03:13 | 15 |  | (Reconvened at 3:33 p.m.) |
|  | 16 |  | MR. HODSON: The next witness, Mr. |
|  | 17 |  | Commissioner, is Spencer Ronald Fainstein. |
|  | 18 |  | SPENCER RONALD FAINSTEIN, Sworn: |
|  | 19 |  | BY MR. HODSON : |
| 03:33 | 20 | Q | Good afternoon, Mr. Fainstein. Thank you for |
|  | 21 |  | agreeing to testify. |
|  | 22 |  | For the record, you're here |
|  | 23 |  | represented by counsel for the federal minister, |
|  | 24 |  | Jennifer Cox and David Frayer; correct? |
| 03:33 | 25 | A | Yes. |
|  |  |  | $\qquad$ Meyer CompuCourt Reporting Certified 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 if we could call up 339840, please, which is a curriculum vitae that you provided to us, and I just want to go through parts of this. I think the, and I'll just lead you through this and ask for some comments, that you were employed with the federal Justice Department from 1972 until 2002; is that correct?

Yes.
And working in the Winnipeg Regional Office for five years and then off to Ottawa for the remainder of your career; is that correct?

That's right.
And it's my understanding that your involvement in the David Milgaard matter, if $I$ can put it that way, is essentially in two respects; the first was acting as counsel for the federal minister in the Supreme Court reference?

That's right.
And, secondly, after, and during the course of and following the Supreme Court reference, you would have been the individual for Federal Justice that looked after the DNA testing on Gail Miller's clothing; is that a fair way to put it?

I did, yes.
Okay. And is it correct that you would have had
little involvement in the investigation of the first application and second application, that your primary involvement began when you became counsel for the Supreme Court reference; is that correct?

That's correct. I had no substantive involvement in the applications for mercy under the 617, 690, 696 process, except that $I$ think there may be one or two proforma letters that $I$ sent out just indicating to Mr. Milgaard what was required so that we could deal with such an application. Right. And, Mr. Fainstein, in our earlier discussions with you and your counsel you are familiar with the limitations in my questioning of you --

Yes.
-- arising out of Chief Justice Laing's decision, namely questions about advice given or received, and I think we have a good understanding between you and $I$ and your counsel on that front. And it's my understanding that your role as counsel before the reference, and your role in looking after the DNA exhibits, was one that did not necessitate the giving and receiving advice on very many occasions; is that fair?

A

Q
.

That -- there were certainly reports on the progress of the proceedings and with respect to the DNA, but --

But, primarily, they would be your activities as opposed to --

Exactly, yes.
Okay. If we can go to the next page, please, just go through some of your work experience. I see here that you appeared as counsel in about 90 cases in the Supreme Court of Canada -- if we drop the nine, you and $I$ are on about the same footing, Mr. Fainstein -- involving criminal and constitutional law over your career; is that correct?

Yes, it is.
And $I$ note with interest, if we can go to page 843, you would have been involved in the Arp decision, is that correct, decision?

I was, yes.
And that was a case involving similar-fact evidence?

Yes, and DNA. And Borden, which I mention a little bit before that, was the first DNA case that was entertained by the Supreme Court of Canada.

A

If we can just go back up to that, 1994, so you would have had some involvement in litigating before the Supreme Court on issues relating to DNA and similar-fact evidence?

I did.
If we can go to page 339845. It's my
understanding, Mr. Fainstein, from your curriculum
vitae that for a time period, and $I$ think you say 1977 to mid-1980s, you were involved in dealing with applications under -- you've listed various sections, if we can go up, 617 being the primary one, and 690, but as well 748 and 749 , the royal prerogative of mercy, that you would have been involved in handling those applications; is that correct?

Yes, I was, this was one component of my practice and a fairly substantial one at times.

And again, $I$ don't want to get into much in the way of details of those applications, but would you have performed essentially a similar function on those applications as Mr. Williams did on David Milgaard's first application? I did, yes.

And approximately how many applications would you have been involved in in your career as far as
being the investigator, just a rough ballpark?

A

2

A
Q

My guess would be between 200 and 300 files would have been opened and dealt with by me.

And, again, $I$ don't want to get into the details but they would be applications for a remedy under 617, or a similar provision, for the mercy of the Crown alleging a wrongful conviction?

Yes.
And you would investigate those and they would go through and be dealt with by the minister?

That's right.
You've identified a couple of examples here where the minister granted relief, and $I$ think you listed Donald Marshall, on the next page Warwick and St. Cyr, and were those matters that you would have had some involvement in then?

They were, yes.
And if we could go down, then, you describe your involvement in the Milgaard case as counsel. And just -- just generally, Mr. Fainstein, can you comment on the following. Would you agree that the David Milgaard case, and in particular the application under Section 690, would have been a case that may have been more difficult or more challenging than many of the others, or can you
give us some general idea of that?
A
I certainly encountered a number of challenging cases over the years but $I$ must say that this case, especially the way it unfolded, was a very challenging case, just from what $I$ could see from the sidelines and from what $I$ learned during the reference process, and $I$ think that that's validated by the Supreme Court's advice to the Governor-in-Council.

There is one sentence, as you
know, that $I$ would like to highlight, and maybe this is as good a time as any? Sure.

It's at the top of page 6 of the advice that was given, and $I$ think it's around April 14 th or $15 t h$ of 1992, by the Supreme Court. Some might refer to it as a judgement but technically, when the Court is giving its answer to a reference, it's advice to the Crown. And $I$ don't see it in front of me there, but --

I can bring it up, 008879 , and go to page 87.
Thank you.
Don't worry, I'll let you go back to your CV. Go to page 87.

I'll -- thank you. Yes, the Court says there, at
the top of the page:
"... we are not satisfied, on the basis
of the judicial record, the Reference case and the further evidence heard on this Reference, on a preponderance of all the evidence, that David Milgaard is innocent of that murder."

This was the Court expressing its view, having been exposed to everything but the DNA evidence essentially, that it wasn't satisfied that he did not commit the murder.

And so, if someone wants to
speak about tunnel vision or other failings, I
think it's very important to recognize that this was a panel of five learned justices, highly intelligent people, dispassionate, with no axe to grind, and their view at the end of the proceedings was that they couldn't say, on a balance of probabilities, that he was innocent. It was at least equally possible that he was the culprit in this case. And so I think that highlights very clearly the degree of difficulty that was inherent in this case when you look at all the facts together.

> It's very easy, with the
benefit of hindsight, to eviscerate the case, to abstract certain references, and to create a web that suggests something different, but $I$ think this is a very important touchstone for the Commission when it's evaluating exactly what transpired.

Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
-- moment and indicate why $I$ was so enthralled with this?

Yes.
A
Okay. And we'll come back to the reference a little bit later, Mr. Fainstein. If we can just go back to 339847?

Yes.
You then talk about DNA evidence and some of your involvement there in 1992, and then as well $I$ think there's another reference. Can you tell us, did you become fairly familiar, then, with DNA issues as a result of your involvement in the David Milgaard matter, but, as well as other matters for the Department of Justice?

I did. I was absolutely fascinated by this. I don't have a background in science, but may $I$ just take a --

Yes.

Apart from the fact that it's a fantastic gift
from science to the resolution of serious criminal cases -- I shouldn't even say 'apart from', I mean that's fantastic -- but as $I$ understand it the average person has something like 100 trillion cells in his and her body, and all those cells apart from red blood cells, which have no nuclei, and sperm or egg cells which only have half the complement of DNA, have, in the 23 pairs of chromosomes in the nucleus, one's full genetic blueprint. And so you take something that's in the nucleus of 100 -trillionth of yourself, and you find that the DNA within the 23 pairs of chromosomes is expressed in pairs of organic bases. Adenine and guanine always mesh together -- it's like a ladder, the double helix, and so there are complementary bases at each rung -- and thymine and cytosine are the other two, and you have a sequence of bases.

You know that computers
operate on the binary system, it's like a switch is either on or off, and you can see how much information they can contain. This system, which nature has provided for us, is a quaternary system with these four bases, and in a single cell within the nucleus of that cell, within the 23 pairs of
chromosomes, there are more than 3 billion pairs of organic bases. Now that just blows me away. I can't imagine a microcosm like that. And the fact that scientists can deal with that, that they can focus on specific sites within those chromosomes, is almost miraculous to my non-scientific mind, and so $I$ have been very, very fascinated by this. And it was that, and it was my experience with Milgaard, that caused me to feel that it was very important that the Department of Justice got up to speed on this, and that legislation be passed providing for DNA warrants, for data banks, and that we establish a DNA resource centre so we could bring our counsel up to speed, and so forth, and so I did continue to remain involved in this area within the department.

Can you tell us just generally in 1992 then, at that time where was -- and we've heard some evidence that DNA had been evolutionary starting mid to late '80s --

A Yes.
-- as a forensic tool. 1992, if you're able to go back, at the time you started the reference case Central Booking - Call Irene @ 1-800-667-6777 or go to www.compucourt.tv

A Right.
Q
-- what was the status of the prevalence of DNA in the legal world?

A
Q
A
Okay. If $I$ can just go back a little bit -Sure.
-- to give you a more complete picture very quickly?

DNA was first used in a
forensic context in England in 1986 in the Pitchfork case. And that was the case where there had been two separate murders at different times, the police secured a confession from one Richard Buckland, and the policeman who was investigating felt that the person who committed that particular offence must have been responsible for the other one as well so he went to Alec Jeffries, now Sir Alec Jeffries who developed DNA fingerprinting, and, with the appropriate samples, and he asked him to see if his thesis was correct. And the scientist said "well, $I$ have some good news and some bad news for you, you were right in surmising that the same person committed the two offences, but that person is not Richard Buckland".

And so the first use of DNA in
a forensic context in criminal matters was to
eliminate a suspect, someone who had actually confessed, and that's a very famous case written about by Joseph Wambaugh in a book called The Blooding. So it's as recently as 1986 that this began.

And then the main test that was developed early on was one called RFLP, but that required a certain quantity of material to work with and it wasn't as effective with old and degraded materials as more recent tests that superceded it have been. And then there were other developments, one major one being the invention of a sort of a molecular Xerox machine that would facilitate the -- a process called Polymerase Chain Reaction, $P C R$, which enabled the scientists to take a very minute quantity, we're talking about billionths of a gram of DNA, and to replicate it through a number of cycles so they would have more material to work with. And so they developed very, very sensitive tests that required only the use of perhaps as little as . 2 of an nanogram, . 2 of 1 -billionth of a gram of genetic material, or 1 nanogram of genetic material, to get the most remarkable results. And, of course, all of that was happening over
time.

I, my first involvement with
the DNA in this connection is when $I$ was asked to be counsel for the Attorney General of Canada on the reference. And the first thing I did, we didn't have much time before the reference was actually going to begin and $I$ had very little acquaintance with case by then so $I$ had to sit and read through, literally, thousands of pages of material to learn everything $I$ could about the case, and one of the things that $I$ came across was a letter that $I$ don't recall extremely well, but $I$ did refer to it in Court so that's refreshed my memory, to the effect that 'within about two years there will be far more sophisticated testing measures available and we will be able to accomplish a lot more at that time'. And $I$ noted, when $I$ encountered the letter, that that had been written about two years before. So one of the first things that $I$ did, along with reading material for background in the case, was to consult Dr. Ron Fourney, F-O-U-R-N-E-Y, who was the chief research scientist for the RCMP in the area of DNA and a very well-known and reputed scientist in DNA circles worldwide, and to ask
him, you know, what we could do with this tool. And what he had to say was quite encouraging, and so $I$ asked counsel for David Milgaard and for Larry Fisher if they would give me samples of blood to use as known samples for DNA testing, and secured the release of exhibits. I think some of them may have been in Saskatoon at the time, and some in Ottawa, $I$ don't recall that.

That would have been around -- while the reference was going on?

This was early on in the reference.
Yeah.
At the end of January of 1992 .
Right. And I'll maybe call up a couple of documents --

Okay.
-- to go through that. Just on Dr. Fourney, would he have been your primary advisor then throughout this process?

Yes, he was. I met other people in the lab and got to know them a little bit, but $I$ was relying on Dr. Fourney essentially for my advice.

Let's just -- if we can maybe leave the DNA for a moment and just go through a couple of other items
that lead up to the reference and then we'll pick it up again.

The first is 333272, please, and there's a couple of letters here I want to ask you about, and this is Mr. Milgaard's January 28th, 1986 letter to John Crosbie and indicating that he is innocent and referring to the Fifth Estate program?

A
Q

A
Q

A
$Q$

A
Q
A

Culliton's recitation of the facts as he understood them.
$Q$

A

Q

A

Q
Right. So, I'm sorry, yes, so this would have been based on what you read in the Court of Appeal decision?

Yes.
And then here is your, $I$ think this is a draft letter that ends up going out that you would have prepared to be sent out; is that correct?

That's right.
And we've been through this a few times, but essentially saying:
"...you may make application to the minister for relief. We would request the following from you: A brief ... detailing why you say that there was an injustice; copies of transcripts of the preliminary hearing and trial; copies of any judgments..."

Etcetera, and:
"On receipt of this material your
application will be duly considered."
And the requirement for transcripts, can you just comment on that? At that time what was the purpose of that?

A

Q

So we would have as much background as possible as to how the case had unfolded and how it had been dealt with through the various stages of courts. These applications only come to the department after all conventional recourse has been exhausted and so there must necessarily have been transcripts prepared for the appeal process. If we can go to 333264 , it appears that in light of Mr. Milgaard's letter, you opened a file in anticipation of getting an application; is that fair?

Yes.
And then 333268, I think is, just for the record, a March 11, '86 letter to Mr. Milgaard -- if we can go to the next page -- it's from Henry Brown, the fellow you sent it to, and $I$ think it roughly tracks your memo?

Yes.
I don't think anything turns on the wording. Right.

And then 333266, this is Mr. Milgaard's letter back to Mr. Crosbie. Are you able to tell us at this time, Mr. Fainstein, were you the lawyer looking after these applications; is that -- or were there others as well, but were you the main
person?

A
This may have been the moment of transition for me. I can't place it all that well, but from the time $I$ moved to Ottawa in the summer of 1977 until sometime in the mid $1980 s$, I was doing virtually all the applications for mercy with the exception of those that came in French, but at some point, perhaps roughly around then, $I$ was doing other things as well, $I$ had a full litigation practice, I had the good fortune of being able to litigate in the Supreme Court from a fairly early stage, and there was an awful lot going on, and my assistant Deputy Attorney General I believe in his wisdom decided that maybe $I$ should hand off some or all of this mercy work to enable me to concentrate more on some other matters.

So there was a transition at some point?
At some point.
Around this time?
Somewhere in there.
But it appears in light of the fact that you drafted the earlier letter --

Right.
-- you would have had some involvement at this time?

A
$Q$
 Crosbie saying:
"I am aware of how to proceed legally and have a reputable solicitor, Mr.

Hersh Wolch, presently retained."
And goes on to talk about it. And it's my understanding that you would have known Mr. Wolch at this time having worked with him; is that right, prior to this?

Yes, very well. Mr. Wolch was in the Winnipeg regional office of justice when $I$ joined it as an articled student and, if $I$ recall correctly, he was probably on the board that hired me.

Go to 157000 --
No, actually $I$ don't think you were, sorry. I remember now who it was.

This is a May 28 th, 1986 letter from you back to Mr. Milgaard indicating about the letter and saying:
"We look forward to receiving Mr.
Wolch's representations in connection with your application for mercy."

Now, the record shows that the application was
filed December 28th, 1988. Do you recall any discussions with Mr. Wolch during that time frame about section 617, any legal requirements, anything of that nature?

A

Q

No, I have no recollection of that at all, I'm sorry.

Go to 002486. I'm just going to go through some of these documents somewhat chronologically, Mr. Fainstein. This is a September 13 th, 1988 report of Dr. Ferris to Mr. Wolch, and if we can go to page 492, this is the last page, and would you have been at some point in 1992 generally aware that a fellow by the name of Dr. Ferris attempted DNA testing on some of Gail Miller's clothing, did you at some point become aware of that?

At some point $I$ did, but $I$ don't recall when that was.

And this is the actual report, and this was filed I think for another purpose, this dealt with the secretor issue?

Uh-huh.
It was filed as part of the first application, but it's, $I$ think it is the extent of Dr. Ferris' report on the DNA?

Uh-huh.

And what was your understanding, maybe just generally, of what Dr. Ferris had looked at and what his conclusions were?

A
$Q$

A

Q
Okay. If I may just clarify?
Yes.
I may not have encountered this, probably didn't I think, until $I$ was assigned to serve as counsel on the reference.

Right, sorry, $I$ didn't mean to suggest that you were.

A

Q

A
Q

A
$Q$

A Right.

I'm talking, and I appreciate it's dated September, 1988 --

Right.
-- but in 1992 when you were dealing with DNA issues --

Yes.
-- do you think you would have looked at this and --

Oh, I definitely did, $I$ was aware of it, and $I$ was dismayed that the testing was done without result, some precious material was sacrificed and I didn't know what sort of qualifications or background Dr. Ferris had to be doing this work and that sort of compounded my concern.

7
8

9

Q
A
$Q$
A

Q

A

Q
A

Q
Q id you come to realize later at any point in your work that either the samples used by Dr. Ferris could have been looked at by another scientist and maybe obtained results or that had he not done the work he did in 1988, that other work could have been done much sooner?

Well, we just don't know because some material was consumed in that process and we didn't know what the consequence of that would be until much later. Go to 000002, and this is the first application made under Section 690, and just for the record, it's my understanding then that you would have had little or no involvement in responding or investigating this matter; is that correct?

That's right. I believe Mr. Wolch sent me a copy of it because he knew $I$ had been working in the area and he knew me, but as it turned out, Mr. Williams did the substantive work on the case. And if we can go to 002479 , and I'm going to show you two documents before $I$ ask you a question. This is just Mr. Williams' memo to file about talking to Barry Gaudette and DNA testing and current technology would not enable, will be developed within two years, and then secondly, a letter, 002480 --

That must be the memo that $I$ had seen.
Actually, sorry, maybe the memo -- this is a letter two days later from the RCMP to Mr. Williams that talks about -- scroll down to the bottom -- about two years' time. Is this possibly the letter that you came across in 199 -- late
'91, '92?
A
Quite likely, yes. Can $I$ just see that for a moment?

Sure.
I'm just curious, $I$ haven't seen it in a long, long time. Yeah, the concern was that the -- the standard technique that was used at that time, wherever possible, was RFLP, but that required a good deal of material and they were concerned that -- it was unlikely that there would be enough to subject to that process, so they were anxious to wait a little while until much better testing was available because they new it was in the offing. Would you like me to speak
briefly to what was required? You know, they had the theory worked out, they were very excited about what was in prospect, but before these things could be used in court certain things had to be done.

They had to develop a protocol
so that the work could be replicated, it would all be done in a standard fashion by whatever lab was doing it, they had to determine what the limits of the testing would be, how sensitive it would be, they had to determine if it could work well with
material that was degraded or subject to whatever kind of environment insult, be it chemical or whatever, and ultimately they had to determine what would be the significance of a match if there was a match and they would develop population statistics to understand the frequency with which any given profile would occur within a population, so these were all the steps that were required from the time the basic science had been worked out.

So it's my understanding then that people were aware of this PCR which allowed replication which held some promise for old and degraded samples? Yes.

But the scientists, it's my understanding, were not prepared to provide opinions on it until matters were checked out and they could give reliable opinions that would stand up in court; is that a fair way to put it, that -PCR is not a test per se, it's an element in the process.

Okay.
That's the molecular Xerox machine process, to put it in lay terms, that's the process that makes more DNA from a tiny sample and enables a
successful analysis using very little material. PCR-based processes that were in the offing were starting to be used depending on what time frame you look at, were such things as DQ Alpha and short tandem repeats, they both used PCR as part and parcel of their processes, but although there was more experience at that point with DQ Alpha, it had some limitations that suggested to the scientists that it would be better if possible to await the availability of short tandem repeats. And so both DQ Alpha and I think, was it Polymarker, was that another PCR -Yes.

PCR-based DNA typing was a scientific process that involved the PCR process; is that correct?

I'm sorry, could you say it again?
Just so that $I$ understand this, the PCR process was the replication?

Yes.
And there were different techniques -- maybe that's the wrong word.

Different tests.
-- tests to look at what was replicated to do the DNA match?

A
Yes.
$Q$

BY MR. HODSON:
Oh, Polymarker. Is that related to DQ Alpha or is that --

They have been used in tandem and that's what Dr. Blaise ultimately suggested we use here, DQ Alpha and Polymarker.

And so those are two different test proceedings? That's right.

And without getting too technical, would the different tests be looking at different parts of the molecule or the DNA, looking at different parts and comparing different parts, was that -Yes, and they use somewhat different mechanisms. The DQ Alpha test was what they called the dot blot test, they subjected the DNA that they wanted to type to a strip that had dots on it with certain probes that would pick up the existence of particular profiles if they existed in that sample and the short tandem repeats process was more akin to RFLP in that it measured the length of
fragments of DNA at a particular locus in a person's chromosome.
$Q$

A
Q

A
Q
A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A
Q Right. And then we've also heard about the Roche Laboratory in North Carolina that had done some DQ Alpha?


A Yes.

Q

A
$Q$

A

Q

A

And various other labs, so that it wasn't the case if there's one type of DNA and every scientist does it the same way, that it was developing in different parts of the world at different speeds? It was, and I expect that some labs were using more than one technique. I can distinguish between the two PCR-based techniques that are germane here if you like?

Sure.
Just very briefly.
And just, sorry, before that, for the benefit of you, Mr. Commissioner, we are going to get into the significance of this when we hit the 1995 time period, so I think it's helpful if you explain that.

There were several limitations with DQ Alpha that made it less preferable than short tandem repeats when the latter became available. Basically there was some concern about whether it was the best test to use when there were mixed samples. Very often, especially in sexual assault cases, you had some genetic material from the complainant or victim and some from the assailant and there were techniques of preferential extraction of materials
where you could break down the, let's say, the female component of the materials first and hopefully centrifuge that out and analyse it separately and then break down the spermatozoa which are more hardy using a stronger chemical bath and analyse that separately, but the reality was that in many instances you would still end up with some sort of a mixture in spite of having sorted most of it out.

You see, with the DQ Alpha
test, you either got a dot reacting or not reacting and so you could have a multiplicity of dots and not know exactly whose profile you were looking at because you could have a bit from each of the parties involved, so that was one concern.

Another thing was that short
tandem repeats has been found to be extremely good with old and degraded and very challenged material. I'm getting a bit ahead of myself, but certainly -- well, $I$ guess I should wait about that.
$Q$
That's fine, we can come back to that.
A
And if $I$ can just add one --
Yes.
-- just to finish the thought. The main thing was
that DQ Alpha profiles would be much more common in the population than an STR profile would be and so there was a chance of a random match. If you had a match, you couldn't say almost without a doubt, as you often can do with short tandem repeats, that you got the right person.
$Q$
A
So --
You could only say that it's possible that the genetic material came from this person, but you have to acknowledge that in a city of medium size there could be thousands of other people in the city any of whom could have contributed that profile.
$Q$

A 1ess?

Yes.
And it's my understanding that DQ Alpha, although it could eliminate an individual in some cases, that if it was a match, that all that might mean is that you are one of thousands that could have been the contributor, whereas short tandem repeat was more discriminatory and that if it was a match, you would be one in a much larger number; is that fair?

A Exactly.

Q

A

And was it your understanding that -- is DQ Alpha still used today?

No. I had a chat with Dr. Fourney recently just to understand what has been happening since $I$ retired and he tells me that short tandem repeats is the standard used by the FBI, used by the Armed Forces pathology labs in the United States, used by labs in Europe, used by the Forensic Science Service in England and used for our own DNA data bank in Canada and, moreover, the DQ Alpha test kits with the dot blot strips are no longer manufactured.

If we could go to 000901 , this is the second application, and I don't believe -- the first application under Section 690 or the second application under Section 690. To your knowledge, did either of these raise the issue of DNA testing?

No, I don't believe they did.
And I think we've heard some evidence that in each of these, or at the time that Mr. Milgaard was prepared to have his blood or whatever tested at any time; in other words, that if tests were available he was prepared to take them; is that your understanding?

A I'm sorry, I cycled out for a moment.
Q
A

Q

A
$Q$
A
$Q$
A
Q

A
work, so, you know, it's understandable that they would be pessimistic for sure.

Go ahead to 002663, please. Sorry, let me back up, 157840 , and this is the letter that sets up the reference case, and maybe you can just tell us generally, Mr. Fainstein, what was your role on behalf of the Federal Minister? If you want to go to the order we can, just go to the third page. Can you tell us generally, what was your role -Yes.
-- in the Supreme Court reference?
Well, it was a multifarious role. For one thing, the court didn't have all of the resources and facilities that commissions of inquiry have, they didn't have a secretariat to assist them, and so it fell to me and to counsel working with me, Rob Frater, to do a lot of that. We liaised between the court and counsel, we did our best to bring everyone onto the same page when there were controversies or concerns to see that everyone was satisfied to the extent they could be with how things were proceeding, we arranged for the subpoenas and all of the logistics for the attendance of witnesses, we dealt with all the other counsel with respect to what witnesses
should be called and when and what subjects should be tackled at what time. An issue developed early on in the reference as to what test the court should apply ultimately and there was a bit of a kerfuffle over that. We had a sense around the time that the reference started, or maybe a little before, that there would be an onus on Mr. Milgaard to demonstrate on a balance of probabilities that he in fact did not commit the offence and then there was a comment made by the Chief Justice in chambers that suggested that if the Crown couldn't prove its case beyond a reasonable doubt all these many years after the fact, that that might be enough to warrant a remedy, and then the day after that, which as I'm sure you'll imagine left us in some disarray, the court invited counsel to make representations as to what the test should be, and on behalf of the Attorney General of Canada I submitted a brief and briefs were submitted by other counsel as well and then the court issued a ruling as to what the guidelines were to be.

And as far as the -- maybe just go to the next page. I think you described it as an opinion from the court?

Q

A
Q
A
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A Yes.
And I believe that, and I'll take you to this a bit later in some of your opening submissions, essentially $I$ think your position was that the Supreme Court of Canada was in the same position of the Federal Minister and they could hear or receive any information that the Federal Minister could receive to consider whether or not David Milgaard's continued conviction constituted a miscarriage of justice and, in effect, get the same information the Federal Minister could so that the court could give their advice to the minister. Is that a fair way to put it?

I think it is, yes. That was my understanding.
And so that as far as the rules of evidence, I think they were relaxed somewhat? They were.

And --
I believe the Chief Justice referred to fairness and natural justice as being the relevance.

And would it be fair to describe the relevancy parameters as being any evidence or information that might go to the issue of whether or not David Milgaard's continued conviction constituted a miscarriage of justice?

That was certainly my appreciation of the situation.

What about the calling of witnesses then, $I$ think you said you were the individual responsible, primarily responsible for that. How did that work, who decided in practical terms what witnesses were called?

No, actually there was a lot of, there were a lot of interchanges between counsel. I should go back a little bit. I mean, the first indication we received from the court was that, you know, this was the court's reference, it had a job to do and it was going to decide, you know, what it wanted to entertain, who it wanted to hear from, it was going to be asking most of the questions and then counsel, if they wished, could supplement those questions, that was sort of a first indication, but I think it very quickly became clear that this was a case that had, that involved a good many factors, countless details, required fairly Encyclopedic knowledge of all the facts, and that the court needed assistance to determine exactly, you know, what were the major issues that it should entertain and it needed help in eliciting from the witnesses what the counsel who had been
representing various interests as the case developed felt were important, and so it became a more conventional proceeding at that point with myself and Mr. Frater chasing after the other counsel to say, hopefully by a short deadiine because we were going to start very soon, okay, you know, what issues do you feel we should lead with and what witnesses do you feel should be called, and then in the event of any controversy, we sought, we tried to see to what extent we could sort that out, and then there were some discussions in chambers and the court said okay, we'll hear from $X, Y$ and $Z$ on this issue. So, as far as witnesses who could be called, counsel could come to you and say "we want the following ten witnesses", --

A
$Q$

A Yes.
-- and then what, you would then say "okay" or would you go to the Court and get their blessing, or how did that work?

It wasn't for us, ultimately, to say, we were just facilitating things, but we certainly were liaising between counsel and the court trying to ensure that everyone got what they needed and we were able to make progress.

Q of discussions in chambers from time to time with all the counsel present where we went through various of these things but, you know, in order to make them as productive as possible there was often material in writing submitted in advance so that all the counsel could consider that and digest it, and then we got some direction from the Court. Now there may have been some times where the Court communicated with me and I communicated, in turn, with the other counsel, --

Do you recall ---- there undoubtedly were.

Do you recall whether there were many or any instances where, for example, counsel for David Milgaard would ask to have a witness called and the Court would say "no"?

I remember one instance where the Court wanted to hear from a witness that no one else really felt would contribute very much, and that was Albert

Would it be correct to say that, where witnesses had been identified, that you would go to the Court and unless they said "no" you would go and call them, or -- I'm just trying to understand that?

Umm, yes, I -- well, generally there were a number

2
A

Cadrain, because of his disability. But I don't recall -- and it's very important for me to couch this in this way because $I$ just don't remember -I don't recall the Chief Justice or the panel ever foreclosing the calling of any witness that any of the counsel felt the Court should hear because what he or she had to say was germane to the terms of the reference.

And maybe, more specifically, any police officers or former police officers who were involved in the investigation of Gail Miller's death; do you recall whether the Court said "no" to any of those police officers being called as a witness?

No. Now I know there is a suggestion by Mr. Wolch that that was foreclosed, and I wish I could help further, but all $I$ can really say from my own recollection is that two officers did testify, of course that was Art Roberts and Officer Karst, and I know that two others were subpoenaed, being Short and Mackie, and of course the subpoenas were issued by the Court so, you know, you can read into that what you will. It would seem that that carried some sort of Imprimatur from the Court. But it was learned, in the process of trying to serve those subpoenas, that Mr. Short was
apparently quite ill and unable to travel, and Mr. Mackie, $I$ think, was ultimately tracked down in Phoenix.

Yes, $I$ think that's what the record reflects.
And $I$ understand, from reading through
Mr. Pearson's notes, that he had some discussion with Eugene Williams about the possible use of the Court's closed-circuit facilities to receive some evidence from distant witnesses.

Is that something you would have entertained for Mr. Short?

I wouldn't have had a problem with it because the Court -- you see, it used to be the case years ago that, before the Court had that facility, that applications for leave to appeal, which were limited to 15 -minute submissions, were made by counsel in person, and so counsel would have to come across country at great expense to present themselves, and the Court finally dealt with that by putting in $T V$ monitors and all the other facilities that were needed for two-way closed-circuit proceedings where counsel in Vancouver or Halifax, or whatever, could make his application for leave to appeal without having to travel, and he could see the Court in turn. And
so they were available, they were in the courts, the Court was comfortable with using them, and that was one possibility. But $I$ have no idea whatever became of that suggestion except that that never happened.

Okay. And then, as far as Mr. Mackie being out of country, --

Yes.
-- I think we heard some evidence or saw some documents that he was away until sometime in the spring, but do you have any recollection of whether efforts were made to wait for him or bring him in, or things of that nature?

No. And $I$ must say that, given my division of labour with Mr. Frater, that would have been something that he would have dealt with primarily.

And what about other police officers then? I don't, I don't recall seeing on the record a request for other police officers, but for example if Mr. Penkala or some of the other officers were involved, if counsel wished to have them called to give evidence would that have been any difficulty from your end or from the Court's end, based on your dealings with the Court?

The Court had a job to do which was framed by the
terms of reference, it said that the rules of evidence which normally obtain in Court proceedings didn't apply, that things could be a bit more freewheeling than that, and they were limited only by relevance and fairness and natural justice. And so I think there was an expectation on the part of the court that anything that any of the counsel representing any interest felt was germane and important for the court to consider should be proposed and the Court, if it agreed with that characterization, would accept it and hear the witness.
$Q$
And for example on the issue of police misconduct in the investigation of David Milgaard, and in particular the police interaction with witnesses who gave evidence against David Milgaard at the trial, would that be the type of evidence and information, in your view, would have been properly brought before the court on the reference?

Umm, given concern as to how the statements of Ron Wilson and Nichol John were obtained, and especially in light of Ron Wilson's recantation and Nichol John's extreme difficulty with recall, I think it would have been absolutely germane to
consider whether -- what, well, what sort of conduct there was on the part of police who took these young people from Regina to Saskatoon before they were polygraphed, and how they were dealt with, and whether that possibly contributed to a miscarriage. Because, according to the one view that was propounded, that was the case.

Now --
And so, I mean, how can you expound that view and -- on the one hand, and not want that evidence entertained by the panel that's making these decisions.

Was that your understanding of Mr. Roberts and Mr. Karst's evidence, primarily to give evidence about their interaction with Nichol John and Ron Wilson?

A
Umm, yes. Roberts was the --
Polygraph?
-- polygraphist, he was from the Calgary City Police, and he spoke at length about his role in the proceedings. I recall some of the things that Karst did but $I$ don't recall his evidence, particularly, at this juncture.

But was it your understanding that the issue of police misconduct, or police conduct and how they
dealt with the main witnesses in the case against David Milgaard, was an issue that was before the Supreme Court reference in considering whether a miscarriage of justice had or would occur? If anyone had asked me for my opinion at the time I would have said absolutely, and if I had been representing interests that might have been affected by that $I$ would have insisted that those officers be heard, if $I$ had any suspicion that something untoward transpired.

And so as, in your role as counsel for the federal minister, if something would have come to your attention that suggested police misconduct or even Crown misconduct in the course of evidence that was there, you would have gone and called that evidence, is that -- or made arrangements to try and get that evidence in?

Absolutely.
Probably an appropriate spot to break for the day, Mr. Commissioner. I think, if we can get a start at 9:00 tomorrow, we can hopefully get

Mr. Fainstein done tomorrow.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.
(Adjourned at 4:30 p.m.)
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