Commission of Inquiry

Into the Wrongful

Conviction of David Milgaard

before

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE

EDWARD P. MacCALLUM

Transcript of Proceedings

and

Testimony before the Commission sitting at the

Bessborough Hotel at

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan

On Thursday, January 27th, 2005

Volume 10

Inquiry Proceedings



Commission Staff:

Mr. Douglas C. Hodson, Commission Counsel

Jordan Hardy, Esq., Assistant Commission Counsel

John Agioritis, Esq., Assistant Commission Counsel

Chris Veeman, Esq., Assistant Commission Counsel

Ms. Candace D. Congram, Executive Director/Media Liaison

Ms. Sandra Boswell, Document Manager

Ms. Kara Isabelle, Document Assistant

Ms. Cheryl Ellerman, Document Assistant

Support Staff:

Ms. Irene Beitel, Clerk to the Commission

Ms. Karen Hinz, CSR, and Official Q.B. Court Reporters

Mr. Donald G. Meyer, RPR, CSR,

Mr. Jerry Wilde, Security Officer

Mr. Tony Fitzpatrick, Inland Audio Technician



Appearances:

Mr. Hersh Wolch, Q.C., for Mr. David Milgaard

Mrs. Joyce Milgaard, appearing without counsel

Ms. Lana Krogan, for Government of Saskatchewan

Ms. Catherine Knox, for Mr. T.D.R. (Bobs) Caldwell

Mr. Jay Watson, Esq., for Mr. Serge Kujawa

Mr. Rick Elson, Esq., for the Saskatoon Police Service

Mr. Chris Boychuk, Esq., for Mr. Eddie Karst

Mr. Bruce Gibson, Esq., for the RCMP

and Ms. Rochelle Wempe,

Mr. Brian A. Beresh, Esq., for Mr. Larry Fisher



INDEX OF PROCEEDINGS

DESCRIPTION:	PAGE:
HARRY EDMUND EMSON (CONTINUED)	
BY MR. BERESH	1373
BY MR. ELSON	1427
BY MR. GIBSON	1448
BY MS. KNOX	1461
BY MR. HODSON	1488
BY COMMISSIONER MACCALLUM	1492



= Page 1372 *=*

INDEX OF EXHIBITS

<u>NO</u> :	DESCRIPTION:	PAGE:
>EXHIBIT	<u>P-3</u> :	
TWO LARGE	PHOTOGRAPHS OF AUTOPSY	1426
(BATES ID	NUMBERS 241975 & 241973).	
> <u>EXHIBIT</u>	P-4:	
KNIFE BLAD	DE AND EVIDENCE BAG.	1491



			· ·
	1		Transcript of Proceedings
	2		(Reconvened at 10:04 a.m.)
	3		COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Mr. Beresh?
	4		MR. BERESH: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner.
10:04	5		I hope not to be too long with this witness.
	6	HAR	RY EDMUND EMSON (continued), previously sworn:
	7	ву	MR. BERESH:
	8	Q	My name is Brian Beresh, and I represent Mr.
	9		Fisher, and I'm pleased to see you have returned.
10:04	10		After yesterday, I thought we might have to get a
	11		warrant to bring you here, but I'm pleased that
	12		you are here.
	13	А	I didn't know that I had an option.
	14	Q	But we appreciate your co-operation.
10:04	15		Many things, of course, have
	16		changed since 1969, you told us that yesterday, in
	17		terms of investigation, in terms of roles
	18		individuals played; is that fair?
	19	A	Yes.
10:04	20	Q	All right. In 1969 I think Mr. Wolch was a Crown
	21		prosecutor, now he has come to the light side, so
	22		there have been many changes, and this morning I
	23		want to ask you some questions in a specific area
	24		and then some questions of a more general nature,
10:05	25		if I can, please.

	1		And, first of all, it involves
	2		some evidence you touched on yesterday. And just
	3		to assist your memory, I would like to see
	4		document 066732, please. You will recall
10:05	5		yesterday, Doctor, that we spoke of the apparent
	6		injury above the deceased's left breast?
	7	А	Yes.
	8	Q	And I have drawn a circle around it. My only
	9		question regarding that is that appears to be an
10:05	10		injury of some recency, is that fair, and by
	11		"recency" I mean prior to death?
	12	А	Yes.
	13	Q	Okay. And
	14	A	Let me qualify that. It could have been, I think,
10:06	15		inflicted at the time of or just after death.
	16	Q	Fair enough. But my understanding from my
	17		pathological knowledge, which is extensive I
	18		should tell you, is that bruising doesn't often
	19		occur for very long after death; is that fair?
10:06	20	A	I'm sorry, I don't understand that, you mean
	21		bruising doesn't remain after death or is not
	22		caused after death?
	23	Q	It is not caused, that shortly, if an injury is
	24		inflicted at a point after death, there are some
10:06	25		instances where we could expect no bruising at

	ī		Page 1375 ————
			r ago 1070
	1		all; is that fair?
	2	А	There would be none, or very little, because if
	3		the circulation has stopped there is no supply of
	4		red cells.
10:06	5	Q	Exactly. So, although we don't know, this is
	6		likely to have been caused before death or shortly
	7		after death; is that fair?
	8	А	Before, at, or around the time of death I would
	9		say.
10:06	10	Q	It had been my understanding that there were some
	11		enhanced photographs of this injury, but none
	12		could be found this morning, so dealing with this;
	13		this injury appears to be circular in nature?
	14	А	Semicircular.
10:07	15	Q	Semicircular. And I take it, although we don't
	16		know what may have caused it, it may have been
	17		caused by an object struck against that part of
	18		the body; is that fair?
	19	A	It could have been.
10:07	20	Q	For example, I think of something round like a
	21		flashlight or a round stick, something like that?
	22	A	Something of that contour, but it does not show
	23		the whole circumference of such an object.
	24	Q	Yes, but that might be explained by the fact that
10:07	25		the round circumference came into contact at



			Page 1376 —————
	1		something of an angle with the body; is that fair?
	2	A	There are a number of hypotheses you can suggest
	3		about that.
	4	Q	Okay. While we have this photograph up, and you
10:07	5		were asked this at length yesterday whether or not
	6		the assailant was right-handed or left-handed,
	7		isn't it correct, sir, that in order for us to
	8		make any scientific conclusions, or what we in law
	9		what we might call concrete inferences, you would
10:08	10		have to know a number of potential factors such as
	11		how the knife was held by the assailant; is that
	12		right?
	13	А	I think the interpretation of injuries, in terms
	14		of the handedness of the assailant, is always
10:08	15		difficult, never certain, and sometimes almost
	16		impossible.
	17	Q	That's
	18	A	That you can only draw inferences, because unless
	19		you have other evidence as to the relative
10:08	20		positions of the assailant and the victim at the
	21		time of infliction of the injury, then you have to
	22		make an inference.
	23	Q	Well
	24	A	And the inference we were making here, if I
10:08	25		recollect, is that these were two people facing $lacktrian$

			——————————————————————————————————————
	1		each other in an upright position.
	2	Q	But we do know some concrete facts about the
	3		injuries, don't we, and one is if we assume it was
	4		a single-bladed knife
10:09	5	A	I'm sorry?
	6	Q	If we assume it was a single-sided knife,
	7	A	Single edged?
	8	Q	edged knife, we do know what edge what the
	9		cutting edge is, don't we, if we look at the
10:09	10		injury?
	11	А	Only the cutting edge could have cut.
	12	Q	Of course. The cutting edge has a V to it, and we
	13		notice that in a number of injuries sustained by
	14		various individuals, is that fair?
10:09	15	A	The cutting edge has to be slightly angled, but it
	16		can be very, a very narrow angle.
	17	Q	Absolutely.
	18	A	And to be sharpened to a side, a cutting edge, if
	19		that's what I understand you mean?
10:09	20	Q	Yes.
	21	A	Okay.
	22	Q	But the problem, if we know that, is that we don't
	23		know how the knife was held, whether the cutting
	24		edge was to the assailant's right side or to the
10:09	25		left side; is that fair?
		(

	Ī		Page 1378 ————
			1 agc 1370
	1	А	Short of a statement or an eyewitness, I don't
	2		think we ever know that.
	3	Q	Fair enough. And I take it so what you are
	4		telling us is, in the end, we can't conclude
10:10	5		whether the assailant was right-handed in this
	6		case or left-handed?
	7	А	We can only suggest possibilities.
	8	Q	That's right. And one possibility is it may have
	9		been a left-handed individual?
10:10	10	А	Yes, that
	11	Q	Yes?
	12	А	is always a possibility.
	13	Q	Yes. Next, sir, the injuries, all of the injuries
	14		would have, with the potential exception of the
10:10	15		slashes on the neck, caused the deceased to be in
	16		pain; is that correct?
	17	А	In pain?
	18	Q	In pain?
	19	A	Oh yes.
10:10	20	Q	Okay. And I can take you to the transcript
	21		portion if you need to, but at the Fisher
	22		preliminary, Fisher trial, you said that these
	23		would be very painful injuries; is that a fair
	24		description?
10:10	25	A	I think so.
		ii	



		——————————————————————————————————————
1	Q	Okay. And I take it they would, it would be of
2		such a magnitude that the normal individual might
3		find it difficult to refrain from screaming out as
4		a natural reaction; is that fair?
5	А	Depends on whether the individual was conscious at
6		the time or not.
7	Q	That's fair. Let's assume consciousness.
8	А	Assuming consciousness
9	Q	Isn't it correct that we would expect that
10		somebody who receives those injuries, which do not
11		immediately cause death, would cause such pain
12		that the natural reaction would be to scream
13		out
14	А	Yes.
15	Q	in pain?
16	А	Yes, I think so.
17	Q	Okay. I just want to clarify, for his Lordship's
18		information, none of the injuries themselves, or
19		them self, would have rendered the deceased
20		unconscious upon immediate contact?
21	А	No.
22	Q	Is that fair?
23	А	No, the, none of the injuries would have caused
24		unconsciousness until the bleeding into the chest
25		cavity had occurred.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	2 3 4 5 A 6 7 Q 8 A 9 Q 10 11 12 13 14 A 15 Q 16 A 17 Q 18 19 20 21 A 22 Q 23 A 24

			Page 1380 —————
	1	Q	Okay. Which you said would be about 15 minutes,
	2		potentially?
	3	А	It's, again, a very difficult estimate, but that
	4		would be my estimate.
10:12	5	Q	Okay. And then during that 15 minutes, although
	6		you said that the deceased might be able to
	7		stumble, probably wouldn't be able to walk
	8		upright, that individual would not be unconscious
	9		and would have the ability to call out for help or
10:12	10		scream potentially; is that fair?
	11	A	We have to take other circumstances into account,
	12		that if this injury was sustained outside on a
	13		minus 40 morning, then we always have that
	14		temperature to consider, and any reaction which
10:12	15		one might consider normal say in this room or
	16		outside on a warm day might be totally different
	17		under those circumstances.
	18	Q	Fair enough. But, with respect, yesterday you
	19		said death due to exposure would be about 15
10:12	20		minutes, death due to the most major injury would
	21		be about 15 minutes. My question is this. If the
	22		individual is conscious for the first few minutes,
	23		that individual would have the ability to cry out,
	24		call for help, scream in pain?
10:13	25	A	I think so.

			r age 1001
	1	Q	Okay. Sir, are you telling us that the police
	2		never displayed for you or reported to you on
	3		their findings vis-a-vis the injury to the
	4		clothing, and in particular I'm interested in
10:13	5		apparent cut marks in the coat?
	6	А	These, to my recollection, these were never
	7		discussed with me.
	8	Q	Okay. And I take it, for what it's worth, you
	9		might have had an opinion about the case
10:13	10		generally, or about that piece of evidence
	11		specifically, had you been consulted?
	12	A	If I had been consulted we could have discussed
	13		the relationship of the lesions in the clothes to
	14		the injuries on the body, and as I stated
10:14	15		yesterday, in the depths of the wound in the lung
	16		there were fibres, suggesting that this injury had
	17		this wound had also passed through a garment.
	18		But I have no recollection of the lesions in the
	19		clothes being discussed with me at any point.
10:14	20	Q	You are aware of Dr. Graham Dowling, who is the
	21		Chief Medical Examiner in Alberta, officed in
	22		Edmonton; are you, sir?
	23	А	I know him. I have a great respect for him. I
	24		only know him professionally and I don't know him
10:14	25		well.

	1	Q	Are you aware of a practice by pathologists,
	2		long-standing practice I suggest, of actually
	3		laying clothes out at an autopsy, either prior to
	4		incision or internal examination or subsequent,
10:15	5		sir?
	6	A	My memory of this is that I we have done it on
	7		occasion, but this practice has passed, and I
	8		think it has probably passed because the
	9		examination of the clothing by the forensic
10:15	10		laboratory has become far more sophisticated.
	11	Q	Fair enough. But, in 1969, were you aware that it
	12		was a practice of some pathologists?
	13	A	We if I had been asked to do it, we would, yes.
	14		But it's my opinion is that, once the clothing
10:15	15		has been removed from the body and handed to the
	16		police, it becomes their responsibility as an
	17		exhibit, and it is their decision as to how it is
	18		approached. I could have made a suggestion at
	19		this point, but I was not in possession of any
10:15	20		information that suggested it might be relevant.
	21	Q	Okay. Doctor, while we have this photograph up,
	22		it appears that the marks to the side of the neck
	23		are appears to be gratuitous violence; is that
	24		what your observation is?
10:16	25	A	It's not a term I would use, no. "Gratuitous" is

	1		free and not expecting reward. I don't consider
	2		those falling in that category, with no reason,
	3		possibly. But I have seen similar marks in
	4		perhaps two or three homicides during my life
10:16	5		where there has been a sexual element, and they
	6		have always suggested to me the desire to inflict
	7		possibly pain, to demean, to diminish, almost
	8		hatred, as opposed to the desire to kill.
	9	Q	It appears to be a unique type of signature; do
10:17	10		you agree with that?
	11	A	No, it's not unique, "unique" means unique to one
	12		situation.
	13	Q	Okay.
	14	A	It's uncommon, but it may be part of a specific
10:17	15		pattern.
	16	Q	Were you involved in other homicides in this city
	17		where you saw that type of patterning, sir?
	18	A	Oh yes, I have seen one or two, but very few.
	19	Q	When that occurred, did you report those findings
10:17	20		to anyone?
	21	A	Well I remember one case, which was actually a
	22		homosexual homicide in which the sexual element
	23		was very prominent from the very beginning, and
	24		these fell into that category.
10:17	25		I think one has to remember, I



	1		have been told, though I'm not an expert, that
	2		rape is a crime not of sexual desire, but of
	3		hatred.
	4	Q	My question was, when you encountered those two
10:17	5		other cases, did you write to the chief of police
	6		saying "I found this similarity in these three
	7		instances"?
	8	А	No.
	9	Q	Okay. Can I take you, please, to document 313838.
10:18	10		In the next volume? I'm looking for page 108 and
	11		I'm not seeing it there, could we try document
	12		238473 please, 238473. Page 108, please, and if
	13		we can highlight this portion, please. Starting
	14		at line 23 sorry, could we start at line 16? I
10:20	15		think we have it now.
	16		Doctor, let me read this to
	17		you you have it before you, do you, Doctor, you
	18		have it before you?
	19	А	I have 472 I think. The numbers are obscured at
10:21	20		the bottom.
	21	Q	Thank you. Question, line 15:
	22		"Q Okay, I appreciate that, sir. In your
	23		examination, sir, of the body, you've
	24		told us about injuries you detected, but
10:21	25		you did examine the entire body
		1	

		Page 1385 ————————————————————————————————————
	1	obviously?
	2	A Yes."
	3	I take it, sir, in answering that question, you
	4	knew I was referring to the body of Gail Miller?
10:21	5	A If this is an examination I don't know what
	6	this is taken from.
	7	Q This is the trial of Mr. Fisher, sir.
	8	A Then that would be the examination of Gail Miller.
	9	Q Thank you. Line 20:
10:21	10	"Q Okay. And you examined the vaginal area
	11	of the body obviously?
	12	A Yes.
	13	Q First of all, I want to deal with the
	14	body generally, away from consideration
10:21	15	of the latter. It's my understanding
	16	that there were no skin tears or bruises
	17	found on the inner do we call it the
	18	inner thigh, sir?
	19	A No.
10:21	20	Q Sorry, I asked two questions. My fault.
	21	A Sorry.
	22	Q Do we call this the inner thigh here?
	23	A Yes.
	24	Q Here?"
10:21	25	There was a demonstration of that. $lacksquare$



			——————————————————————————————————————
			· ·
	1	" A	Yes, that is your inner thigh.
	2	Q	Thank you. You found no bruising, no
	3		tear, no injury in that location,
	4		correct?
10:22	5	А	No.
	6	Q	You found no injury, as I understand, to
	7		the knees or the shins?
	8	А	No.
	9	Q	Have you heard of finger pad bruising?
10:22	10	А	No. It's probably in the text book, but
	11		it's not a term I'm familiar with.
	12	Q	Okay. That's where I get it from. So
	13		finger pad bruising, as I understand,
	14		is injury caused by the fingers when you
10:22	15		attempt to separate someone's legs, and
	16		it's called finger pad because for
	17		obvious reasons. Knowing that, sir,
	18		looking at your autopsy report, you
	19		found no finger pad bruising at all?
10:22	20	А	We didn't find anything like that.
	21	Q	Sir, you found, according to your
	22		autopsy report, no redness, bruising or
	23		subtle tearing to the large or small
	24		lips of the vaginal opening?
10:23	25	А	Of the vulva?



			——————————————————————————————————————
	1	Q	Correct.
	2	A	No.
	3	Q	You found no bruising or the tearing at
	4		the end of the vaginal opening which is
10:23	5		closer to the anus?
	6	А	No.
	7	Q	You found no such injuries at the
	8		opposite end of the vaginal opening?
	9	А	No.
10:23	10	Q	In your science, sir, you used the word
	11		petechiae?
	12	А	Yes."
	13	And then	it's spelled.
	14	"Q	Would you tell the court what petechiae
10:23	15		is, before we get into the questions."
	16	And then	you describe it as the rupturing of very
	17	small bl	ood vessels. Question, line 24:
	18	"Q	According to your autopsy report which
	19		I've looked at thoroughly, you found no
10:23	20		petechiae
	21	A	No.
	22	Q	Abrasions, bruises, or lacerations to
	23		the wall of the vagina?
	24	А	No.
10:23	25	Q	You found no redness, petechiae,
			4



			rage 1300
	1		abrasions, bruises, or lacerations at
	2		the opening of the womb?
	3	А	I think we have to modify here. The
	4		opening of the womb, which is what we
10:24	5		call the cervix, I think I recorded as
	6		reddish, and there is a note that it
	7		showed a certain degree of inflammation,
	8		that is not uncommon in woman at all.
	9		But I have a note that there was, I have
10:24	10		chronic cervicitis, which is a technical
	11		term for inflammation of the neck of the
	12		womb, and the here we are; the cervix
	13		showed a small erosion. Well, that is
	14		almost a little ulcer. It's nothing
10:24	15		unusual about this, it's very, very
	16		common."
	17	And then	you were asked the question:
	18	" Q	So you found none of these indicators of
	19		sexual assault which one might expect to
10:24	20		find in some cases?"
	21	Your ans	wer:
	22	А	We found none of those indicators of
	23		sexual assault, but the question of
	24		expecting them is another matter."
10:24	25	And I app	preciate your answer. I take it, sir,
			1



			•
	1		though, that in fairness, we might expect some of
	2		those indicators to be present where unexpected,
	3		forced, sudden intercourse takes place; is that
	4		fair?
10:25	5	A	I think I said yesterday that it is unusual to
	6		find significant injury from penial intercourse in
	7		a woman in the mature sexual years even when this
	8		is non-consensual rape. It does occur, but it's
	9		unusual.
10:25	10	Q	My question was this though, we might expect to
	11		find it in the circumstances I described; isn't
	12		that correct?
	13	A	Which circumstances?
	14	Q	Circumstances where it's sudden, unexpected?
10:25	15	A	No, I have to say that in my experience, which is
	16		not large, and in the textbooks the occurrence of
	17		injury in a woman in her mature sexual years, and
	18		particularly a woman who is sexually experienced,
	19		from penial intercourse is not common.
10:25	20	Q	But what we have also here, Doctor, is no bruising
	21		to the inner thigh, no indication of any force
	22		being used in that area; isn't that correct?
	23	A	No, we don't.
	24	Q	Right. Doctor, you were asked yesterday about the
10:26	25		life of spermatozoa and you will recall at the
	l)		

	1		trial of Mr. Fisher same document, please, page
	2		129 that I had, as most criminal lawyers like
	3		to present, particularly before a jury, the
	4		authority of Phipps and Fisher's Medical Legal
10:26	5		Investigation of Death, and you recall your
	6		acknowledgement that that was an acknowledged
	7		authority used by pathologists?
	8	А	Yes.
	9	Q	And I had brought your attention to the paragraph
10:26	10		which is now found in this transcript, lines 9
	11		through 18, and the specific reference, My Lord,
	12		was page 790 where the authors made the following
	13		observation:
	14		"Decomposition of the body does not preclude
10:27	15		the finding of identifiable spermatozoa and
	16		embalming of the body helps preserve it.
	17		Intact spermatozoa, i.e., tails, are rarely
	18		found in a vagina later than 72 hours after
	19		coitus."
10:27	20		Just so we're clear, I take it that at least some
	21		experts are of the opinion that the range for
	22		deposit of the sperm might be, at the outset, 72
	23		hours; is that correct?
	24	А	I think it varies according to what happens to the
10:27	25		person after intercourse. I have found

	1		spermatozoa heads in a partly decomposed body a
	2		week after death when presumptively the death
	3		occurred just around the time or following the
	4		instant of intercourse and the death and the
10:28	5		cooling of the body tend to preserve these. What
	6		destroys spermatozoa in the vagina are the general
	7		warmth of the body and the extreme acidity of the
	8		vaginal medium in the adult woman, so that all
	9		these circumstances are exceedingly variable.
10:28	10	Q	That's not my question though, Doctor, with
	11		respect. My question is that there is a body of
	12		science within which at least some acknowledged
	13		experts believe that it could be up to 72 hours
	14		before; isn't that correct?
10:28	15	A	In the living body?
	16	Q	Yes.
	17	A	I think that's a very long estimate, but if some
	18		experts have found it and recorded it, then we
	19		have to accept it.
10:28	20	Q	In addition, sir, Doctor, you will recall that I
	21		put to you at Mr. Fisher's trial, which is found
	22		at 238498
	23		COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Just a minute, Mr.
	24		Beresh. Was your question based on that quote
10:29	25		there from page 790?

	1		MR. BERESH: Yes.
	2		COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: It's not clear to
	3	n	ne there whether they are talking whether the
	4	j	.e. reference refers to a living body or a dead
10:29	5	Ē	person.
	6	BY MR	. BERESH:
	7	Q F	air enough. Let's clarify that with the witness.
	8	7	hank you, My Lord. Doctor, I take it His
	9	I	ordship is right, as we read this it's not clear,
10:29	10	k	pecause of reference to decomposition, but this
	11	á	appears to suggest that even where death occurs,
	12	t	hat we could find it up to 70 there is a
	13	k	pelief that it could have been deposited 72 hours
	14	k	pefore death?
10:29	15	A A	as I have said, I have found identifiable
	16	٤	spermatozoa in a partly decomposed body a week
	17	á	fter death. In this quote the author is not
	18	n	making it clear whether he refers to an embalmed
	19	C	or a not embalmed body, and embalming of course
10:30	20	V	vill preserve spermatozoa as it preserves
	21	ϵ	everything else. It's not a very clear statement
	22	j	n the text.
	23	Q V	Well, I take it, though, there are differing
	24	C	ppinions in this area?
10:30	25	A Y	Tes, there are different opinions and there are
	I.	i	

			rage 1373
	1		different records of possibilities. 72 hours in a
	2		dead body is quite I think quite reasonable.
	3		72 hours in a living body I would find very
	4		difficult.
10:30	5	Q	So 72 hours in a dead body is not unreasonable?
	6	A	No, it's not.
	7	Q	Okay. And I take it that there wasn't, in 1969,
	8		and there probably isn't now, an ability,
	9		scientific ability to date deposit of seminal
10:30	10		fluid or spermatozoa?
	11	А	Yes.
	12	Q	That is, if we took a sample scientifically, we
	13		couldn't tell when that ejaculate entered the
	14		female?
10:31	15	A	Not other than from circumstantial evidence and
	16		the degree of loss of the spermatozoa. One might
	17		hypothesize from that.
	18	Q	Yes. That was going to be my next question. The
	19		way you described it yesterday, I take it that the
10:31	20		disappearance of the spermatozoa is an evolving
	21		process; is that fair to say?
	22	А	Yes. It doesn't occur all at once, it's a process
	23		with a time frame.
	24	Q	So the percentage of or amount of spermatozoa
10:31	25		might assist us in terms of timing for deposit?

	Г		Page 1394 ————
	1	A	It may suggest, yes. It's one of the things you
	2		have to take into account.
	3	Q	Fair enough. And in this case there was no
	4		attempt, and I'm not being critical, there was no
10:31	5		attempt to quantify spermatozoa?
	6	A	I don't know how you would.
	7	Q	Okay.
	8	A	Because you don't know how many there were in the
	9		initial ejaculate and the number in an ejaculate
10:32	10		varies very considerably.
	11	Q	Okay. I take it that after normal sexual
	12		intercourse, that we might expect to find seminal
	13		fluid on undergarments that come into contact with
	14		the pubic area; is that fair?
10:32	15	А	Yes.
	16	Q	Okay. Did you ever were you ever told that
	17		subsequent to this the police found or claimed to
	18		have found seminal fluid on the panties of
	19		Ms. Miller?
10:32	20	А	I have no recollection, sir.
	21	Q	Just so we're clear, when you saw the body, the
	22		undergarments were not in their normal position on
	23		the body, but around the ankle or legs; is that
	24		correct?
10:33	25	А	My record is number 6, a pair of panties which
			4



	Ī		——————————————————————————————————————
	1		were around one ankle.
	2	Q	So they were not around her waist
	3	А	No.
	4	Q	in contact with the pubic area of her body were
10:33	5		they?
	6	А	No.
	7	Q	I see. Doctor, I just want to clarify. Yesterday
	8		you were shown a photograph of a knife and as I
	9		recall it had a maroon handle, and my number is
10:33	10		073509, and if we could highlight that's pretty
	11		neat. Is this, I wasn't sure, is this the knife
	12		that you were shown by the police before you
	13		proffered the opinion that it may have caused the
	14		injuries or was consistent with an object that
10:34	15		would cause the injuries?
	16	A	My memory is that at some time subsequent to the
	17		autopsy I was shown a knife, which appears to be
	18		identical to this one, and asked if this was
	19		capable of causing the injuries and I said yes.
10:34	20	Q	Okay. Now, I apologize that I have to draw on
	21		your memory. Do you recall if it was taken to you
	22		at your office, if you went to the police station
	23		or where was the physical location where you
	24		looked at the object?
10:34	25	А	I have no memory of having been asked to go to the

			1 agc 1370
	1		police station at all. I would presume that this
	2		was brought to me and at that time I would presume
	3		it was brought to St. Paul's.
	4	Q	Okay. And do you recall whether it was brought to
10:34	5		you in something presumably it was in some sort
	6		of container, but do you recall whether you took
	7		it out, looked at it, that sort of thing?
	8	А	No, I have no memory of this, of whether it was
	9		contained or whether I handled it. I presume we
10:35	10		measured it because we could do that whether it
	11		was enclosed in plastic or not, but I have no
	12		memory of the actual process.
	13	Q	Okay. And do you have any memory as to whether or
	14		not the measure that we see in this photograph is
10:35	15		your measure or someone else's measure or a
	16		measure that was stuck on, for example, a plastic
	17		bag?
	18	А	It's a very simple measure. I don't think it was
	19		one from our laboratory because
10:35	20	Q	Can we highlight that at all? SPHML, St. Paul's
	21		Hospital Medical Lab?
	22	A	Medical legal autopsy number 07-69.
	23	Q	So does that help us?
	24	А	That's our reference number, but I don't think
10:35	25		this was a laboratory measure because we would not

			1 ago 1077
	1		usually have used one which was only marked in
	2		centimetres.
	3	Q	Is it an actual measure, can you tell is it a
	4		measure or is it, say, a piece of tape that has
10:36	5		that measure on that that it could be stuck onto?
	6	A	I can't tell.
	7	Q	Okay. But would the police so does this come
	8		from St. Paul's, apparently, this object?
	9	A	This object? I don't know.
10:36	10	Q	Okay. Would the police in 1969 normally have had
	11		objects like this from the hospital?
	12	A	Would they have had rulers from the hospital?
	13	Q	That's right.
	14	A	In the course of an autopsy we would have used
10:36	15		rulers then which were most probably part of the
	16		laboratory equipment. Now very often the police
	17		produce rulers which are part of their equipment
	18		and standardized, but then I think they would have
	19		been our rulers.
10:36	20	Q	Okay.
	21	A	So where this little bit of measurement came from
	22		I really have no idea.
	23	Q	Fair enough. If we can go back to the full photo.
	24	A	It's marked in centimetres and presumably this is
10:37	25		accurate.
		li .	

			Page 1398
	1	Q	Fair enough. Do you know when you saw the knife
	2		whether or not it was as it appears to be, that
	3		is, intact?
	4	A	Yes, I was shown an intact knife. I was never
10:37	5		shown a partial knife.
	6	Q	You were never shown a blade of anything, never
	7		shown a handle, it was an intact knife?
	8	A	To my recollection I was the only knife I have
	9		been shown was intact.
10:37	10	Q	Thank you, sir.
	11	A	And my memory is exactly of that one.
	12	Q	Thank you. And I take it I was too young to
	13		remember this, so in 1969 this would be sort of a
	14		common household paring knife by all appearances?
10:37	15	A	That's what it appears to be. I wouldn't have it
	16		in my kitchen, but
	17	Q	Fair enough. And I won't pursue why, but we'll
	18		leave that to speculation. I take it it's the
	19		sort of object that could be purchased at any sort
10:37	20		of corner store or hardware store in 1969?
	21	A	It's a cheap little knife.
	22	Q	Okay. Easily obtainable?
	23	A	I would presume so.
	24	Q	Presumably something we might find in thousands of
10:38	25		households; is that fair?

			Page 1399
	1	А	That's not in my area, but I would presume you
	2		might find this in a lot of houses.
	3	Q	Thank you very much. And just so we're clear,
	4		that is the only weapon ever shown to you in this
10:38	5		case
	6	А	To my recollection.
	7	Q	since 1969?
	8	А	Yes.
	9	Q	I want to turn quickly to another area if we can,
10:38	10		sir. If we could have the transcript again, the
	11		document number is 23844, but it's at page 103,
	12		please. The person assisting you that day I think
	13		you said before was a mortician as opposed to
	14		someone you called an assistant?
10:39	15	А	I'm sorry, could you say that again?
	16	Q	Sure. My understanding from your evidence in
	17		previous proceedings is that the individual who
	18		assisted you at the autopsy you described as a
	19		mortician as opposed to someone who might be an
10:39	20		assistant?
	21	А	This is a term generally applied here. The term
	22		pathologist's assistant is not a definable one,
	23		but has been used variably for somebody with
	24		rather more training and rather extended
10:39	25		expertise, but it's not a strict definition.
			A



			Page 1400 —————
		_	
	1	Q	Fair enough.
	2	Α	The term I used, the term I would use now is a
	3		mortician.
	4	Q	Fair enough, and I only ask that to put this in
10:39	5		context. I was asking you at the Fisher trial
	6		about that very issue and you gave the answer at
	7		about line 9, and I'm not overly interested in the
	8		answer, but the next question was:
	9		"Q And you say the clothing was handed or
10:40	10		were handed to"
	11		It says Pentella, but that would be Penkala;
	12		correct?
	13	A	Yes.
	14	Q	And just so we're clear again, you understood by
10:40	15		the question the reference was to Gail Miller's
	16		clothing at the autopsy?
	17	A	Yes.
	18	Q	And you say that's what my records show?
	19	А	The following specimens were taken and handed to
10:40	20		Lieutenant Penkala, the clothing removed from the
	21		body.
	22	Q	And you were good enough to tell us yesterday that
	23		you would make some hand notes before you started
	24		the autopsy, some board notes in the middle and
10:40	25		then subsequently some hand notes, so presumably
			Meyer CompuCourt Reporting

			rage 1401
	1		this was recorded in some fashion which allowed
	2		you to place it into your report; is that correct?
	3	A	This is something I try to be careful about, as to
	4		what specimens the police received, though now
10:41	5		that the number of police attending an autopsy has
	6		increased so much, nowadays I'm not always
	7		specific or clear as to which one of them has the
	8		responsibility for them.
	9	Q	Fair enough. I'm just saying
10:41	10	А	At this case where there were only two police
	11		then, then I know they went to Mr. Penkala.
	12	Q	And my next question at the Fisher trial was:
	13		"Q Your records don't show they were handed
	14		to Kleiv?
10:41	15		A No."
	16	А	The record states specifically these were handed
	17		to Lieutenant Penkala.
	18	Q	Okay. Now, you'll recall at Mr. Fisher's trial
	19		that you were shown some photographs of the
10:41	20		autopsy that had been enhanced or enlarged. Do
	21		you remember that, sir?
	22	А	I remember being shown photographs of the autopsy,
	23		but I don't know how they had been technically
	24		treated.
10:41	25	Q	Okay. On the original autopsy photos it was not \P

			Page 1402 —
	1		very clear what was on the floor of the examiner's
	2		suite. Do you recall that, sir?
	3	A	No, but I didn't take them and I don't recollect
	4		just what was clear in them. You would have to
10:42	5		show me the photos.
	6	Q	Fair enough. Let's let Mr. Commissioner look at
	7		them or if we could have document 066729,
	8		please. That was the document that I was
	9		interested in and it wasn't clear as to what was
10:43	10		below the gurney or table, is that correct, and
	11		I'm interested in this area right here, please.
	12	А	There's something down there, but I don't know
	13		what it is.
	14	Q	It's hard to tell what it is. You recall at Mr.
10:43	15		Fisher's trial being shown what had been marked at
	16		that trial as Exhibit D-3, which I believe is
	17		document 241975, and I have the original,
	18		Mr. Commissioner, if the witness might look at it.
	19		COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: What's the page
10:43	20		number again?
	21		MR. BERESH: 241975, My Lord.
	22		COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thank you.
	23	BY M	R. BERESH:
	24	Q	You recall seeing that exhibit, do you, at the
10:44	25		trial, sir?

			rage 1405
	1	A	No, I don't recall seeing it at the trial.
	2	Q	Fair enough.
	3	A	I may have been shown it. May I comment that the
	4		print I have here is a great deal clearer than the
10:44	5		screen.
	6	Q	Yes, certainly, the screen is not all that clear.
	7		If we can go then to document 241973, and just so
	8		we confirm, the last document you saw is obviously
	9		of the medical examiner's suite, sir?
10:44	10	A	I'm sorry?
	11	Q	The last photo you looked at is in fact
	12	A	It's a corner of the mortuary at St. Paul's
	13		Hospital and it is now as it was then.
	14	Q	Again, sir, in relation to this document that you
10:44	15		are looking at, it's clearer in the copy you have
	16		than it is on our screen?
	17	А	The print is certainly clearer than the screen.
	18	Q	Okay. You would agree, sir, that what it depicts
	19		are the clothing or items of clothing removed from
10:45	20		Gail Miller's body?
	21	А	That's what it appears to show, yes.
	22	Q	Okay. You will recall, sir, testifying that the
	23		normal practice for the police was for you or your
	24		office to supply what you called a garbage bag or
10:45	25		a box for the removal of items taken at autopsy in

			——————————————————————————————————————
	1		1969; is that correct?
	2	А	I think so. I think that at that time the police
	3		were not provided with formal kits in any way and
	4		we had bags and boxes around the laboratory which
10:45	5		we used to give to them if there was anything to
	6		be taken away.
	7	Q	Can we then go quickly, please, if we can, to
	8		document 238470. I'm interested you were asked
	9		the question of what occurred, and I'm interested,
10:46	10		I don't think I take this out of context by taking
	11		that portion of your answer, it was in relation to
	12		how the exhibits were removed, and at line 6 your
	13		answer was:
	14		"A Now, I have no record and I cannot
10:46	15		remember whether the police turned up
	16		with the kit or not, and I hypothesized
	17		a garbage bag because that was what
	18		commonly happened. If the police
	19		records show a kit"
10:46	20		Et cetera, and I take it that was correct, that
	21		the common practice was for them to show up with
	22		a garbage bag?
	23	А	I don't know what the common practice was in '69.
	24		I don't think we had formalized or in any way
10:47	25		formalized this question of containers. We used
			Meyer CompuCourt Reporting

		Page 1405 —————
	1	what was handy.
	2	Q Fair enough. But it's clear if we look at the
	3	Gail Miller clothing, it was not individually
	4	bagged as it was removed from the body?
10:47	5	A No.
	6	Q Okay. If we can then go quickly, please, to
	7	document 246207, page 482. 246207, please. It's
	8	this dry Saskatchewan air, My Lord. I'm suffering
	9	from the same thing.
10:48	10	COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I don't know if
	11	I'm reassured, Mr. Beresh, by that or not.
	12	MR. BERESH: Back one page, please, to page
	13	482.
	14	COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Mr. Beresh, I
10:49	15	thought you wanted 246207?
	16	MR. BERESH: I did, 246207.
	17	COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: He needs the
	18	beginning number.
	19	MR. BERESH: That is the number.
10:49	20	MR. HODSON: Try 246198.
	21	BY MR. BERESH:
	22	Q If you can highlight starting at question 207.
	23	Doctor, just to put this in context, this was the
	24	evidence of Detective Kleiv at Mr. Fisher's
10:51	25	preliminary inquiry. Crown Prosecutor Sinclair



		r ago i roo
	1	asked this question, question 207:
	2	"Q All right. Can you describe that
	3	process?
	4	A The process of seizing the clothing?
10:51	5	Q Yes, please?"
	6	Now this was in the context of seizing the
	7	closing at the autopsy where you were present:
	8	"A The pathologist's assistant removes the
	9	clothing and each item is placed in a
10:51	10	plastic bag. We the Identification
	11	Officer who is in attendance, in this
	12	case it was myself, and Lieutenant
	13	Penkala the items are placed in
	14	plastic bags. And then after the
10:52	15	autopsy is completed they are taken to
	16	the to the Identification Section of
	17	the police station and for further
	18	examination and so on."
	19	Given what we see in the photograph, given what
10:52	20	you have indicated, would you agree with me, sir,
	21	that that was not common practice in 1969, that
	22	is to individually bag items of clothing at an
	23	autopsy?
	24	A It was it was obviously not done in the case
10:52	25	under examination.

	1	Q	Doctor, you said it was common to put them in a
	2		garbage bag, and I didn't gather, from that, that
	3		we were talking about individual plastic bags?
	4	A	Umm, it's to the best of my recollection, we
10:52	5		would usually have put them in one bag.
	6	Q	Yes.
	7	A	I do not remember a practice of individual
	8		bagging, but if Mr. Kleiv does, then it was his
	9		responsibility, primarily, to receive the
10:53	10		exhibits, and he may have done this.
	11		I had examined the body with the
	12		clothing on, and made my description, and, after
	13		that, the removal of the clothing was a matter
	14		between my mortician and
10:53	15	Q	But
	16	A	the police representative.
	17	Q	But, Doctor, it's not quite that simple. The
	18		photographs betray that suggestion; don't you
	19		agree?
10:53	20	A	The photographs in this case show that the
	21		clothing was in a pile on the floor.
	22	Q	Yeah. Now just let me ask this, you weren't
	23		asked, but my understanding and I'm not sure of
	24		the source was that in 1969 there were about
10:53	25		three homicide cases in Saskatoon; does that

			G
	1		accord with your recollection, you, of course,
	2		having done the autopsies
	3	А	I have absolutely no recollection.
	4		COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Wait a minute,
10:53	5		please. Please refrain from answering, Doctor,
	6		until the question is finished. The reporters
	7		are going to quit on us.
	8		BY MR. BERESH:
	9	Q	Thank you, My Lord. My understanding, in 1969, is
10:54	10		that there were not many homicides?
	11	A	I cannot remember.
	12	Q	But was there another pathologist, other than
	13		yourself, in operating in Saskatoon?
	14	A	Oh yes. There were three hospitals with
10:54	15		three pathology with pathology staff in the
	16		three hospitals, and the hospitals to which the
	17		Coroner sent a body for examination was variable,
	18		and still is. It is very much a matter of the
	19		Coroner's decision as to where he or she wants a
10:54	20		body sent. So there were other pathologists in
	21		practice, and examinations would be done at the
	22		other two hospitals, and I do not know the total
	23		and I do not know the proportions.
	24	Q	Fair enough. But I understood, yesterday, that in
10:54	25		1969 there was a division of hospital autopsies
		ĺ	

			——————————————————————————————————————
	1		and forensic autopsies; did I understand that
	2		correctly?
	3	A	There is, and there was and still is this
	4		distinction between autopsies done, which we
10:54	5		usually call autopsy hospital autopsies for
	6		shorthand which are done on a permit from the
	7		next of kin, which were a much greater proportion
	8		in 1969 and which are very few now; and the
	9		hospital the autopsies done on the Coroner's
10:55	10		order under the Coroner's Act, which are now the
	11		majority.
	12	Q	But my question is this; would you do the bulk of
	13		forensic autopsies in 1969?
	14	A	I cannot tell you.
10:55	15	Q	Okay.
	16	A	I do not know what was done at the other
	17		hospitals, I only know what I did.
	18	Q	But I take it a matter of common sense, this is a
	19		death, it's going to be the most serious of
10:55	20		investigations; isn't that fair? And everyone
	21		knew that in 1969; didn't they?
	22	A	I'm sorry, the this particular case?
	23	Q	Yes?
	24	A	Well this particular case was an obvious homicide,
10:55	25		and it was virtually on the doorstep of St.
		l	—

				——————————————————————————————————————
	1		Paul's,	so that is where the body went.
	2	Q	Okay. Do	octor, I want to take you quickly then, if
	3		I can, to	o document 313602 please, page 400. Here
	4		again, De	etective Kleiv was testifying at Mr.
10:56	5		Fisher's	trial, and we're interested in line 24
	6		onward o	nto the next page. Question by
	7		Mr. Sinc	lair:
	8		" Q	Now was the clothing worn by the victim
	9			•••, "
10:56	10		thank you	a:
	11			" seized at some point by yourself?
	12		A	Yes.
	13		Q	At what point was it seized?
	14		A	The clothing was seized at the autopsy
10:56	15			during the time of the autopsy. After
	16			photographs were taken then we then
	17			the then the clothing items were
	18			seized.
	19		Q	Okay. And can you indicate, sir,
10:57	20			whether or not or how that seizure took
	21			place at that time, what you recall
	22			about that?
	23		A	Generally the procedure is that the
	24			pathologist's assistant removes the
10:57	25			clothing from the body and hand it to
		I		•

			Page 1411 —————
	1		the identification officer, and the
	2		identification officer places each
	3		item in a separate bag. And so this
	4		is the usual procedure. But I can't
10:57	5		specifically remember doing this
	6		because it's a matter of routine and
	7		it's not always written down."
	8		I take it, sir, that that answer is incorrect, it
	9		was not matter of police routine to individually
10:57	10		bag items; is that correct, sir?
	11	А	Are you asking me?
	12	Q	Yes?
	13	А	I don't know.
	14	Q	In your presence, sir, it was in 1969, it was
10:57	15		
	16	A	In this particular case, it was obviously not
	17		done, but I have no recollection of other cases.
	18	Q	Well, but sir, if it was a routine practice, and
	19		this was a homicide,
10:58	20	A	Then
	21	Q	why would it not be done?
	22	A	Then it should have been done, but I didn't
	23		specifically watch the police at each case to see
	24		what they were doing.
10:58	25	Q	I appreciate that, Doctor, but you just said to us $lacktrian$

	1		it was common practice to get a garbage bag, put
	2		the clothes in, and take it away, and that's what
	3		appears to have happened in this case; isn't that
	4		correct?
10:58	5	A	That's my recollection, but it's not Mr. Kleiv's,
	6		and as it was his responsibility to receive the
	7		clothing when it was being seized as an exhibit,
	8		then I think he probably knows more about it than
	9		I do.
	10	Q	Well
	11	А	I had finished, at that point, with the clothing.
	12	Q	But sir, with respect, your notes say Kleiv wasn't
	13		involved, you gave them to Penkala?
	14	А	That's what my notes say.
10:58	15	Q	Yes. And presumably, if your note is correct,
	16		when you gave them to Penkala, he put them on the
	17		floor in a pile; is that right?
	18	А	I don't know. They are on the floor in a pile,
	19		and somebody put them there, but I'm not making
10:59	20		inferences as to what happened after the clothing
	21		was removed from the body.
	22	Q	Sir, you were asked yesterday about attending the
	23		scene, and I appreciate your answer. My question,
	24		though, moves a little further, and it's this.
10:59	25		Would you not agree that at least videotaping a
		li .	



1 2 3		scene by the police and providing it to a
3		pathologist before, during or after autopsy, would
Į!		be of assistance
4	A	I
5	Q	in a criminal investigation?
6	A	I can think of cases in which it might have been
7		of assistance, but actually most of these are not
8		criminal cases, they are cases of deaths in
9		peculiar circumstances like those of epileptics.
10		I am searching my memory for a case in which it
11		might have been helpful for me to see a scene, and
12		there are a few, but not the majority. I
13		generally get a good description, and can ask
14		questions, and the information gained from being
15		at a scene, I think in the majority of cases,
16		would not help me very much.
17	Q	Well, would it have assisted if you had had a
18		videotape of the Dalton case, sir; or would it
19		have assisted the individuals initially involved
20		
21	A	In the Dalton
22	Q	from a scientific point of view? Yes.
23	A	In the Dalton case?
24	Q	Yes.
25	A	The Dalton case turned completely on the
	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	4 A 5 Q 6 A 7 8 8 9 10 11 1 12 13 14 15 16 16 17 Q 18 19 20 21 A 22 Q 23 A 24 Q

	1		interpretation of neck injuries and the autopsy
	2		was, I understand, properly done. It was one of
	3		these cases, in which I have been involved quite
	4		often, where the findings are clear but their
11:00	5		interpretation is a matter of opinion. I don't
	6		the account given by Mr. Dalton of his wife's
	7		death, certainly if there had been a videotape of
	8		that it would have been of great help, but after
	9		she was removed to hospital there was an hour and
11:00	10		a half's resuscitation, and that is liable to
	11		obscure anybody's findings.
	12	Q	No question about that. I'm talking about the
	13		case where the individual is clearly deceased, no
	14		resuscitation will be of any assistance, don't you
11:01	15		agree that it ought to be mandatory to videotape
	16		the scene?
	17	А	I'm not agreeing that anything ought to be
	18		mandatory. I'm not in charge of things.
	19	Q	Just to make it clear, sir, I take it the police
11:01	20		in this case never came back to you with any
	21		exhibits after autopsy and asked you for a
	22		secondary opinion or comment at all?
	23	А	The only exhibits that they brought to me after
	24		the autopsy was the seminal material found in the
11:01	25		snow.

	1	Q	Okay. And did you advise them that, if it was
	2		seminal fluid, it could not be dated in terms of a
	3		deposit there?
	4	A	I may have said that, but it's a thing which is
11:01	5		frozen is, in general, difficult to date.
	6	Q	Yes, okay. Finally I just want to deal with some
	7		quick matters, My Lord, and conclude here, if you
	8		will bear with me. You were asked some questions
	9		yesterday, and with respect to Mr. Lockyer's
11:02	10		questions, my view goes beyond that in terms of
	11		how this Commission might assist justice in this
	12		province and Canada in the next 20 years, not I
	13		don't want to talk about fine tuning, tuning the
	14		wheels, that might have been suggested to you
11:02	15		yesterday. I just want to go through, quickly, a
	16		list of major causes for miscarriages of justice,
	17		and I want to deal with the scientific portion,
	18		which relates to you.
	19		Obviously I take it we agree,
11:02	20		even as lay people without any professional
	21		experience, that inadequate investigations can
	22		lead to a wrongful conviction?
	23	A	Certainly.
	24	Q	Okay. Tunnel vision, what we know is a tunnel
11:02	25		vision by investigators, can lead to that? \P

	[Page 1416 ————
	1	А	That was certainly the case in Dalton.
	2	Q	And I take it, clearly, that that includes bias,
	3		racial bias, other types of bias, which come into
	4		play; fair?
11:03	5	A	That's a general, a general opinion on most
	6		anything.
	7	Q	Clearly a malicious prosecution, number 3 is what
	8		I have on my list, could lead to a wrongful
	9		conviction?
11:03	10	A	Yes.
	11	Q	Yes. Improper science; is that fair?
	12	A	Improper science?
	13	Q	Yeah, what I call junk science, and the example I
	14		have is recovered memory syndrome which played
11:03	15		itself out in our court rooms for a number of
	16		years and then was found to be nothing more than
	17		junk science?
	18	A	I certainly agree with you on the recalled memory
	19		syndrome, but most of the science which we apply
11:03	20		in cases like this is capable of being expressed
	21		in numerical terms, and if you are measuring
	22		something, however you whatever it is you
	23		measure and however you measure it, it is much
	24		more difficult to introduce or to accept junk.
11:04	25	Q	Well, but we do agree with this, that people with

	1		forceful personalities who wear the cloak of an
	2		expert can certainly take the day in a trial for
	3		either side?
	4	А	You are bringing in, now, the adversarial system
11:04	5		of justice, and I don't particularly want to get
	6		into discussing that, but the in this system it
	7		is the credibility attached to any witness, and
	8		his or her conviction of the jury or judge, which
	9		is important.
11:04	10		And, quite obviously, it's no
	11		good being an inarticulate genius. One of the
	12		things that you need and I'm speaking now in
	13		forensic pathology is the capability of giving
	14		convincing evidence in court, and of standing up
11:05	15		to cross-examination, and these are not part of
	16		medical training.
	17	Q	I appreciate that, Doctor, but I'm talking more
	18		about those experts who might try on trial
	19		balloons like we saw with the memory syndrome
11:05	20		situation, and my only question is, unless the
	21		science is pure, it can lead to a wrongful
	22		conviction; don't you agree?
	23	А	Certainly, if science is inaccurate, it can
	24		contribute to a wrongful conviction. I hope that
11:05	25		the science of pathology insofar as it is a
			4

	1		science but in pathology we have seen that
	2		there is a matter of fact, of what you
	3		demonstrate, and a matter of opinion as to how it
	4		was caused, and these have, carefully, to be
11:05	5		distinguished.
	6	Q	I appreciate that, Doctor, but isn't the real
	7		problem the matter of interpretation? You touched
	8		on it yesterday. Back in 1959, 1960s,
	9		pathologists were estimating time of death based
11:06	10		upon stomach contents
	11	A	Yes.
	12	Q	and we now know that that science is not an
	13		accurate science, it's not fact?
	14	A	This, in fact, led to the very spectacular
11:06	15		wrongful conviction of Mr. Truscott.
	16	Q	Of course. So what I am saying is the scientific
	17		information has to be honest, and by that I don't
	18		mean it being untoward, and the interpretation has
	19		to be honest and not favour one side or the other;
11:06	20		don't you agree?
	21	A	Certainly. And it's, as I tried to make it very
	22		forcefully, my point yesterday, I am not a witness
	23		for one side or the other, I am a witness for the
	24		court, and I would far prefer it if the
11:06	25		adversarial system permitted me to be called as a

			r ago 1117
	1		witness for the court, and not called by one side
	2		or the other.
	3	Q	Well I have a suggestion this morning as to how
	4		that might occur, if Mr. Commissioner decides in
11:06	5		the end to recommend this, but let me go through
	6		my list of what I suggest is a fairly complete
	7		list of reasons for wrongful conviction.
	8		Dishonest witnesses; we don't
	9		disagree about that?
11:06	10	А	I'm sorry?
	11	Q	Dishonest witnesses can cause a wrongful
	12		conviction?
	13	A	I hope all witnesses are honest and the
	14		conviction, in the end, is the due to the
11:07	15		relative weight placed on their evidence.
	16	Q	I think you have answered that. Reliance upon
	17		informants, we know, is a reason for wrongful
	18		convictions?
	19	A	Reliance upon?
11:07	20	Q	On informants who have something benefit to gain
	21		from giving false evidence?
	22	A	I have no personal knowledge of that, but one
	23		would presume it's there.
	24	Q	Okay. The other I have on my list, and I'll just
11:07	25		read them to you; mistaken identity, false
			•

	1		confessions, lack of experience, and lack of
	2		critical analysis. Would you agree that those can
	3		be factors which would lead to a wrongful
	4		conviction?
11:07	5	A	Now you went very quickly there, sir. The first
	6		two, I think, are outside my province. The last
	7		two, could you repeat them?
	8	Q	Lack of experience, and I'm thinking about lack of
	9		experience in the system itself?
11:07	10	A	Well that's a problem one is always faced with,
	11		and the problem one is faced with in Saskatchewan
	12		is that we are a small I was going to say poor,
	13		but I'm told now that we're not a poor province
	14		though it doesn't feel that way and, in some
11:08	15		ways, Saskatoon is approaching the end of the line
	16		and we're trying, here, to deploy, with very
	17		limited resources, expertise equivalent to the
	18		large centres of Canada and the U.S.
	19	Q	Right.
11:08	20	A	And this will always, I think here it will remain
	21		a problem and has to be factored into every
	22		consideration, that certainly we are we may
	23		have people who are inexperienced, or young, or
	24		both, in a very serious situation, and it is not
11:08	25		always practical to call for help from outside.

			——————————————————————————————————————
	1	Q Well,	but my suggestion, Doctor, is that there is
	2	actual	ly a fairly easy answer. The machinery for
	3	puttin	g it into place is more difficult. And the
	4	easy a	nswer is that there has to be some critical
11:08	5	analys	is, a skepticism, about evidence collected;
	6	don't	you agree, sir?
	7	A I thin	k there is always that, but one one
	8	should	view evidence, always, with a dispassionate
	9	and po	ssibly critical eye. I am more concerned,
11:09	10	person	ally, with the availability of expertise and
	11	review	
	12	Q Well 1	et
	13		COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Mr. Beresh, are
	14	you qu	estioning this witness with respect to his
11:09	15	own wo	rk, or
	16		MR. BERESH: Yes.
	17		COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: just being
	18	genera	1?
	19		MR. BERESH: And this is my last series of
11:09	20	questi	ons, My Lord, we're leading right to his
	21	area o	f expertise.
	22		COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.
	23	BY MR. BERE	SH:
	24	Q Doctor	, I'm proposing a model, and I just want
11:09	25	your c	omment on it only insofar as your expertise

1 is involved. And my question, I guess, is this. 2 Isn't the problem that police forces face -- and 3 they are not to be faulted for this -- isn't the 4 problem that they face that most of their work is 5 enforcement, --11:10 6 Α T --7 -- much of it, of course, is investigation, and Q 8 there's, of course, overlap. Now, if His Lordship 9 was to propose the establishment of an independent 10 review body for major crimes, which review body 11:10 would be independent of the police force, which 11 12 would review evidence collected by the 13 prosecution, by yourself -- I have you in the area 14 of experts -- and then provide an objective or 15 critical assessment to the prosecution; wouldn't 11:10 16 that overcome a lot of the problems that we've 17 talked about over the last two days, sir? 18 I don't know. It's another layer. From my point Α 19 of view, the possibility of this is an independent 20 review panel of forensic pathologists, and I have 11:11 21 suggested this on occasion; that certainly, in 22 review of possible miscarriages of justice, that 23 rather than going sampling for itinerant experts, 24 that a national panel, perhaps of Chief Medical 11:11 25 Examiners and Chief Coroners, would be a very



		Page 1423 ————
1		useful body in this respect.
2	Q	Well my model takes that into account, because I
3		suggested the independent review body, once having
4		received a pathologist's report, would have access
5		to other experts?
6	А	And you are suggesting that this applies in every
7		major case and not in major cases that come under
8		question?
9	Q	In major well, we could decide, it would be
10		hard to decide what's major cases. Parliament
11		decided which are indictable offences, which are
12		summary conviction; in major cases, an independent
13		review, an independent assessment. Because
14		yesterday, when you talked about "I'm a piece of
15		the puzzle", it struck me that a piece of the
16		puzzle is missing, and this is the piece that may
17		be missing?
18	А	I can't really comment on this on such short re
19		short viewing. The only thing it would appear to
20		me is to establish yet another layer in the
21		process, and yet another possible source of delay,
22		and as I am now dealing with cases coming into
23		Queen's Bench which have taken three years to get
24		there, I'm not anxious to be dealing with any
25		further delay in this process.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	2 Q 3 4 5 6 A 7 8 9 Q 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 A 19 20 21 22 23 24

			Page 1424
	1	Q	No.
	2	A	This would imply to me, also, a degree of
	3		expedition in the processes of law which I have
	4		not encountered.
11:12	5	Q	I appreciate that. I guess my suggestion, as it
	6		relates to you, is this would take into account
	7		and give an independent body the right to contact
	8		another pathologist where there is any question
	9		about the pathologist's report, findings, and,
11:13	10		most importantly, interpretation?
	11	А	I have no objection to that, and I think it might
	12		be quite useful, but I do have to emphasize that I
	13		think the majority of forensic pathology in Canada
	14		is well done at the primary level.
11:13	15	Q	Thank you, Doctor, for your patience and
	16		COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: We'll
	17		MR. BERESH: My Lord, I'm not sure if you
	18		established a process for marking of physical
	19		exhibits here?
11:13	20		COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: All documentary
	21		evidence is in and serves as an exhibit without
	22		being formally identified as such.
	23		MR. BERESH: Thank you. I would ask for an
	24		exception to that because of what the witness has
11:13	25		said about the two photographs, they are better



	1	in real life than they are on the screen, and I
	2	am asking that they either collectively or
	3	separately be marked as exhibits at this Judicial
	4	Inquiry, please.
11:14	5	COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Mr. Hodson?
	6	MR. HODSON: Yes. Both of these
	7	photographs are, in fact, exhibits that we
	8	obtained this morning from the courthouse, they
	9	were exhibits in the Fisher matter, so they are
11:14	10	similar in nature to the knife handle and the
	11	toque, so it might be appropriate that, the fact
	12	that they were exhibits in these proceedings,
	13	they be marked here. We do have copies of these
	14	that are Bates stamped, and in our document
11:14	15	system, but I have no trouble marking these as
	16	separate exhibits.
	17	MR. BERESH: Thank you, My Lord.
	18	COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Madam Clerk, are
	19	we at Exhibit 3?
11:14	20	MR. HODSON: Together or separate?
	21	MR. BERESH: They can be together, sir.
	22	The more distant shot should be the first, and
	23	then the close-up should be the second, please.
	24	COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Was it Exhibit 3?
11:14	25	Two photos, Exhibit 3.

	1	MR. BERESH: Thank you, My Lord.
	2	COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: And understand,
	3	everybody present, that marking the exhibits
	4	formally, by that word, applies only to items of
11:15	5	real evidence. This is perhaps an exception, but
	6	given for the reasons expressed by Mr. Beresh.
	7	MR. BERESH: Might I suggest that Madam
	8	Clerk also mark, on the exhibit stamp, the number
	9	where we would find it electronically for ease of
11:15	10	reference, Mr. Commissioner?
	11	MR. HODSON: And, as well, both of those
	12	photographs are part of the publication ban.
	13	COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: They are.
	14	MR. HODSON: And one last concern,
11:15	15	Mr. Beresh. Your notes, here, that you showed to
	16	Dr. Emson, will be provided a number and put in
	17	as an exhibit as well?
	18	MR. BERESH: Yes, thank you.
	19	COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: All right.
	20	> <u>EXHIBIT P-3</u> :
	21	TWO LARGE PHOTOGRAPHS OF AUTOPSY
	22	(BATES ID NUMBERS 241975 & 241973).
	23	MR. BERESH: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner.
	24	COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: 15 minutes,
11:15	25	please.
		lacksquare



	1	(Adjourned at 11:15 a.m.)
	2	(Reconvened at 11:33 a.m.)
	3	COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes, Mr. Elson?
	4	MR. ELSON: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner.
11:32	5	BY MR. ELSON:
	6	Q Dr. Emson, in the questioning yesterday you
	7	indicated that you had not been apprised, in 1969
	8	or 1970, as to the antigen secretor status of
	9	David Milgaard; is that correct?
11:33	10	A I don't think I ever have been.
	11	Q And, in fact, you have not been advised since the
	12	trial in 1970 as to Mr. Milgaard's antigen
	13	secretor status; is that correct?
	14	A Umm, no, I haven't. I have read bits of evidence
11:33	15	here or there but I have never been informed.
	16	Q Now, as I understood your evidence yesterday, you
	17	indicated that, if one were to take a sample of
	18	bodily fluid, say for example saliva; and if one
	19	were to test that saliva and discover no antigens;
11:33	20	and let's assume also that this is a group A or a
	21	type A blood patient; if there were no antigens in
	22	the saliva, as I understood your evidence and
	23	correct me if I'm wrong that is not conclusive
	24	evidence that the person in question is not an
11:33	25	antigen secretor? If no antigens were found in



	1		the saliva, the person is known to be group A but
	2		there are no antigens found in the saliva, that is
	3		not conclusive evidence that the person is a
	4		non-secretor?
11:34	5	A	Well this is not my field of expertise, but no, I
	6		would not do that. If I knew the person to be
	7		group A on blood grouping, and if the A antigen
	8		was not expressed in saliva, I would presume he
	9		was a non-secretor.
11:34	10	Q	All right. My understanding is that there are
	11		and I understood your evidence yesterday, and I
	12		stand to be corrected but I understood your
	13		evidence yesterday that it is conceivable that you
	14		could have a group A antigen secretor, but not
11:34	15		secrete antigens within saliva, but perhaps
	16		secrete antigens in other bodily fluids?
	17	А	I didn't say that, and I the answer is I don't
	18		know. If you want to go into this you need an
	19		immunohematologist, not me.
11:34	20	Q	I see. Now, in 1992, were you ever advised of a
	21		test done on David Milgaard which demonstrated
	22		that, in fact, he was an A antigen secretor?
	23	А	No.
	24	Q	You have never been advised of that?
11:35	25	А	I have never had this question discussed with me
	ŀ	I	

			——————————————————————————————————————
	1		before, before this hearing.
	2	Q	Now I also want to deal with the practice in 1969
		Q Q	
	3		compared to the practice today. I believe your
	4		testimony was that you are still performing
11:35	5		autopsies, albeit not today, but in 2005?
	6	А	I'm not performing them today for obvious reasons,
	7		but I am currently, when not otherwise preempted,
	8		engaged in performing autopsies.
	9	Q	Now, and that would also include, obviously,
11:35	10		autopsies with respect to patients or persons who
	11		appear to be victims of homicide?
	12	А	Like Monday.
	13	Q	Now in 1969 My Friend Mr. Beresh has identified
	14		a pile of clothing on the floor and, in fairness,
11:36	15		you identified that as well in one of the
	16		photographs that's been presented to you this
	17		morning you indicated that, in 1969, there were
	18		not as many police officers in the room during an
	19		autopsy as there are currently; is that correct?
11:36	20	А	Yes.
	21	Q	How many police officers, generally, are there in
	22		the autopsy suite when an autopsy is done now,
	23		again assuming a homicide victim or an apparent
	24		homicide victim?
11:36	25	А	It's variable, but I would say there would be a



		J
1		minimum of three, and a maximum of quite a lot.
2	Q	Now if we were also to assume that that homicide
3		victim appeared concurrently, also, to be a victim
4		of sexual assault, would the sexual assault kit be
5		in use in conducting the examination of the body
6		and the postmortem?
7	A	Yes.
8	Q	Was that, to your recollection, sexual assault kit
9		in use in 1969 at the time of Gail Miller's
10		autopsy?
11	A	No, it was not, not to my recollection, and it was
12		certainly not deployed at Gail Miller's autopsy.
13		I don't know if it existed. The development of
14		the sexual assault kit was a gradual process, from
15		us putting together one on very empirical grounds,
16		to our welcoming of am almost national kit devised
17		by a number of people which I think is now in use.
18	Q	Within, and as I understand it, the sexual assault
19		kit includes what is described as a forensic
20		evidence record which is to be completed both by
21		either the physician, in the case of a live
22		patient, or the pathologist, in the case of
23		deceased patient, and the police officer. Are you
24		aware of that particular record?
25	А	Yes. I think I've had to take part in it from
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	2 Q 3 4 5 6 7 A 8 Q 9 10 11 A 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 Q 19 20 21 22 23 24

	1		time to time, though as I have said, homicides
	2		involving sexual assault are rare in my
	3		experience. I've had very few.
	4	Q	Now, it's my understanding that the practice
11:38	5		presently in the case of a homicide victim,
	6		whether or not there is or is not a sexual assault
	7		associated with it, is that the police officers in
	8		attendance from the identification branch of the
	9		police service would have individual bags for each
11:38	10		individual item of clothing; is that correct?
	11	A	That was certainly what was done on Monday, the
	12		police attended with a role of green plastic bags
	13		from which they tore one as they needed it and
	14		they are very equipped in these now.
11:38	15	Q	And part of the equipment would also include
	16		gloves; is that correct?
	17	A	We usually supply the gloves I think, but they've
	18		certainly got them and I can't say for sure
	19		whether they are wearing ours or theirs.
11:39	20	Q	In any event, at the time an item of clothing from
	21		a homicide victim is handed either by the
	22		pathologist or by the technician to the police
	23		officer, it would be handed to an identification
	24		police officer with a gloved hand; is that
11:39	25		correct?

	Ī		——————————————————————————————————————
	1	A	Are you saying the gloved hand is that of the
	2		officer or of the
	3	Q	That of the officer.
	4	A	The handing person would have a glove on. I
11:39	5		haven't specifically observed the officers.
	6	Q	All right. If I were to suggest to you that the
	7	Z.	police officers typically do wear gloves when they
	8		receive clothing either from the pathologist or
	9		the technician and that they change their gloves
11:39	10		with each individual garment, would you have any
	11		facts within your knowledge tending to suggest
	12		that that's not true?
	13	А	No. I think that accounts for perfection and
	14		should be approached. Whether it's fulfilled or
11:39	15		not I don't know.
	16	Q	Are you aware as to whether or not that indeed was
	17		the practice with respect to gloved identification
	18		officers in 1969?
	19	А	In retrospect, I would say almost certainly not.
11:40	20	Q	As part of the sexual assault kit, it would now be
	21		routine for the vaginal contents, if there are
	22		any, to be collected; is that correct?
	23	А	Yes.
	24	Q	And that would be no less routine than taking
11:40	25		fingernail scrapings in 1969 as you've testified
	1.	ai contract of the contract of	

			Page 1433 ——————————————————————————————————
	1		yesterday?
	2	A	I presume so. The sexual assault kit lays down a
	3		protocol of things to be done and specimens to be
	4		collected. It is not always possible in such a
11.40	5		
11:40			protocol to get everything that is listed, but
	6		these are the things one tries to get.
	7	Q	And it's my understanding that in the protocol
	8		there is a requirement that the pubic hair be
	9		examined for semen-like material; is that correct?
11:40	10	A	I have no specific knowledge, but that sounds
	11		reasonable.
	12	Q	And also that the pubic hair is combed again for
	13		any foreign articles?
	14	A	That is certainly done.
11:41	15	Q	And a pubic hair sample is always maintained?
	16	A	Yes.
	17	Q	And a vaginal swab is maintained?
	18	A	The I presume that the vaginal contents are
	19		taken by swab. There may be cases in which there
11:41	20		is more fluid and such as this one in which
	21		one can get a sample by pipette.
	22	Q	And you just answered my next question. And then
	23		there also would be a motility check that would be
	24		done
11:41	25		COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Excuse me, Mr.



	1	Elson. Did you sa	y, Doctor, that the swab is not
	2	taken if the vagin	al content or fluid, I mean,
	3	is available?	
	4	A What I would try to	o get, Your Lordship, would
11:41	5	depend on the amou:	nt of vaginal fluid. If the
	6	vagina is only moi	st, then one can take a swab,
	7	but if there is a	pool of fluid, then you can pick
	8	it up in a pipette	with a little rubber bulb and
	9	obviously this is	more satisfactory.
11:42	10	BY MR. ELSON:	
	11	Q You've already tes	tified as to the motility check
	12	that was done in G	ail Miller's case in 1969. That
	13	is also currently	required by the sexual assault
	14	kit; is that corre	ct?
11:42	15	A I presume so. As	I say, I have not performed an
	16	autopsy on a victi	m of sexual assault for quite a
	17	long time, but I w	ould presume that this would be
	18	done as a matter o	f routine.
	19	Q And then also as a	matter of routine there would
11:42	20	be rectal and anal	swabs; is that correct?
	21	A Oh, yes.	
	22	COMMISSIONER	MacCALLUM: Nowadays?
	23	BY MR. HODSON:	
	24	Q Nowadays, yes. I'	m also confining my questions
11:42	25	with respect to the	e sexual assault kit to the
		II	



	1		examination of the genital area and the rectal
	2		area. There is also, as I understand it,
	3		examination that is done of the oral area; is that
	4		correct?
11:42	5	А	Yes.
	6	Q	Now, yesterday, Doctor, and I'm not sure, and I
	7		apologize, I hope this doesn't offend you, but you
	8		made reference to Watson and Crick discovering the
	9		double helix and I wasn't sure that I caught your
11:43	10		evidence with respect to when it was that DNA was
	11		discovered.
	12	А	I can't remember when it was.
	13	Q	If I were to put to you that it was in 1953, would
	14		you
11:43	15	А	Oh, no, it was much longer after that, but a
	16		simple it's probably in everybody's computer
	17		who knows how to use one.
	18	Q	And that's what I endeavoured to do last night
	19		when I went home, is to double check that. It was
11:43	20		my understanding that it's 1953, but you are the
	21		witness. Your recollection was that it was
	22		somewhat later than that?
	23	А	Well, if it would have been 1953, then in 1969 we
	24		would have known about it and been chasing DNA.
11:43	25	Q	My understanding, Dr. Emson, and please correct me \P

	1		if you have any understanding that is different
	2		from what I am about to put to you, is that
	3		although DNA was discovered in 1953, it was not
	4		used for forensic purposes until it was used in
11:44	5		the case in Leicester, England in 1988.
	6	A	You may well be right, and this is what I was
	7		going to try and modify my answer, that there is a
	8		difference between discovering the structure of
	9		DNA and being able to use it in forensic
11:44	10		investigation, and I think the key in forensic
	11		investigation was the capability of replicating
	12		the DNA, of increasing its content, increasing its
	13		amount by biochemical techniques. Now, one I
	14		have to distinguish carefully here between
11:44	15		knowledge of the structure, which may well have
	16		been '53, and the capability to use this knowledge
	17		which may well have been much later, and I'm sorry
	18		if I haven't been clear on that.
	19	Q	That's fine, and I wanted to make sure I had that
11:45	20		understanding. Do you have any recollection of
	21		the first occasion in the world in which DNA was
	22		used for forensic purposes?
	23	Α	No, I don't.
	24	Q	Now, Doctor, you indicated yesterday as well that
11:45	25		in 1969 there wasn't the degree of specialization

			rage 1437
	1		in matters such as sexual assault, major crimes or
	2		identification as there is today. I believe that
	3		was your evidence?
	4	А	Well, I'm not familiar with the matters of police
11:45	5		organization, but certainly as the amount of
	6		knowledge has increased exponentially, so has the
	7		specialization of the people necessary to use it,
	8		and this is applied to the police equally as to
	9		everybody else.
11:45	10	Q	And that leads to my next question. In 1969 when
	11		this autopsy was performed, and you indicated that
	12		Lieutenant Penkala was in the autopsy suite as
	13		well as Officer Kleiv, what knowledge did you have
	14		at that time as to the training or expertise of
11:46	15		either Lieutenant Penkala or Officer Kleiv?
	16	A	The same as I have now, none.
	17		COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: None?
	18	Α	None. I don't know how police officers are
	19		trained, Your Lordship.
11:46	20		COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh, your knowledge
	21		was none, okay. You didn't know about their
	22		qualifications?
	23	Α	No, I don't know about the training or
	24		qualifications of police officers.
11:46	25	BY M	R. ELSON:



	1	Q	So if a bodily substance was removed from a
	2		homicide victim, among the three people in the
	3		room, yourself, Lieutenant Penkala and Officer
	4		Kleiv, you would agree with me that you were the
11:46	5		best person to make an assessment as to the value
	6		of that bodily substance in determining who the
	7		possible assailant might be?
	8	A	Not necessarily. I would not, I think, at that
	9		time, have been very knowledgeable about the
11:47	10		capabilities of the forensic laboratories. It was
	11		stated yesterday that had the vaginal specimen
	12		been saved, it would have been very useful to the
	13		person investigating in Regina. I didn't know
	14		this, or I presume I didn't know this or else it
11:47	15		would have been saved. There's no note in this
	16		stating there's no note in this material saying
	17		what we knew at the time and I can only go by
	18		inference, that because something was not done, it
	19		was because either we were not we were not
11:47	20		informed or knowledgeable that it could be done or
	21		that we didn't know it was going to be useful. I
	22		think my attitude now has changed to the opposite
	23		pole, that you should save everything because it
	24		may come in useful even if you don't know at the
11:47	25		time you save it what it's going to be useful for,
		ll .	

	1		but that is an opinion gained by a lifetime of
	2		sometimes hard experience.
	3	Q	I appreciate that. Now, Mr. Lockyer yesterday
	4		cross-examined you at some length with respect to
11:48	5		wrongful convictions which occur as a result of,
	6		and I will use his words, "bad pathology". Now,
	7		in this particular case the only you've
	8		acknowledged that your evidence at the Milgaard
	9		trial that it was common for blood to be found
11:48	10		within spermatozoa was wrong and that Dr.
	11		Markesteyn was correct and that you were wrong.
	12		That was your evidence yesterday; is that correct?
	13	А	Yes, that is my I was of the wrong opinion at
	14		the original trial and I had to vary that opinion
11:48	15		as I became more knowledgeable, and incidentally,
	16		may I go back to your use of the term
	17		cross-examination? Is this in fact a
	18		cross-examination?
	19	Q	Technically yes, as I understand it.
11:49	20	A	Oh.
	21	Q	Now
	22	А	Well, Your Lordship, I
	23		COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: What are you
	24		referring to, the one today or the one yesterday?
11:49	25	A	Both. My experience with cross-examination is
		l	

that it's customary at a trial. I was not aware of the passing of the examination, of a Commission of this type, and whereas the term -- I would just like to be sure of the terminology, that this is in fact a cross-examination and what preceded it was an examination-in-chief.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: And one can gain only some guidance from trial practice here, sir. This is a public inquiry with obvious differences and Commission Counsel, who in a trial setting would be cross-examining, is not cross-examining here because his position is a neutral one, he's here simply to present the evidence without commentary. Yesterday we listened to some cross-examination which contained editorial content and we listened to some more of that this I believe those questions were put to morning. you, sir, in recognition of your undoubted expertise in the field of pathology. I listened to it for that reason. I promise you that I won't be as lenient as time goes on with other witnesses, particularly if they are not experts like you are.

A Thank you, Your Lordship.

BY MR. ELSON:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

11:49

11:49

11:49

11:50



I wasn't sure whether, Dr. Emson, you were thinking that my cross-examination was not particularly cross, but in any event, I will continue.

In the reference that Mr. Lockyer made yesterday, again he made the reference to wrongful convictions occurring from bad pathology, and forgive me for being trite for a moment, but I take it that you would agree that in the field of forensic pathology there can be two very competent, very qualified forensic pathologists who can disagree on the interpretation of findings and the disagreement on the interpretation of findings does not make, or does not mean that one of those forensic pathologists is practicing bad pathology and the other necessarily practicing good pathology. Would you agree with that as a proposition? Firstly, I am quite familiar with the phenomenon of different interpretations from the same accepted findings. My last two cases where I have appeared in other provinces have dealt with this. The question as to whether this necessarily admits the incompetence of the pathologist, no, it

doesn't.

There may quite valid ly be different

	1		interpretations of the same set of facts and then
	2		it's a question of the pathologist being able to
	3		produce supporting material to support his or her
	4		opinion and whether this in fact convinces the
11:52	5		court or not.
	6	Q	Now, yesterday also Mr. Lockyer raised other cases
	7		of wrongful conviction, only one of which you were
	8		familiar with, and that would be the Dalton case,
	9		and that was because you were a consultant
11:52	10		forensic pathologist in that case; is that
	11		correct?
	12	А	Yes.
	13	Q	And as I understand it, in the Dalton case, as
	14		would be the case in most wrongful convictions
11:52	15		attributable to pathology, the finding as to the
	16		cause of death is the one or the conclusion,
	17		rather, I should say, as to the cause of death is
	18		the thing that is the subject of most of the
	19		criticism, and that was the case in Dalton, the
11:52	20		pathologist made a wrong conclusion with respect
	21		to the facts he had found?
	22	А	In the Dalton case it turned upon the
	23		interpretation of injuries to the neck and about
	24		the larynx, the voice box, but if I am to comment
11:53	25		on that case, I have to say that for some legal

	1		reason, with which I'm not informed, the
	2		re-examination of the case only started when
	3		Mr. Dalton had done eight years after his
	4		conviction, but if the pathology evidence had been
11:53	5		properly examined and presented at his initial
	6		trial we would have been able to say what we said
	7		eight years later, that there was nothing much
	8		that occurred in the interval. This is why I was
	9		rather dubious about the pathologist in Dalton
11:53	10		because it didn't appear to me that it had been
	11		properly examined at the initial trial.
	12	Q	I appreciate that. My point of it is, though, is
	13		that where pathologists get into trouble in these
	14		issues of wrongful conviction is making a finding
11:53	15		as to a cause of death suggesting criminal
	16		activity when in fact the cause of death occurred
	17		from nothing innocuous?
	18	А	There are other cases. There is the I'm not
	19		good on the names of cases that I haven't
11:53	20		participated in, but I remember one where injuries
	21		inflicted by a dog were misinterpreted and that is
	22		the sort of thing that can happen, or where a
	23		person dying from a fall down the stair was
	24		misinterpreted as being homicide rather than
11:54	25		accident. These are the sort of things that



	1		happen.
	2	Q	Now, if we were to look at the comments that have
	3		been made by others with respect to the autopsy
	4		and the testimony at trial, Dr. Ferris, as we
11:54	5		heard yesterday in the evidence presented to you
	6		by my friend Mr. Hodson, expressed criticism about
	7		how long Gail Miller would have lived after she
	8		had been stabbed in the lung. Now, Dr. Emson, in
	9		your opinion how would the length of time it took
11:54	10		Gail Miller to die after her lung was pierced with
	11		a knife, how could that in any way assist in
	12		distinguishing one assailant from another
	13		assailant?
	14	A	That would depend entirely on the circumstantial
11:55	15		evidence of which I'm not informed.
	16	Q	Secondly, Dr. Ferris expresses a criticism in
	17		which he suggests that the deceased was probably
	18		alive at the time of the rape, and in fairness to
	19		you, sir, you've indicated, as you've always done,
11:55	20		that you have no conclusive opinion one way or the
	21		other on that matter; is that correct?
	22	A	I think that the rape might have occurred before,
	23		at the time of or shortly after death and I have
	24		no way of distinguishing it.
11:55	25	Q	How would the evidence of the victim being alive \P

	1		at the time of the rape assist in distinguishing
	2		one possible assailant from another possible
	3		assailant?
	4	А	That, as I said, depends entirely on the
11:55	5		circumstantial evidence, as to where these people
	6		might have been. I don't know that.
	7	Q	Now thirdly, Dr. Ferris expressed some criticism
	8		of your conclusion you expressed earlier about the
	9		presence of menstrual blood.
11:56	10	А	Dr. Ferris was quite wrong there. My report says
	11		that the endometrium, the lining of the uterus was
	12		on the verge of menstruation, and I believe then
	13		and I believe now that there may have been a
	14		slight preliminary loss of blood from that before
11:56	15		the onset of full menstruation. It didn't appear
	16		from what I saw from Dr. Ferris' comments that he
	17		had in fact read that bit about the microscopic
	18		examination of the endometrium.
	19	Q	Be that as it may, if we were to assume for a
11:56	20		moment, and I appreciate you disagree with Dr.
	21		Ferris, if we were to assume for a moment that
	22		he's right, how would the presence or not of
	23		menstrual blood assist in distinguishing again one
	24		possible assailant from another possible
11:56	25		assailant?

	1	А	Well, it would only complicate the matters if
	2		there was a question of grouping the semen with
	3		regard to its blood antigens.
	4	Q	And again, you had testified yesterday that in
11:57	5		your opinion, had that been done, it would have
	6		been very difficult to interpret; is that correct?
	7	А	Yes, and I think there was another document
	8		produced which established the same opinion, but I
	9		have learned since then that as a matter of
11:57	10		defensive pathology one should always do a test
	11		and then explain why it means nothing rather than
	12		not do it because it's not going to mean anything.
	13		It's always better to have done something and then
	14		try to explain it.
11:57	15	Q	Now, also yesterday Mr. Lockyer in his questioning
	16		implied some criticism of you for the fact that
	17		you had not intervened earlier, notably at the
	18		time or sometime before the Supreme Court
	19		reference, to express your suspicion that the rape
11:57	20		had occurred somewhere other than in the open.
	21		You'll recall that being put to you yesterday?
	22	А	I recall Mr. Lockyer's comments very well and I do
	23		not know how, in the present organization of the
	24		legal system, I might reasonably have intervened
11:58	25		on what was only a suspicion in a case which

	1	ev	erybody, more people had more evidence than I
	2	ha	d.
	3	Q Le	t me be perhaps a little bit more basic. How
	4	ne	cessary is it for someone to have qualifications
11:58	5	in	forensic pathology in order to express an
	6	op	inion which contains the suspicion that the rape
	7	ha	d occurred other than in the open?
	8	A I	don't think it requires anything other than
	9	kn	owledge of what a minus 40 morning feels like,
11:58	10	an	d most of us here have got that.
	11	Q No	w, Mr. Lockyer also put to you something
	12	ye	sterday which he suggested as a statement of
	13	fa	ct, and again I am using his words, not mine.
	14		COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I'm going to ask
11:58	15	УC	u just to I just want to catch up to you
	16	he	re.
	17		MR. ELSON: I'm sorry.
	18		COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay, Mr. Elson,
	19	re	peat that, please?
11:59	20	BY MR.	ELSON:
	21	Q Ye	sterday, Dr. Emson, Mr. Lockyer put something to
	22	ус	u which he described as a statement of fact, and
	23	I	am using his words, not mine, when he said to
	24	УC	u that it was essential for the Crown to show
12:00	25	th	at the rape occurred in the open in order to,

			•
	1		and again I use Mr. Lockyer's words, "To pin it on
	2		David Milgaard." Now, that's the lead-in to my
	3		question, Dr. Emson. You testified in the Larry
	4		Fisher trial; is that correct?
12:00	5	A	Yes.
	6	Q	And were you advised by Crown counsel in that case
	7		as to the Crown's theory against Mr. Fisher? I'm
	8		not suggesting you should have been, but were you
	9		advised by Crown counsel as to the theory of the
12:00	10		entire case against Mr. Fisher?
	11	A	No.
	12	Q	Do you have any knowledge as to how essential it
	13		was to show that the rape occurred other than in
	14		the open or in the open in the case against Larry
12:00	15		Fisher in order to pin it on Larry Fisher?
	16	A	My knowledge of the case was that the attribution
	17		of the homicide to Mr. Fisher was virtually
	18		dependent on the DNA evidence.
	19	Q	And that it mattered not whether the rape had
12:01	20		occurred in the open or indoors or in a car?
	21	A	I was not aware of that aspect of it.
	22		MR. ELSON: Thank you, Dr. Emson. I have
	23		no further questions.
	24	BY M	MR. GIBSON:
12:01	25	Q	The good news, Dr. Emson, is we're starting to run

	1	out of lawyers, so you shouldn't be up there much
	2	longer. The bad news is I do have a few
	3	questions. My name is Bruce Gibson, I act for the
	4	RCMP, and unfortunately I'm going to have to visit
12:01	5	a few areas that you've been over again and I
	6	apologize for that.
	7	If I could have document 001256
	8	up, please, and if we could go to 263 in that.
	9	Now, Doctor, this is a letter that was written
12:02	10	by and if we can go to the bottom, I think it's
	11	Dr
	12	A This is from Dr. Markesteyn.
	13	Q Markesteyn. And you went over that the other day
	14	with Mr. Lockyer I believe.
12:02	15	COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Written by
	16	Markesteyn was it?
	17	BY MR. GIBSON:
	18	Q Yes, it is. If I could have 263, please, of that,
	19	and there's his name there at the bottom. One of
12:02	20	the things that was put to you, it might have been
	21	by Mr. Hodson could I get that enlarged along
	22	the side there, and it's this passage right here:
	23	"If, to everyone's satisfaction, it was

24

25

12:02

established that the origin of the yellowish

patch was unadulterated, uncontaminated

	1		human semen, then the presence of the A
	2		antigen in this specimen clearly, from a
	3		serological point of view, could not be Mr.
	4		Milgaard's."
12:03	5		And at that point in time Mr. Milgaard was seen
	6		as a non-secretor. Would you agree with that
	7		statement? I believe you did agree with it the
	8		other day.
	9	А	If at that time Mr. Milgaard was known or
12:03	10		considered to be a non-secretor, then it is my
	11		information that the absence of an A antigen from
	12		the specimen, the presence of the A antigen in the
	13		specimen indicated that the semen was not from Mr.
	14		Milgaard.
	15	Q	Okay.
	16	А	Now, here again I'm being exhaustively examined on
	17		an area in which I am not an expert and I can only
	18		suggest that if this is a vital part of the
	19		Commission's evidence, that an immunohematologist
12:03	20		should be called because I have only very basic
	21		knowledge of these things.
	22	Q	Yes, and I'm just trying to be fair with you,
	23		Doctor, because you were asked and went over those
	24		questions, and I know that you have given evidence
12:04	25		on that point, but I believe in your testimony
	1		_

			Tage 1431
	1		yesterday, and Mr. Elson just went over it with
	2		you, that you said that an A-type secretor may at
	3		times not secrete an A antigen?
	4	А	I don't think I said that and I don't know if it's
12:04	5		correct. My presumption would be that if you were
	6		an A secretor, you always secreted A.
	7	Q	What I'm going to do then is I'll put up another
	8		document here and if I could get to 278893. I
	9		don't believe you've seen that document before.
12:05	10		If we could just enlarge that. It's a memorandum
	11		from a Cathy MacMillan with the RCMP biology
	12		section to the subdivision in Regina and we'll
	13		look at paragraph 5. I'm just going to read this
	14		to you, Doctor, and see whether that jives with
12:05	15		your understanding:
	16		"It is my understanding, the lab did not
	17		conclude that David Milgaard was a
	18		non-secretor. The lab did; however,
	19		conclude that Milgaard's saliva did not
12:05	20		contain any detectable antigens. This does
	21		not mean that Milgaard is a non-secretor.
	22		Several situations can arise whereby
	23		antigens might not be detected. They are as
	24		follows:
12:05	25		(i) insufficient quantity of sample to

			Page 1452 —
	1		analyze,
	2		(ii) the concentration of the antigen was
	3		low."
	4		And if I could just go to the next page, finally:
12:05	5		"(iii) finally, sample degradation."
	6		So all I'm trying to put to you, Doctor, is does
	7		that make sense to you in that there may be other
	8		reasons why a person could in fact be an A-type
	9		secretor but for some reason a particular sample
12:06	10		may not show that?
	11	А	That seems to me to be a very proper and
	12		scientific explanation.
	13	Q	Thank you. Because there was a bit of confusion
	14		on that point, so I did want to spend a bit of
12:06	15		time with that.
	16	А	No, as I said, I'm not an expert, but presuming
	17		this person to be an expert, that is a very proper
	18		expression of expertise and certainly the reasons
	19		given are quite comprehensive.
12:06	20	Q	Thank you. If we could go back to the first part
	21		of that document, just on the previous page,
	22		please. If you could highlight that.
	23		"On January 28th, 1992, I analyzed a saliva
	24		sample from D. Milgaard. Further, on May
12:07	25		12, 192 I analyzed a buccal swab from L.

Fisher. Detectable quantities of A antigen were found in each sample. Therefore, in response to question number 1, D. Milgaard and L. Fisher are both blood type A."

Number 2:

"An individual who is classified as a secretor has detectable quantities of their blood group antigens, i.e., (A, B or H) in their saliva, semen (or vaginal fluid) or other body fluids."

Number 3:

"Larry Fisher is a secretor."

Number 4:

"David Milgaard is a secretor."

So the document states that the two men who have now been convicted of killing Gail Miller both have blood A type, or both blood A type secretors, and what I want to know, Doctor, is to your knowledge would there have been any other tests available in 1969 that could have somehow differentiated their seminal fluid or blood from a particular sample that may have been found at the crime scene? I mean, going back to 1969 what science was available? If you end up with two individuals that are both A blood type secretors,



	1		is there anything else to your knowledge that
	2		could have been done to differentiate those from
	3		a known sample?
	4	А	Well, as I said, and I'll repeat, I'm not an
12:08	5		expert on this. The only other antigen I can
	6		think of is the D antigen, D for Delta, but it was
	7		certainly well known in blood transfusion practice
	8		at that time, but whether the D antigen is
	9		secreted or not I do not know, and there has never
12:08	10		been any mention of it, so I would rather presume
	11		it isn't secreted, but that again is a question.
	12		That there were various other antigens known at
	13		that time and just precisely what they were I
	14		cannot say, but the pertinent point would be were
12:08	15		any of these other antigens in fact subject to
	16		expression in secretor status and I don't know
	17		that either.
	18	Q	And again I believe you've given us evidence that
	19		tests were limited back in 1969 as to what you
12:09	20		could do with any kind of fluid?
	21	А	I was not then and never have been an
	22		immunohematologist and I'm not informed as to what
	23		tests were then available.
	24	Q	Now, you were asked a number of times about why
12:09	25		you discarded the vaginal sample taken from Ms.

	1		Miller and I believe you replied along the lines
	2		that you didn't think that the blood would be of
	3		any scientific use?
	4	A	I can only presume, in the absence of any record,
12:09	5		that the reason that that sample was discarded was
	6		because between us we felt there was no further
	7		use for it.
	8	Q	All right.
	9	A	I am now informed that there might in fact have
12:09	10		been a further use for it and I have radically
	11		altered my opinion since then partly as a result
	12		of this type of examination, that what one should
	13		do is save everything and then decide whether it's
	14		useful or not. The other point about saving
12:10	15		everything is of course you don't know what tests
	16		are going to become available in the future, as we
	17		did not know in 1969 that DNA would become
	18		available as a practical test, and there's a very
	19		good argument for saving everything, though it
12:10	20		does lead to problems of storage.
	21	Q	Okay. Now Dr. Emson, you have testified that, I
	22		think it was a number of days later, I think
	23		February 4th or later of 1969, that the Saskatoon
	24		Police brought in to you some other samples that
12:10	25		were taken from a snowbank near the body?

	1	Α	I have no written record of this, but my memory is
	2		that Lieutenant Penkala brought in this frozen
	3		snow, we thawed it, examined it, and I found that
	4		it contained mammalian-type spermatozoa.
12:11	5		Lieutenant Penkala then took the specimen, I did
	6		nothing further, and, as it has not been produced,
	7		I assumed I did not make a written report on this.
	8	Q	Now were you aware that that sample was forwarded
	9		on to the RCMP?
12:11	10	А	Not until this Commission.
	11	Q	Okay. And you mentioned that you weren't
	12		necessarily aware of what testing may or may not
	13		have been available at the crime lab?
	14	A	I'm not aware of that now, I'm not informed as to
12:11	15		what their gamut of testing availability is.
	16	Q	So again, you know, for the purpose of what this
	17		inquiry, I guess, is all about, and making
	18		recommendations; is there any ongoing dialogue
	19		between pathologists and the crime lab people?
12:11	20	A	Well, first of all, I think I'm not informed as to
	21		RCMP organization, but from personal experience
	22		over the last year I know that virtually all the
	23		chemical analyses are being done in Halifax, and
	24		virtually all the photographic reproduction is
12:12	25		being done in Ottawa, I don't know if we still

	1		have a crime lab in Regina. It would be very nice
	2		if the pathologists were informed as to what the
	3		availabilities from the RCM Crime Lab are, and
	4		particularly as to the nature of the specimens and
12:12	5		the containers which are best to use, but we do
	6		not get communications of this nature.
	7	Q	Okay. Now, Dr. Emson, do you have was there
	8		any discussion and, again, I may know this
	9		answer but I guess I would want to hear it from
12:12	10		you was there any discussion between yourself
	11		and the city police members that assisted you at
	12		the autopsy and then came later on with the sample
	13		from the snowbank, as to why the snowbank sample
	14		was, I guess, gathered and sent on to the RCMP for
12:12	15		analysis, whereas the one from the autopsy was not
	16		retained and was not forwarded on; is there
	17		anything that you can help us
	18	Α	I was not told that the snowbank sample was being
	19		sent on.
12:13	20	Q	So I guess the short answer is you have no idea as
	21		to why they may not have suggested to you to
	22		retain the sample during the autopsy, but yet were
	23		gathering other samples from near the body and
	24		sending them on?
12:13	25	Α	Possibly the police members had been informed,
	11		

		1 age 1430
1		subsequent to the autopsy, that the specimen
2		should have been kept. I don't know.
3	Q	One other final point I want to cover with you.
4		Again, you were shown an Email yesterday by
5		Mr. Lockyer between a Ronald Fainstein and a Dave
6		Werrett with respect to maybe we can just put
7		that document up, it's 33006.
8		COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I didn't get the
9		number; 033006?
10		MR. GIBSON: Right. If you could go to the
11		last page of that, I think it's 008 sorry, I
12		guess the second-last page, 008. Thank you.
13		COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: And this is
14		Fainstein's memo to who?
15		MR. GIBSON: To Werrett, to a Dr. Werrett.
16	ВҮ	MR. GIBSON:
17	Q	And I take it, Dr. Emson, that you don't know Ron
18		Fainstein; or do you?
19	А	No.
20	Q	Okay. And so you have never had any discussion
21		with him concerning this memo or the thoughts in
22		it?
23	А	Not to my knowledge.
24	Q	Okay. And the only reason I raise it is that I
25		guess it was put to you for another reason, but
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	2

1 the point that was singled out here, if we could 2 have just this portion highlighted. And it talks 3 about Mr. Fainstein saying: 4 "I believe that she was raped in a car, then 5 pulled on her coat without taking the time 12:15 to put her arms back through the sleeves of 6 7 her dress, tried to flee down a laneway, 8 then was caught and stabbed by her 9 assailant. This would also explain why she 10 was stabbed through her coat, but not 12:15 through her dress." 11 12 And I think that that was put to you, again in 13 Mr. Lockyer's words, it was put to you as that 14 that was a matter of fact and you acknowledged 15 that it was a matter of fact. I guess, if we 12:15 16 could just clarify, would it be -- would I be 17 correct in assuming that you were simply saying it is a matter of fact that that was contained in 18 19 that memorandum? 20 It is a matter of fact that this paragraph is in 12:15 Α 21 the memorandum. 22 Yes. Q 23 Α It is a matter of opinion as to the events 24 described. 25 Exactly. I mean it does say "I believe" in that 12:15 Q

			Č
	1		sentence, so it's a hypothesis with respect to the
	2		crime, and
	3	A	It describes a hypothesis, which appears to be
	4		valid, but it's one of a number possible.
12:16	5	Q	And, as you are well aware, there are a number of
	6		hypotheses and a number of pieces of evidence that
	7		went into making various determinations along the
	8		line in this case; correct?
	9	A	I do not accept this statement as a matter of
12:16	10		fact, the statement is a matter of opinion.
	11	Q	Thank you very much.
	12		MR. BOYCHUK: Mr. Commissioner, I have no
	13		questions for this witness.
	14		COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thank you. Ms.
12:16	15		Krogan?
	16		MS. KROGAN: No questions.
	17		COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Ms. Knox?
	18		MS. KNOX: Mr. Commissioner, I do have some
	19		questions, I expect to be more than a few
12:16	20		minutes, so this might be an appropriate point to
	21		break.
	22		COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well, if you're
	23		ready to go, I don't want to waste time, but if
	24		you're not, then we can break.
12:17	25		MS. KNOX: Mr. Commissioner, there is some
		İ	



1 information that I made a phone call to look to 2 have retrieved for me during the morning break, 3 and that won't be available at my office until I 4 return there so --5 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: We'll break now, 12:17 then, until 2:00. 6 7 (Adjourned at 12:17 p.m.) 8 (Reconvened at 2:00 p.m.) 9 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Good afternoon. 10 Ms. Knox? 02:00 BY MS. KNOX: 11 12 Q Good afternoon, Dr. Emson. My name is Catherine 13 Knox and I am counsel for Mr. Caldwell, and I 14 won't keep you a long time. And I apologize that 15 I had to bring you back after lunch, but I was 16 relying on technology to get me some materials so 17 that I could have my hands on it to go where I 18 need to go this afternoon. 19 Now you have indicated -- and 20 02:01

21

22

23

24

25

02:01

I'll summarize, and if I summarize unfairly I have no doubt that you will correct me -- but I'm just going to try to summarize. The essence of your evidence is that you completed the autopsy in, arising from this homicide on January 31st, 1969, and with the exception of an occasion when the



	1		police came with some snow samples that you
	2		examined for them, or melted for them but did no
	3		testing on, and the time when they brought the
	4		knife that you have looked at in the exhibits this
02:01	5		morning, I gather you don't recall having any
	6		other contact with or discussions with the police
	7		about this incident, or the mechanics of death, or
	8		anything of that nature?
	9	А	I have no specific recollection. It is quite
02:01	10		possible that I may have had some communication
	11		with Mr. Penkala or Mr. Kleiv, but I have no
	12		specific recollection of that.
	13	Q	Okay. Now you have indicated throughout your
	14		evidence some aspects of the nature of the
02:02	15		relationship, or the role that you would play in a
	16		case of this type then and now, and I guess I'm
	17		not real clear. But, apart from this case, would
	18		there be other occasions where, routinely, you
	19		would have contact with officers such as
02:02	20		Lieutenant Penkala and Officer Kleiv and about
	21		a different matter, but that you might get into
	22		discussing what's happening on this particular
	23		case?
	24	Α	Umm, I'm sorry, I don't quite understand the
02:02	25		question, but if you mean are there cases in which

1		there might be something of an ongoing
2		relationship between myself and the police
3		representatives, there might. Normally, I should
4		say usually, by the end of the autopsy we have got
5		what we feel we need
6	Q	Uh-huh?
7	A	and the next time I see the police
8		representatives may be in court. But, on
9		occasion, I think they may come back to me with
10		further questions or possibly more information.
11	Q	Yeah. I'm not thinking, though, just of occasions
12		when they would come with further questions or
13		more information, like when they came with the
14		snow lumps or the knife, but just in general
15		conversation that would be a commonality you would
16		have with those police officers at that time, in
17		1969, that being the occurrence of a murder within
18		your city, which would have been a fairly rare
19		occurrence back in those days; am I correct in
20		that?
21	A	In that we had continuing communication?
22	Q	Not continuing, but that
23	A	Intermittent?
24	Q	Not intimate.
25	A	Intermittent.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	2 3 4 5 6 Q 7 A 8 9 10 11 Q 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 A 22 Q 23 A 24 Q

			· ·
	1	Q	Oh, intermittent, yes. So would you agree that
	2		possibly there would have been intermittent
	3	A	Yes, certainly. The investigation is a continuing
	4		affair, and if, after the autopsy procedure, the
02:03	5		police feel I may be able to contribute more, they
	6		will come back, and I think they quite often do.
	7	Q	Uh-huh. And even during the course of events like
	8		the preliminary inquiry when you attend at the
	9		courthouse, the trial when you attend at the
02:04	10		courthouse, it wouldn't be uncommon for there just
	11		to be general discussion between you and the
	12		police officers, the investigators, about the
	13		reason you are there, what's happening with the
	14		case. That would be normal human communication,
02:04	15		as I recall it, between professionals; wouldn't
	16		you agree?
	17	A	I don't think, I don't think it is permitted that
	18		we discuss each other's evidence in court before
	19		it is given, because commonly I am excluded from
02:04	20		court until my evidence is heard. Now this varies
	21		from time to time and place to place, but it's
	22		difficult to define. I think, before the case
	23		gets to court, certainly we may exchange
	24		information
02:04	25	Q	Uh-huh?

	1	А	and opinions. When the case is called to court
	2		it is my understanding that it is not proper for
	3		witnesses to discuss evidence between themselves
	4		until this evidence has been given to the court.
02:05	5	Q	Yeah, and I'm not suggesting that there would be a
	6		discussion of what you are going to say or what
	7		they are going to say, but just a general
	8		acknowledgment of why you are there and, you know,
	9		the facts?
02:05	10	A	There might be.
	11	Q	Yeah.
	12	A	There might be.
	13	Q	That would be
	14	A	We have continual relationships which approach on
02:05	15		friendship from time to time.
	16	Q	And the same with the Crown, there would be some
	17		discussions pre and post
	18	A	Certainly with the Crown, which under the
	19		adversarial system usually calls me, and with
02:05	20		Crown counsel and the prosecutor assigned to the
	21		case there is customarily a pretrial conference.
	22	Q	And, sir, did anyone, either in the policing
	23		authority or the Crown office, at any time prior
	24		to you giving testimony at the preliminary inquiry
02:05	25		in 1969, ever suggest to you how you should
			1

			1 age 1400
	1		testify, or that there were certain areas that
	2		were off limits, or in any way try to colour,
	3		corner, or curtail your testimony or your opinion?
	4	А	They did not, and I would have remembered it, and
02:06	5		so would they if they tried to do so.
	6	Q	I suspect they would. And, sir, post-preliminary
	7		inquiry, and prior to testifying at the trial in
	8		January of 1970, did anybody, any policing
	9		authority or anybody from the Crown office, in any
02:06	10		manner, attempt to engage in a similar exercise
	11		with you; in other words, control what you would
	12		say or what your opinions were and would continue
	13		to be?
	14	А	No.
02:06	15	Q	Okay.
	16	А	If they had, I would have remembered it, and so
	17		would they.
	18	Q	And, sir, post the trial, and up until the point
	19		in time I think when were you first
02:06	20		contacted, do you remember, about this case after
	21		the trial had concluded in 1970?
	22	A	I can't remember.
	23	Q	Do you remember
	24	A	It's been a case which has remained in the media,
02:06	25		
	1	ii	

			Page 1467 ————————————————————————————————————
	1	Q	Uh-huh?
	2	A	and I have no recollection of specific contact
	3		from anybody, certainly I wasn't I wasn't
	4		called to the Supreme Court hearing
02:07	5	Q	Uh-huh?
	6	А	and my the formal communication between the
	7		conviction of Mr. Milgaard and his release, and
	8		the charge of Mr. Fisher, formal communication, I
	9		can't remember any.
02:07	10	Q	Did, in your role as Coroner and in the role that
	11		you play
	12	А	I'm not a Coroner, I'm a pathologist.
	13	Q	I'm sorry. In your role as a pathologist, and in
	14		the role that you played in this case, have you
02:07	15		been contacted by anyone, whether it be with
	16		respect to the Supreme Court of Canada
	17		proceedings, whether it be by Mrs. Milgaard as she
	18		contacted various parties in her quest to
	19		establish her son's innocence; was there any
02:07	20		restriction on you from communicating with them
	21		and, indeed, would you have refused to communicate
	22		with them?
	23	A	No restriction was placed upon me. Nobody, to my
	24		recollection, ever attempted to communicate with
02:08	25		me. If they had done so, I would have had to $lacktrian$



			· ·
	1		treat such communication with my customary
	2		wariness.
	3	Q	But you wouldn't have refused to talk to them, I
	4		take it?
02:08	5	А	I don't know, depending what they wanted me to
	6		talk to them about.
	7	Q	Okay. Am I correct in understanding that, at some
	8		point in time, you discussed with Dr. Ferris the
	9		work that he was doing on the file, and indeed
02:08	10		perhaps with Dr. Markesteyn as well, who were
	11		assisting the advocates on behalf of Mr. Milgaard
	12		to establish his innocence?
	13	А	I might have done. I have no specific
	14		recollection of it, but I know Dr. Markesteyn
02:08	15		quite well and Dr. Ferris peripherally, we're both
	16		members of a small professional group, and my
	17		contacts with Dr. Markesteyn have continued up to
	18		the present day. I don't even know where Dr.
	19		Ferris is, or whether he is still alive, but there
02:08	20		may well have been communications between us, but
	21		I have no record of them.
	22	Q	Okay. Given that Dr. Markesteyn and Dr. Ferris
	23		would be in a slightly different category than a
	24		civilian, such as Mrs. Milgaard, if they, as
	25		professional colleagues from other parts of the
		1	

	1		country, had called you and wanted to discuss,
	2		with you, your expert opinion in the Milgaard
	3		case, would you have felt it appropriate and
	4		proper that you do so?
02:09	5	A	Umm, after Mr. Milgaard's conviction, yes. After
	6		the questions started to arise and he had been
	7		released, and there was the interim and then Mr.
	8		Fisher being charged, I might have queried the
	9		propriety of doing so in case I was called in a
02:09	10		new trial. But certainly, in the years between
	11		1970 and was it 1985 or so, I would have talked to
	12		them as professionals.
	13	Q	Okay. And up until the point in time when it
	14		became a possibility of another suspect, and
02:09	15		specifically Mr. Fisher, would there have been any
	16		time when you would have declined to engage in
	17		discussion with them or to test with them the
	18		merits of your opinion evidence?
	19	A	I don't think so. They are professional
02:10	20		colleagues and we're used we're used to
	21		exchange of opinions and, indeed, were asked for
	22		opinions. I've been in contact, for instance,
	23		with the Chief Medical Examiner for Alberta over
	24		things like this, and it's quite common for
02:10	25		members of a small group to ask for opinion or

			Page 1470 —
	1		comment on ongoing cases.
	2	Q	Is it not, I won't say common, but not uncommon
	3		that sometimes the members of that small group can
	4		have different opinions, as was alluded to by
02:10	5		Mr. Beresh this morning, about the same set of
	6		facts?
	7	A	It happens. How do I phrase this. It happens,
	8		but it is not common, because I think experienced
	9		forensic pathologists in general do not disagree
02:10	10		often on the interpretation of evidence, but it
	11		does happen.
	12	Q	On that point I'm just going to diverge for a
	13		moment. Yesterday, when you were being
	14		cross-examined by Mr. Lockyer, you made reference,
02:11	15		and reference was made this morning in your
	16		reference to a case where you offered expert
	17		opinion in Newfoundland, the Dalton case?
	18	A	Yes.
	19	Q	And I'm not looking to cause problems or to trap
02:11	20		you, I just want to set out some of the background
	21		to that, if I may, and if you know it. Now, am I
	22		correct in my understanding that you were first
	23		consulted in the <i>Dalton case</i> in 1997?
	24	A	I couldn't give you the precise data except by
02:11	25		careful checking of it. It was late in the year
			1

		Page 1471 —————
1		in November and it may well have been '97.
2	Q	And it was
3	А	It probably was because we finally got into the
4		retrial in the year 2000. There had been various
5		postponements, the judge had gotten sick and the
6		trial had started again, and things like that.
7	Q	I'm going to suggest to you that there was an
8		affidavit filed in the Newfoundland Court of
9		Appeal in this matter in November of 1997 from
10		you?
11	А	Yes, that's probably correct, because what
12		happened was I was asked for my opinion and, based
13		on that, Mr. Kennedy came to Saskatchewan from
14		Newfoundland and he now, these are the
15		technicalities of the law and I may not understand
16		them well, but that the case had to go to the
17		Newfoundland Court of Appeal and my evidence had
18		to go in the form of an affidavit, so he assisted
19		me in casting what I had found in the form of an
20		affidavit. This went to the Newfoundland Court of
21		Appeal. Based on this, and possibly other
22		evidence, the Court of Appeal ordered a new trial,
23		and I think that was scheduled to start the next
24		year in '98. It started, the judge got sick, it
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	2 Q 3 A 4 5 6 7 Q 8 9 10 11 A 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23

was decided to restart it again, which was

02:12 25

	1		probably '99, and then I finally got there in the
	2		year 2000.
	3	Q	In fact, the acquittal was entered on the 24th of
	4		June, 2000, so your memory is very good.
02:13	5	A	Yes. Well, at that time I was in England, my wife
	6		was exceedingly ill with cancer and dying and I
	7		flew from England to Newfoundland for the retrial.
	8	Q	Okay. And, Doctor, with respect to your earlier
	9		comment to me that pathologists, you as a small
02:13	10		group of professionals, wouldn't necessarily often
	11		disagree; were you aware that in addition to your
	12		evidence called on behalf of the defence at that
	13		second trial, or retrial after the mistrial due to
	14		the judge's illness, there were four other defence
02:13	15		experts who were pathologists?
	16	A	I did Mr. Kennedy did tell me about this and
	17		tell me who they were, and one of them now,
	18		there was a, another pathologist had appeared for
	19		the Crown. I'm trying to remember his name.
02:13	20		DeMayo, one of the DeMayos had appeared for the
	21		Crown, and I believe Mr. Kennedy had consulted
	22		other forensic pathologists in Canada and Britain,
	23		but I cannot, for the moment, remember who it was.
	24	Q	I'm going to suggest to you that in total there
02:14	25		were seven pathologists called at trial and every \P

	1		one of them had a different opinion as to the
	2		mechanics of the injury that caused the death of
	3		Mrs. Dalton, Five thought accident, two thought
	4		homicide, but the actual mechanics of the injury
02:14	5		all seven of you had differing opinions on?
	6	А	I don't remember hearing that. I don't think
	7		there was I don't think there can have been a
	8		serious discrepancy of opinion between all those
	9		people or else there wouldn't have been an
02:14	10		acquittal.
	11	Q	There was an acquittal?
	12	А	Yes.
	13	Q	And I don't intend to go at great length to that,
	14		the record is there, available to be checked, but
02:14	15		I want to go back for a moment to the evidence
	16		yesterday, and Mr. Lockyer suggested to you that
	17		Mr. Dalton had spent eight years in jail because
	18		of bad pathology; do you remember him suggesting
	19		that to you, or words to that effect?
02:15	20	А	I remember him suggesting that, yes, and I am very
	21		reluctant to appear, to disparage or denigrate
	22		professional colleagues in a public session, but I
	23		have to say that is one valid interpretation of
	24		what happened to Dalton. Not only was the
02:15	25		pathology evidence for the Crown at the original \P



	1		hearing incorrect, the interpretation, in my
	2		opinion, with his subsequent acquittal, apparently
	3		this was justified, it was incorrect, but there
	4		was also very inadequate pathology for the defence
02:15	5		at the original hearing.
	6	Q	And there was, in fact, a defence pathologist at
	7		the original trial, there were two pathologists?
	8	А	Yes, there was, and my feeling was at that time,
	9		and still is, if, at the original trial, the
02:16	10		defence had gone to one or more experienced
	11		Canadian pathologists such as myself, then in
	12		practice, then there would very likely have been
	13		an acquittal at the original trial. I don't think
	14		the original trial in Dalton was handled well at
02:16	15		all from the pathology point of view.
	16	Q	And from the pathology point of view, although
	17		Mr. Lockyer characterized yesterday that
	18		Mr. Dalton spent eight years in jail because of
	19		bad pathology, you are aware in fact, through Mr.
02:16	20		Kennedy, that one of the major reasons for the
	21		long period of time for him remaining in jail
	22		well, there were two reasons, one was that his
	23		counsel, who was not Mr. Kennedy at trial, did not
	24		apply for bail for him following his conviction in
02:16	25		1989, and in fact his counsel didn't pursue his

	1		appeal for many years and it was only when he
	2		became frustrated and Mr. Kennedy took over in
	3		1997 that it moved forward.
	4	A	Well, I was aware of the delay, but I've never
02:16	5		until now been informed of the reasons for it.
	6	Q	Okay. But you knew from Mr. Kennedy that he was
	7		new counsel, or relatively new counsel?
	8	A	Oh, yes, that Mr. Kennedy reactivated the case in
	9		essence, but I was not aware until you told me as
02:17	10		to why there had been that long delay, which
	11		appeared to me to be unusual and unjustified.
	12	Q	And in fact are you aware that that is the issue
	13		that's more the subject of inquiry of Mr. Justice
	14		Lamer in the inquiry that Mr. Lockyer referred you
02:17	15		to than to pathological evidence itself, it was
	16		the long delay in perfecting the appeal?
	17	A	Well, if you could say that the original
	18		conviction was due to bad pathology, you could say
	19		that subsequent appeal and acquittal was due to
02:17	20		bad law.
	21	Q	Yes, that would appear to be certainly one of the
	22		conclusions that's open to Mr. Justice Lamer to
	23		draw. Now, sir, I just have one other area that I
	24		want to touch on with you, and I bring this only
02:17	25		because there were a number of questions that were \blacksquare

	1		put to you with respect to the use of DNA evidence
	2		in criminal law, and it was your belief that it
	3		was sometime after 1969, it certainly wasn't
	4		available in 1969?
02:18	5	A	DNA?
	6	Q	Yes.
	7	A	No, it wasn't, or else we would have used it. And
	8		I have, I know that it became practicable, and
	9		when it was put to me that the double helical
02:18	10		structure was described in '53, this is quite
	11		possible. I had to rephrase that. And what made
	12		DNA available were technical scientific advances
	13		in what is termed replication; in other words,
	14		greatly increasing the amount of DNA from an
02:18	15		original minute sample to an amount that could be
	16		handled by a laboratory and used, and it was that
	17		technique, I think, that made it possible to use
	18		DNA in legal in forensic pathology situations.
	19	Q	Doctor, I'm going to suggest to you that in those
02:18	20		assumptions, that you are quite correct.
	21		Mr. Commissioner, what I was
	22		looking for over the lunch hour when I asked for
	23		some time was a paper that I was familiar with
	24		through other work that I do that traced the
02:19	25		history of the introduction and use of DNA

1 technology in criminal proceedings. I have -- we 2 had a slight technical problem at my office over 3 lunch, because I had to get it faxed, the internet 4 was down and there were some pages of it still to 5 come, and copies are coming for all counsel, but I have enough that I can lead the witness through 6 7 his evidence and put the information that he 8 suspected, I think fairly accurately, on the 9 record with your indulgence, and then we will file 10 the document itself. And Dr. Emson, having said all 11

02:19

02:19

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

02:20

02:19

02:20

And Dr. Emson, having said all that, because of my sense of when DNA came into vogue was consistent with yours I did some research and I found that, in fact, you are correct. You said this morning that you believed, or yesterday, that DNA evidence was first introduced in England, and if I could refer counsel -- or have Mr. Hodson perhaps bring up the cover page of this paper that I refer to -- ah, I now have copies that counsel can circulate to others which should be full copies. The document to which I'm going to refer you is titled From Pitchfork to Terceira: A Decade of DNA Evidence in the Criminal Courtroom, and the cover page will show that this was a paper presented at a



	1		symposium on DNA Forensic Evidence in October,
	2		1998 and subsequently published, or to be
	3		published in the Manitoba Law Journal in December,
	4		1998. I believe that I have copies that are now
02:20	5		being circulated to various counsel in their full
	6		content.
	7	A	If I may ask, I would be very grateful if I might
	8		receive a copy of that paper myself?
	9	Q	Would you like to take five minutes to look at it
02:20	10		before I proceed with the questions?
	11	A	No, I think you can go through it, but I would
	12		like one for my file.
	13	Q	Absolutely, I will ensure that you have one.
	14	A	Thank you very much. If you feel I should read
02:20	15		it, I will, but I'm perfectly content to have you
	16		lead me through it.
	17		MS. KNOX: Perhaps, Mr. Commissioner, in
	18		fairness to the witness, if we gave him five or
	19		10 minutes to do a quick review, that might make
02:21	20		the questions a little more comfortable.
	21		COMMISSION MacCALLUM: Okay, Doctor, what's
	22		your preference?
	23	A	I would like to read it, but I don't think
	24		probably it's necessary, but if you can give me 10
02:21	25		minutes I'll look through it.



1 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I certainly can. 2 (Adjourned at 2:20 p.m.) 3 (Reconvened at 2:31 p.m.) 4 BY MS. KNOX: 5 Q Dr. Emson, I appreciate you haven't read the paper 02:31 in its entirety, and if it's any comfort to you I 6 don't intend to take you through it in its 8 entirety, there are just a few points I wish to 9 address with you. 10 And first off you will agree 02:31 11 with me, having had an opportunity to review it, 12 that, as I stated earlier, your thoughts in terms 13 of the -- as to the timing of the use of DNA 14 evidence in Canada is probably quite correct, and 15 that in fact the record, according to this paper, 02:32 16 shows that the first time DNA evidence, or DNA typing was introduced into a criminal courtroom in 17 18 Canada, was in 1988. And I refer you to the top 19 of page 5 of that document using the pages -- the 20 numbers on the bottom of the pages. 02:32 21 Yes. This is R v Parent. Α 22 Q Yes, a -- and, Mr. Commissioner, the R v Parent 23 case is reported 46 Canadian Criminal Cases Third 24 Series at page 414. It was a case in the Alberta 25 02:32 court, Court of Queen's Bench, I believe.

	1		And then, again appreciating
	2		that you have had very little time to go through
	3		it, you will recognize, looking at page 6, that,
	4		again, the evidence earlier of yours was correct
02:32	5		that the first introduction was in England
	6		sometime in the mid-'80s. I'm referring to the
	7		top of page 6.
	8	A	Yes, this is R v Pitchfork.
	9	Q	Yeah, the 1983, 1986. And if I could refer you,
02:33	10		then, to I'll skip the American stuff and refer
	11		you to page 10. Would you agree with me that this
	12		appears to confirm that Parent was the first case,
	13		and then the pages hereafter trace a chronology of
	14		gradual accep introduction and acceptance of
02:33	15		DNA evidence in courts in Canada. And if we go to
	16		page 11 it identifies some murder cases, and one
	17		that was nationally, if not internationally
	18		familiar to all of us, was the Miramichi murders
	19		in New Brunswick where it was used in the case of
02:33	20		Alain Legere to link him to a number of unsolved
	21		murders in that area?
	22	A	Yes.
	23	Q	Okay. And, Doctor, restating the obvious I guess,
	24		in 1969, when you were looking at the body of Gail
02:34	25		Miller and you were doing the autopsy, would it be

	1		correct for me to assume that you never imagined
	2		that science would take us where we were by 1990
	3		1988 when the Parent case was being dealt with
	4		in Alberta and the Legere murders were being
02:34	5		investigated in New Brunswick in 1991?
	6	А	Yes. That is almost the story of my life, because
	7		in 50 years in pathology what we do now was not
	8		even science fiction when I started, it was not
	9		dreamed of, it was not in the bounds of human
02:34	10		possibility, and all through my life I have seen
	11		and dreamed of science fiction, and science
	12		fiction become true and practical.
	13	Q	And in the field of forensic pathology, what was
	14		science fiction for you in 1969 would equally have
02:34	15		been science fiction for not even science
	16		fiction, I believe that you said, for police and
	17		prosecutors of the day in decisions that they made
	18		and determinations they made about the conduct of
	19		the investigation and the prosecution in the Gail
02:35	20		Miller case?
	21	А	It was not dreamed of.
	22	Q	Thank you. And, Doctor, I earlier asked you
	23		whether you recalled having any discussions or
	24		contact with other persons during the, post the
02:35	25		Milgaard trial in 1970, and in fairness to you my
	ĮĮ.		

	1		attention has been drawn to a number of documents
	2		that are before the Inquiry, and I want to draw
	3		your attention to them.
	4		If I could have brought up
02:35	5		document 025929. Doctor, I'll give you a quick
	6		a minute to do a quick read of this, but I'm
	7		referring you to a story that I understand was
	8		from the StarPhoenix dated in their edition June
	9		7th, 1990.
02:35	10	А	Yes.
	11	Q	And, there, the reporter in question documented
	12		that you declined to comment on the content of Dr.
	13		Markesteyn's opinions with respect to the Gail
	14		Miller death in 1990?
02:36	15	А	I don't customarily enter into disputes via the
	16		media with colleagues on cases like this, it's not
	17		a productive enterprise.
	18	Q	Okay. Reading the article it would appear, or at
	19		least my interpretation of it and I'm not sure
02:36	20		if it's your interpretation it doesn't appear,
	21		there, to be any indication that you had discussed
	22		the matter with Dr. Markesteyn either, much less
	23		with the press, as you declined to do there; would
	24		you agree with that?
02:36	25	А	I can't recollect, but if Dr. Markesteyn had
			1

	1		called me or written me about the case with a,
	2		what appeared to me to be a reasonable approach
	3		and he is an eminent pathologist and a former
	4		Chief Medical Examiner for Manitoba, we have been
02:36	5		associated for many years I would certainly
	6		have treated any approach from him with serious
	7		consideration. But not something like this via
	8		the media.
	9	Q	Okay. Am I correct, in going back in my history
02:37	10		again and pretty soon you are going to figure
	11		out I'm from Newfoundland but that Dr.
	12		Markesteyn was the second expert opinion affidavit
	13		offered in the Court of Appeal in Dalton?
	14	A	Do I know that?
02:37	15	Q	Yeah?
	16	A	No.
	17	Q	Okay. Now I wonder
	18	A	I may have been given this information at some
	19		time but I haven't retained it.
02:37	20	Q	Okay.
	21	A	Because I don't know now doesn't mean I haven't
	22		been told it some time.
	23	Q	But, in the past, you and he have collaborated and
	24		had similar opinions on forensic cases?
02:37	25	А	And we have had differing opinions too.
	ļ	l	

	1	Q	And differing opinions, yes. I now want to call
	2		up 002483. And sir, for the record, this is a
	3		memo from a Mr. Eugene Williams that I believe
	4		counsel, Commission Counsel, drew to your
02:37	5		attention yesterday dated June 12th, 1990, and I
	6		want to direct your attention to page 2 of that
	7		sorry, no, page 3, which would be 002485. And in
	8		reviewing the transcript from yesterday's evidence
	9		I I my impression was that you are not sure,
02:38	10		now, whether you talked to Mr. Williams, who was a
	11		lawyer at Federal Justice who was conducting a
	12		review or an investigation with respect to an
	13		application for mercy by Mr. Milgaard in the late
	14		'80s and early '90s, but there appears to be some
02:38	15		suggestion here that you may have had an interview
	16		with this
	17	А	I might have had.
	18	Q	Okay. If you had been contacted, as this document
	19		appears to suggest, as part of an official review
02:38	20		being conducted by Federal Justice of the
	21		circumstances of the conviction, are would you
	22		have co-operated, as you appear to have done with
	23		Mr
	24	A	Of course I would have done.
02:38	25	Q	Williams?

			Page 1485 ————————————————————————————————————
	1	A	What I should have done was kept better files on
	2		what I did.
	3	Q	And just a final document to draw to your
	4		attention, sir, and this is document 040497. And
02:39	5		I'm not sure if you were referred to this one
	6		yesterday or not, because I was
	7	A	Yes, I have seen this before.
	8	Q	Okay. So you are familiar with this paper by Neil
	9		Boyd and Kim Rossmo from the School of Criminology
02:39	10		at Simon Fraser?
	11	A	I'm not familiar with it, I have seen that title
	12		page before, and presumably I have had reference
	13		to some of the contents.
	14	Q	Yeah. Do you recall if you were ever contacted by
02:39	15		Mr. Rossmo and Mr. Boyd? And I'm asking you to
	16		recall, today, an interview that might have been
	17		done as early as 1989, but certainly
	18	A	No, I don't recall.
	19	Q	Okay. I'm going to refer you, if I could have
02:39	20		brought up page 040507 I'm sorry, the page I
	21		need, I'm mistaken in that one, it's 040513. If I
	22		could direct your attention to the very, the
	23		footnote, the second footnote, 29, at the bottom
	24		of that page.
02:38	25	A	Well, if it says he had a personal communication \P

	1		with me, he did have a I believe him.
	2	Q	But you have no independent memory of it?
	3	A	No, I don't. I don't want to re-emphasize this,
	4		but it's isolated events 14 years ago and perhaps
02:38	5		I should have kept a note, but I didn't.
	6	Q	And, Dr. Emson, please don't misunderstand the
	7		reason I raise these questions with you. What I'm
	8		going to suggest to you is that where there are
	9		indications on the record as to whether you were
02:38	10		co-operative with those who attempted to contact
	11		you in the years since 1970, with the exception of
	12		the press, it appears that you may have made
	13		yourself, and indeed made yourself available to
	14		talk with them and offer your expert opinion as
02:39	15		solicited from you, whether it was from a
	16		criminologist, a lawyer from federal justice or
	17		whoever may be in contact with you where you
	18		deemed it appropriate to talk to them.
	19	A	Certainly, and I would even endeavour to
02:39	20		co-operate with the media on the occasions when I
	21		feel it's appropriate, but I don't want to carry
	22		on or try to carry on a scientific debate on
	23		evidence with reference to another person through
	24		the media. That's not proper.
02:39	25	Q	Okay. And, Dr. Emson, just a final question, and

	1		I may be repeating myself, but I asked you about
	2		after the trial, or after the preliminary inquiry
	3		whether anybody attempted, from police or
	4		prosecutions, to influence your opinion or to keep
02:39	5		a lid on your discussions about this case. Did
	6		anybody at any time when this matter became the
	7		subject of great public debate in the late '80s,
	8		and certainly through the '90s, particularly from
	9		the Government of Saskatchewan and the criminal
02:40	10		prosecution service, in any manner attempt to
	11		contact you or in any way coopt you in terms of
	12		making opinions or offering opinions that would be
	13		beneficial to them to the detriment of the process
	14		or to Mr. Milgaard?
02:40	15	А	This has never happened to me in my life and if it
	16		had I should remember it. It will not happen to
	17		me now because my reputation in this province, and
	18		perhaps elsewhere, is well known. I do not, and
	19		would not, ever respond to such and I might, if
02:40	20		such an approach were made, consider it proper to
	21		draw it to the attention of any authorities I
	22		might feel should be informed.
	23	Q	And from all that, Doctor, I take it nobody tried
	24		to get you to do anything wrong in this process?
02:40	25	А	No.

1 MS. KNOX: Thank you. 2 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: There was one more 3 on the list there. Mr. Watson, any questions? 4 MR. WATSON: No questions. 5 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: 02:41 Thank you. Any redirect then? 6 BY MR. HODSON: 8 Just a couple of questions of redirect, Mr. Emson. 0 9 Mr. Elson asked you some questions about -- and 10 sorry to bring up the secretor issue again, but it 02:41 11 arose from one of my questions and if I could just 12 clarify this, and I think I asked you yesterday 13 that back in 1969, if you tested the bodily fluids of an individual such as saliva and it did not 14 15 contain, that sample did not contain the A 02:41 16 antigen, I believe I asked you, and I believe you 17 said, that that doesn't necessarily mean that that 18 person is a non-secretor, it may be that that 19 sample didn't contain the A antigen. 20 02:41 correct? 21 Well, we've had specific evidence today, and I Α 22 can't quote back, where an expert from the 23 laboratory in Regina gave a list of reasons as to 24 why the body fluids of a secretor might not



contain detectable amounts of antigen, so that

25

02:42

	1		yes, the supplies, the bodily fluids of a secretor
	2		may not always contain detectable amounts of the
	3		antigen expressed.
	4	Q	Right. And so the point, and I think you made it
02:42	5		yesterday, and I just wish to clarify it in light
	6		of questions asked subsequent, is that again back
	7		in 1969 if there was a bodily fluid sample that
	8		did not detect an A antigen on a test, that you
	9		could not conclude conclusively that that person
02:42	10		was a non-secretor?
	11	А	It would suggest that they were a non-secretor,
	12		but it's not conclusive.
	13	Q	Okay. Secondly, a number of counsel in referring
	14		to the vaginal contents from the autopsy in 1969 I
02:43	15		believe, and it may have been unintentional, but a
	16		number of them said words to the effect that you
	17		discarded it, and I believe your evidence was, and
	18		I just wish to have you clarify, that in the
	19		course of the process of the autopsy the vaginal
02:43	20		contents were not saved, but I don't believe, sir,
	21		your evidence was that you personally discarded
	22		it. Is that correct?
	23	Α	We've no evidence or memory as to how and by whom
	24		it was discarded, but if we take the chain of
02:43	25		events, it was acquired by me, it was examined by
			3



	1		me for spermatozoa and demonstrated them in the
	2		absence of motility and it was not further saved
	3		and therefore I must take the responsibility for
	4		discarding it. My assumption is that the decision
02:43	5		to discard it was taken after consultation with
	6		the police representatives, but I am not in any
	7		way trying to push off the responsibility for this
	8		upon them. It would presumably have been a
	9		consensual decision, but the specimen was in my
02:44	10		hands and it was my responsibility.
	11	Q	But you are not able to say whether you personally
	12		physically discarded it?
	13	А	No.
	14	Q	Lastly, I did show you a photograph of a knife and
02:44	15		I believe your evidence was, and Mr. Beresh asked
	16		you some questions, that you looked at not a knife
	17		blade, but a complete intact knife; is that
	18		correct?
	19	Α	The only knife I was ever shown was consistent and
02:44	20		similar and perhaps identical to the one in the
	21		picture which was an intact knife. I was never
	22		shown a fragmented knife.
	23	Q	I'm going to show you, sir we have marked as an
	24		exhibit the knife handle which is, the knife
02:44	25		handle has been marked as Exhibit P-1 and,



	1	Mr. Commissioner, I do have the knife blade t					
	2	2 we've obtained from the Court of Queen's					
	3		that I would ask be marked as an exhibit in this				
	4		proceeding. I think it will be P				
02:45	5		COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Four.				
	6		CLERK: Four.				
	7		> <u>EXHIBIT P-4</u> :				
	8		KNIFE BLADE AND EVIDENCE BAG.				
	9	BY I	MR. HODSON:				
02:45	10	Q	And then I will show both the handle and the knife				
	11		blade to you, Dr. Emson, and just ask a couple				
	12		things when you are looking at it; A, whether you				
	13		are able to say that this was the knife that you				
	14		looked at in 1969, or whether it's similar to what				
02:45	15		you looked at. Do you know, sir, is that similar				
	16		to the knife you would have viewed in 1969?				
	17	A	Yes. The two components re-assembled are very				
	18		similar to the one I saw before.				
	19	Q	And the knife that you saw in 1969, was it a				
02:46	20		broken knife or				
	21	А	It was a whole knife.				
	22	Q	Pardon me?				
	23	А	It was not broken, it was intact.				
	24		MR. HODSON: Thank you, Dr. Emson. Those				
02:46	25		are all my questions.				

1 BY COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: 2 0 Dr. Emson, Ms. Knox asked you a question 3 along these lines: If Mrs. Milgaard had contacted 4 you, would you have spoken to her, and I think 5 your reply was yes, with some degree of caution. 02:46 Did she contact you at any time following her 6 7 son's conviction until his release from prison? 8 Not to my recollection, Your Lordship. Α 9 Anybody on behalf of her or her son? 10 Not that I can recollect. 02:46 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: 11 Thanks. Anything 12 arising from that, counsel? All right. Thank 13 you very much, Dr. Emson, you are excused and we 14 very much appreciate your evidence. 15 Α Thank you, Your Lordship. I may return to my 02:47 16 normal place of residence and work? 17 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes, as long as we 18 don't have to go with you. 19 MR. HODSON: Mr. Commissioner, that is all 20 the evidence for today. I think we are adjourned 02:47 21 and set to go on February the 7th is our next 22 sittings. 23 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: So this matter 24 then is adjourned to February 7th at 10 a.m. and 25 it's across the street at what hotel? 02:47

	Vol 10 - Thursday, January 27th, 2005
	Page 1493 ————————————————————————————————————
1	MR. HODSON: The Sheraton Hotel.
2	COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Sheraton Hotel.
3	MR. HODSON: Thank you.
4	COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thanks very much.
5	(Adjourned at 2:50 p.m.)
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	



Page 1494 =

1 OFFICIAL QUEEN'S BENCH COURT REPORTERS' CERTIFICATE: 2 We, Karen Hinz, CSR, and Donald G. Meyer, RPR, CSR, 3 Official Queen's Bench Court Reporters for the Province of 4 Saskatchewan, hereby certify that the foregoing pages 5 contain a true and correct transcription of our shorthand notes taken herein to the best of my knowledge, skill, and 6 7 ability. 8 9 10 11 12 ____, CSR 13 Karen Hinz, CSR 14 Official Queen's Bench Court Reporter 15 16 17 ____, CSR 18 Donald G. Meyer, RPR, CSR 19 Official Queen's Bench Court Reporter 20 21 22 23 24 25



		Paye I		
	1491:19 1970 - 1427:8, 1427:12,	1480:3, 1480:7	1428:20, 1428:24, 1448:6, 1448:9	1381:5, 1429:23 Appeal - 1471:9,
<u> </u>	1466:8, 1466:21, 1469:11,	7	advocates - 1468:11	1471:17, 1471:21,
'53 - 1436:16, 1476:10	1481:25, 1486:11		affair - 1464:4	1471:22, 1483:13
'69 - 1404:23 '80s - 1484:14, 1487:7	1983 - 1480:9 1985 - 1469:11	70 - 1392:12 72 - 1390:18, 1390:22,	affidavit - 1471:8, 1471:18, 1471:20,	appeal - 1475:1, 1475:16, 1475:19
'90s - 1484:14, 1487:8	1986 - 1480:9	1391:13, 1392:13, 1393:1,	1483:12	appear - 1423:19,
'97 - 1471:1 '98 - 1471:24	1988 - 1436:5, 1479:18, 1481:3	1393:3, 1393:5	afternoon - 1461:9,	1429:11, 1443:10, 1445:15, 1473:21,
'99 - 1472:1	1989 - 1474:25, 1485:17	790 - 1390:12, 1391:25 7th - 1482:9, 1492:21,	1461:12, 1461:18 Agioritis - 1369:4	1475:21, 1482:18,
	1990 - 1481:2, 1482:9,	1492:24	ago - 1486:4	1482:20, 1484:22
0	1482:14, 1484:5 - 1991 - 1481:5		→ agree - 1383:10, 1403:18, 1406:20,	appearances - 1398:14 Appearances - 1370:1
001256 - 1449:7	1992 - 1428:20, 1452:23	9	1407:19, 1412:25,	appeared - 1430:3,
002483 - 1484:2	1997 - 1470:23, 1471:9,	9 - 1390:10, 1400:7	1414:15, 1415:19,	1441:22, 1472:18,
002485 - 1484:7 008 - 1458:11, 1458:12	1475:3 1998 - 1478:2, 1478:4	Λ	☐ 1416:18, 1416:25, ☐ 1417:22, 1418:20, 1420:2,	1472:20, 1475:11, 1483:2 appearing - 1370:3
025929 - 1482:5		Α	1421:6, 1438:4, 1441:9,	application - 1484:13
033006 - 1458:9	2	A-type - 1451:2, 1452:8	1441:18, 1450:6, 1450:7,	applied - 1399:21, 1437:8
040497 - 1485:4 040507 - 1485:20	2 - 1453:5, 1484:6	ability - 1380:9, 1380:23, 1393:8, 1393:9, 1494:7	1464:1, 1464:16, 1479:10, 1480:11, 1482:24	applies - 1423:6, 1426:4
040513 - 1485:21	20 - 1385:9, 1415:12	able - 1380:6, 1380:7,	agreeing - 1414:17	apply - 1416:19, 1474:24
066729 - 1402:7 066732 - 1374:4	2000 - 1471:4, 1472:2, 1472:4	1436:9, 1442:2, 1443:6, 1464:5, 1490:11, 1491:13	air - 1405:8 Alain - 1480:20	appreciate - 1373:14, 1384:22, 1388:25,
07-69 - 1396:22	2005 - 1368:22, 1429:5	Abrasions - 1387:22	albeit - 1429:5	1411:25, 1412:23,
073509 - 1395:10	207 - 1405:22, 1406:1	abrasions - 1388:1	Alberta - 1381:21,	1417:17, 1418:6, 1424:5,
4	23 - 1384:14 23844 - 1399:11	absence - 1450:11, 1455:4, 1490:2	1469:23, 1479:24, 1481:4 alive - 1444:18, 1444:25,	1439:3, 1443:12, 1445:20, 1479:5, 1492:14
1	238470 - 1404:8	absolutely - 1408:3	1468:19	appreciating - 1480:1
1 - 1453:3	238473 - 1384:12	Absolutely - 1377:17,	allowed - 1401:1	apprised - 1427:7
10 - 1368:23, 1478:19, 1478:24, 1480:11,	238498 - 1391:22 24 - 1387:17, 1410:5	1478:13 accep - 1480:14	alluded - 1470:4 almost - 1376:15,	approach - 1465:14, 1483:2, 1483:6, 1487:20
1492:24	241973 - 1372:5, 1403:7,	accept - 1391:19,	1383:7, 1388:14, 1430:16,	approached - 1382:18,
103 - 1399:11	1426:22	1416:24, 1460:9	1432:19, 1481:6	1432:14
108 - 1384:10, 1384:12 10:04 - 1373:2	241975 - 1372:5, 1402:17, 1402:21,	acceptance - 1480:14 accepted - 1441:21	altered - 1455:11 American - 1480:10	approaching - 1420:15 appropriate - 1425:11,
11 - 1480:16	1426:22	access - 1423:4	amount - 1393:24,	1460:20, 1469:3, 1486:18,
11:15 - 1427:1 11:33 - 1427:2	246198 - 1405:20 246207 - 1405:7,	accident - 1443:25, 1473:3	1434:5, 1436:13, 1437:5, 1476:14, 1476:15	1486:21 area - 1373:23, 1385:10,
12 - 1452:25	1405:15, 1405:16	accord - 1408:1	amounts - 1488:25,	1389:22, 1392:24,
129 - 1390:2	24th - 1472:3	according - 1386:21,	1489:2	1394:14, 1395:4, 1399:1,
12:17 - 1461:7 12th - 1484:5	263 - 1449:8, 1449:18 278893 - 1451:8	1390:24, 1479:15 According - 1387:18	anal - 1434:20 analyses - 1456:23	1399:9, 1402:11, 1421:21, 1422:13, 1435:1, 1435:2,
1373 - 1371:4	27th - 1368:22	account - 1380:11,	analysis - 1420:2,	1435:3, 1450:17, 1475:23,
14 - 1486:4	28th - 1452:23	1394:2, 1414:6, 1423:2,	1421:5, 1457:15	1480:21
1426 - 1372:4 1427 - 1371:5	29 - 1485:23 2:00 - 1461:6, 1461:8	1424:6 accounts - 1432:13	analyze - 1452:1 analyzed - 1452:23,	areas - 1449:5, 1466:1 argument - 1455:19
1448 - 1371:6	2:20 - 1479:2	accurate - 1397:25,	1452:25	arise - 1451:22, 1469:6
1461 - 1371:7 1488 - 1371:8	2:31 - 1479:3 2:50 - 1493:5	1418:13	angle - 1376:1, 1377:16 angled - 1377:15	arising - 1461:24, 1492:12
1491 - 1372:7	2.30 - 1493.3	accurately - 1477:8 acidity - 1391:7	ankle - 1394:23, 1395:1	arms - 1459:6
1492 - 1371:9	3	acknowledged - 1390:6,	answer - 1388:21,	arose - 1488:11
15 - 1380:1, 1380:5, 1380:19, 1380:21,	3 - 1416:7, 1425:19,	1391:12, 1439:8, 1459:14 acknowledgement -	1388:25, 1400:6, 1400:8, 1404:11, 1404:13, 1411:8,	article - 1482:18 articles - 1433:13
1384:21, 1426:24	1425:24, 1425:25,	1390:6	1412:23, 1421:2, 1421:4,	aspect - 1448:21
16 - 1384:14 18 - 1390:11	1453:11, 1484:7	acknowledgment -	1428:17, 1436:7, 1457:9, 1457:20	aspects - 1462:14
192 - 1452:25	313602 - 1410:3 313838 - 1384:9	1465:8 acquired - 1489:25	answered - 1419:16,	assailant - 1376:6, 1376:11, 1376:14,
1953 - 1435:13, 1435:20,	31st - 1461:24	acquittal - 1472:3,	1433:22	1376:20, 1378:5, 1438:7,
1435:23, 1436:3 1959 - 1418:8	33006 - 1458:7	1473:10, 1473:11, 1474:2, 1474:13, 1475:19	answering - 1385:3, 1408:5	1444:12, 1444:13, 1445:2, 1445:3, 1445:24, 1445:25,
1960s - 1418:8	4	act - 1449:3	antigen - 1427:8,	1459:9
1969 - 1373:16, 1373:20,		Act - 1409:10	1427:12, 1427:25, 1428:7,	assailant's - 1377:24
1382:11, 1393:7, 1397:10, 1398:13, 1398:20, 1399:7,	4 - 1453:13 40 - 1380:13, 1447:9	activity - 1443:16 actual - 1396:12, 1397:3,	1428:14, 1428:22, 1450:2, 1450:11, 1450:12, 1451:3,	assault - 1388:19, 1388:23, 1430:4, 1430:8,
1404:1, 1406:21, 1407:24,	400 - 1410:3	1473:4	1452:2, 1453:1, 1454:5,	1430:14, 1430:18, 1431:2,
1408:9, 1408:25, 1409:8,	414 - 1479:24	addition - 1391:20,	1454:6, 1454:8, 1488:16,	1431:6, 1432:20, 1433:2,
1409:13, 1409:21, 1411:14, 1427:7, 1429:2,	46 - 1479:23 472 - 1384:19	1472:11 address - 1479:9	1488:19, 1488:25, 1489:3, 1489:8	1434:13, 1434:16, 1434:25, 1437:1
1429:13, 1429:17, 1430:9,	482 - 1405:7, 1405:13	adjourned - 1492:20,	antigens - 1427:19,	assembled - 1491:17
1432:18, 1432:25,	4th - 1455:23	1492:24	1427:21, 1427:25, 1428:2,	assessment - 1422:15,
1434:12, 1435:23, 1436:25, 1437:10,	5	Adjourned - 1427:1, 1461:7, 1479:2, 1493:5	1428:15, 1428:16, 1446:3, 1451:20, 1451:23, 1453:8,	1423:13, 1438:5 assigned - 1465:20
1453:20, 1453:23,		admits - 1441:23	1454:12, 1454:15	assist - 1374:3, 1393:25,
1454:19, 1455:17,	5 - 1451:13, 1479:19	adult - 1391:8	anus - 1387:5 anxious - 1423:24	1415:11, 1444:11, 1445:1,
1455:23, 1461:24, 1463:17, 1465:25, 1476:3,	50 - 1481:7	advances - 1476:12 adversarial - 1417:4,	anxious - 1423.24 apart - 1462:17	1445:23 assistance - 1413:3,
1476:4, 1480:24, 1481:14,	6	1418:25, 1465:19	apologize - 1395:20,	1413:7, 1414:14
1488:13, 1489:7, 1489:14, 1491:14, 1491:16,	6 - 1394:25, 1404:12,	advise - 1415:1 advised - 1427:11,	1435:7, 1449:6, 1461:14 apparent - 1374:5,	Assistant - 1369:3, 1369:4, 1369:5, 1369:8,
1701.17, 1701.10,	J - 1034.20, 1404.12,	auviocu - 1421.11,	<u>apparent - 13/4.3,</u>	1000.7, 1000.0, 1000.0,



assistant - 1399:14. 1399:20, 1399:22, 1406:8, 1410:24 assisted - 1399:18, 1413:17, 1413:19, 1457:11, 1471:18 assisting - 1399:12, 1468:11 associated - 1431:7, 1483:5 assume - 1377:3 1377:6, 1379:7, 1427:20 1430:2, 1445:19, 1445:21, 1481:1 assumed - 1456:7 Assuming - 1379:8 assuming - 1429:23, 1459:17 assumption - 1490:4 assumptions - 1476:20 attached - 1417:7 attempt - 1386:15, 1394:4, 1394:5, 1466:10, 1487:10 attempted - 1467:24, 1486:10, 1487:3 attend - 1464:8, 1464:9 attendance - 1406:11, attended - 1431:12 attending - 1401:5, 1412:22 attention - 1390:9, 1482:1, 1482:3, 1484:5, 1484:6, 1485:4, 1485:22, 1487:21 attitude - 1438:22 attributable - 1442:15 attribution - 1448:16 Audio - 1369:16 author - 1392:17 authorities - 1487:21 authority - 1390:4, 1390:7, 1465:23, 1466:9 authors - 1390:12 autopsies - 1408:2, 1408:25, 1409:1, 1409:4, 1409:5, 1409:9, 1409:13, 1429:5, 1429:8, 1429:10 **autopsy** - 1382:3, 1386:18, 1386:22, 1387:18, 1395:17, 1396:22, 1397:14, 1396:22, 1397:14, 1399:18, 1400:16, 1400:24, 1401:5, 1401:20, 1401:22, 1401:25, 1403:25, 1406:7, 1406:15, 1406:23, 1409:5, 1410:14, 1410:15, 1413:2, 1414:1, 1414:21, 1414:24, 1420:19, 1420:22 1429:19, 1429:22, 1430:10, 1430:12, 1434:16, 1437:11, 1437:12, 1444:3, 1457:12, 1457:15, 1457:22, 1458:1, 1461:23, 1463:4, 1464:4, 1480:25, 1489:14, 1489:19 Autopsy - 1372:4, availabilities - 1457:3 availability - 1421:10, 1456:15 available - 1434:3. 1453:20, 1453:24, 1454:23, 1455:16, 1455:18, 1456:13, 1461:3, 1473:14, 1476:4, 1476:12, 1486:13

aware - 1381:20, 1382:1, 1382:11, 1430:24, 1432:16, 1440:1, 1448:21, 1456:8, 1456:12, 1456:14, 1460:5, 1472:11, 1474:19, 1475:4, 1475:9, 1475:12

В background - 1470:20 **bad** - 1439:6, 1441:8, 1441:16, 1449:2, 1473:18, 1474:19, 1475:18, 1475:20 **Bag** - 1372:7, 1491:8 **bag** - 1396:17, 1403:24, 1404:17, 1404:22, 1406:10, 1406:22, 1407:2, 1407:5, 1411:3, 1411:10, 1412:1 bagged - 1405:4 bagging - 1407:8 bags - 1404:4, 1406:14, 1407:3, 1431:9, 1431:12 bail - 1474:24 balloons - 1417:19 ban - 1426:12 based - 1391:24, 1418:9, 1471:12 Based - 1471:21 basic - 1447:3, 1450:20 Bates - 1372:5, 1425:14, 1426:22 bear - 1415:8 **became** - 1439:15, 1469:14, 1475:2, 1476:8, 1487:6 become - 1382:10, 1455:16, 1455:17, 1481:12 becomes - 1382:16 beginning - 1383:23, behalf - 1468:11, 1472:12, 1492:9 Beitel - 1369:12 belief - 1392:13, 1476:2 below - 1402:10 **Bench** - 1402.10 **Bench** - 1423:23, 1479:25, 1491:2, 1494:1, 1494:3, 1494:14, 1494:19 beneficial - 1487:13 benefit - 1419:20 Beresh - 1370:11 1371:4, 1373:3, 1373:4, 1373:7, 1373:8, 1391:24, 1392:1, 1392:6, 1402:21, 1402:23, 1405:11, 1405:12, 1405:14, 1405:16, 1405:19, 1405:21, 1408:8, 1421:13, 1421:16, 1421:19, 1421:23, 1424:17, 1424:23, 1425:17, 1425:21, 1426:1, 1426:6, 1426:7, 1426:15, 1426:18, 1426:23, 1429:13, 1470:5, 1490:15 Bessborough - 1368:17 best - 1407:4, 1438:5, 1457:5, 1494:6 betray - 1407:18 better - 1424:25, 1446:13, 1485:1

between - 1407:14.

1409:4, 1436:8, 1436:14,

1455:6, 1456:19, 1457:10, 1458:5, 1463:2, 1464:11, 1467:1

1464:15, 1465:3, 1467:6, 1468:20, 1469:10, 1473:8

beyond - 1415:10 bias - 1416:2, 1416:3 biochemical - 1436:13 **biology** - 1451:11 **bit** - 1397:21, 1445:17 1447:3, 1452:13, 1452:14 bits - 1427:14 **Blade** - 1372:7, 1491:8 **blade** - 1398:6, 1490:17, 1491:1, 1491:11 bladed - 1377:4 bleeding - 1379:24 **blood** - 1387:17, 1427:21, 1428:7, 1439:9, 1445:9, 1445:14, 1445:23, 1446:3, 1453:4, 1453:8, 1453:17, 1453:21, 1453:25, 1454:7, 1455:2 **board** - 1400:24 **Bobs** - 1370:5 **bodily** - 1427:18 1428:16, 1438:1, 1438:6, 1488:13, 1489:1, 1489:7 **body** - 1375:18, 1376:1, 1381:14, 1382:15, 1384:23, 1384:25, 1385:4, 1385:11, 1385:14, 1390:14, 1390:16, 1391:1, 1391:5, 1391:7, 1391:11, 1391:15, 1392:4, 1392:16, 1392:19, 1393:2, 1393:3, 1393:5, 1394:21, 1394:23, 1395:4, 1400:21, 1403:20, 1405:4, 1407:11, 1408:17, 1408:20, 1410:1, 1410:25, 1412:21, 1422:10, 1423:1, 1423:3, 1424:7, 1430:5, 1453:10, 1455:25, 1457:23, 1480:24, 1488:24 book - 1386:10 Boswell - 1369:7 bottom - 1384:20, 1449:10, 1449:19, 1479:20, 1485:23 **bounds** - 1481:9 box - 1403:25, 1442:24 boxes - 1404:4 Boychuk - 1370:8, 1460:12 Boyd - 1485:9, 1485:15 **branch** - 1431:8 break - 1460:21, 1460:24, 1461:2, 1461:5 breast - 1374:6 Brian - 1370:11, 1373:8 bring - 1373:11, 1461:15, 1475:24, 1477:18, 1488:10 bringing - 1417:4 Britain - 1472:22 broken - 1491:20. 1491:23 brought - 1390:9, 1396:2, 1396:3, 1396:4, 1414:23, 1455:24, 1456:2, 1462:3, 1482:4, 1485:20 Bruce - 1370:9, 1449:3 bruises - 1385:16, 1387:22, 1388:1 **bruising** - 1374:18, 1374:21, 1374:25, 1386:2, 1386:9, 1386:13, 1386:19, 1386:22, 1387:3, 1389:20 Brunswick - 1480:19, 1481:5 buccal - 1452:25

C Caldwell - 1370:5, 1461:13 Canada - 1415:12, 1420:18, 1424:13, 1467:16, 1472:22, 1479:14, 1479:18, 1480:15 Canadian - 1474:11, 1479:23 cancer - 1472:6 Candace - 1369:6 cannot - 1404:14, 1408:11, 1409:14, 1454:14, 1472:23 capabilities - 1438:10 **capability** - 1417:13, 1436:11, 1436:16 capable - 1395:19. 1416:20 car - 1448:20, 1459:4 careful - 1401:3, 1470:25 carefully - 1418:4, 1436:14 carry - 1486:21, 1486:22 case - 1378:6, 1381:9, 1383:21, 1394:3, 1399:5, 1401:10, 1406:12 1406:12, 1406:24, 1407:20, 1409:22, 1409:24, 1411:16, 1411:23, 1412:3, 1413:10, 1413:18, 1413:23, 1412:25 1413:23, 1413:25, 1414:13, 1414:20, 1416:1, 1423:7, 1430:21, 1430:22, 1431:5, 1434:12, 1436:5, 1439:7, 1442:8, 1442:10, 1442:13, 1442:14, 1442:19, 1442:22 1442:25, 1443:2, 1446:25, 1448:6, 1448:10, 1448:14, 1448:16, 1460:8, 1462:16, 1462:17, 1462:23 1464:14, 1464:22, 1465:1, 1465:24, 1466:20, 1466:24, 1467:14, 1469:3, 1469:9, 1470:16, 1470:17, 1470:23, 1471:16, 1475:8, 1470:23, 1470:24 1479:23, 1479:24, 1480:12, 1480:19, 1481:3, 1481:20, 1483:1, 1487:5 cases - 1384:5, 1388:20, 1407:25, 1411:17, 1413:6, 1413:8, 1413:15, 1414:3, 1416:20, 1423:7, 1423:10, 1423:12, 1423:22 1433:19, 1441:21, 1442:6, 1443:18, 1443:19, 1462:25, 1470:1, 1480:16, 1482:16, 1483:24 Cases - 1479:23 casting - 1471:19 catch - 1447:15 category - 1383:2, 1383:24, 1468:23 Catherine - 1370:5, 1461:12 Cathy - 1451:11 caught - 1435:9, 1459:8 caused - 1374:22 1374:23, 1375:6, 1375:16, 1375:17, 1378:15, 1379:23, 1386:14, 1395:13, 1418:4, 1473:2 causes - 1415:16 causing - 1395:19 caution - 1492:5

cavity - 1379:25

cells - 1375:4 centimetres - 1397:2. 1397:24 centres - 1420:18 certain - 1376:15, 1388:7, 1466:1 **certainly** - 1403:6, 1403:17, 1414:7, 1416:1, 1416:18, 1417:2, 1420:22, 1422:21, 1430:12, 1431:11, 1431:18, 1432:19, 1433:14, 1437:5, 1452:18, 1454:7, 1464:3, 1464:23, 1467:3, 1469:10, 1475:21, 1476:3, 1479:1, 1483:5, 1485:17, 1487:8 **Certainly** - 1415:23, 1417:23, 1418:21, 1465:18, 1486:19 Certificate - 1494:1 certify - 1494:4 cervicitis - 1388:10 cervix - 1388:5, 1388:12 cetera - 1404:20 chain - 1489:24 change - 1432:9 changed - 1373:16, changes - 1373:22 characterized - 1474:17 charge - 1414:18, 1467:8 **charged** - 1469:8 chasing - 1435:24 cheap - 1398:21 check - 1433:23, 1434:11, 1435:19 checked - 1473:14 checking - 1470:25 chemical - 1456:23 Cheryl - 1369:9 chest - 1379:24 chief - 1384:5, 1440:6 Chief - 1381:21, 1422:24 1422:25, 1469:23, 1483:4 Chris - 1369:5, 1370:8 chronic - 1388:10 chronology - 1480:13 circle - 1374:8 circular - 1375:13 circulate - 1477:20 circulated - 1478:5 circulation - 1375:3 circumference -1375:23, 1375:25 Circumstances -1389:14 circumstances -1380:11, 1380:17, 1389:11, 1389:13, 1391:9, 1413:9, 1484:21 circumstantial 1393:15, 1444:14, 1445:5 **city** - 1383:16, 1457:11, 1463:18 civilian - 1468:24 claimed - 1394:17 **clarify** - 1379:17, 1392:7, 1395:7, 1459:16, 1488:12, 1489:5, 1489:18 classified - 1453:6 clear - 1390:20, 1392:2 1392:9, 1392:18, 1392:21, 1394:21, 1399:3, 1400:14, 1401:7, 1402:1, 1402:4, 1402:9, 1403:6, 1405:2, 1414:4, 1414:19, 1436:18, 1462:17 clearer - 1403:4,



1403:15, 1403:17

clearly - 1414:13,

bulb - 1434:8 bulk - 1409:12

1416:2, 1450:2 Clearly - 1416:7 Clerk - 1369:12, 1425:18, 1426:8, 1491:6 cloak - 1417:1 close - 1425:23 close-up - 1425:23 closer - 1387:5 closing - 1406:7 clothes - 1381:13 1381:19, 1382:3, 1412:2 **clothing** - 1381:4, 1382:9, 1382:14, 1400:9, 1400:16, 1400:20, 1403:19, 1405:3, 1406:4, 1406:9, 1406:22, 1407:12, 1406.9, 1406.22, 1407.12, 1407.13, 1407.21, 1410.8, 1410.14, 1410.17, 1410.25, 1412.7, 1412.11, 1412.20, 1429.14, 1431:10, 1431:20, 1432:8 co - 1373:14, 1484:22, 1486:10, 1486:20 co-operate - 1486:20 co-operated - 1484:22 co-operation - 1373:14 **co-operative** - 1486:10 coat - 1381:5, 1459:5, 1459:10 coitus - 1390:19 collaborated - 1483:23 **colleagues** - 1468:25, 1469:20, 1473:22, 1482:16 collected - 1421:5, 1422:12, 1432:22, 1433:4 collectively - 1425:2 colour - 1466:2 combed - 1433:12 comfort - 1479:6 comfortable - 1478:20 coming - 1423:22, comment - 1403:3, 1414:22, 1421:25, 1423:18, 1442:24, 1470:1, 1472:9, 1482:12 commentary - 1440:14 comments - 1444:2, 1445:16, 1446:22 Commission - 1368:2 1368:15, 1369:1, 1369:2, 1369:3, 1369:4, 1369:5 1369:12, 1415:11, 1440:2, 1440:10, 1456:10, 1478:21, 1484:4 Commission's - 1450:19 Commissioner - 1371:9, 1373:3, 1373:4, 1391:23, 1392:2, 1402:6, 1402:18, 1392.2, 1402.16, 1402.16, 1402.18, 1402:19, 1402:22, 1405:10, 1405:14, 1405:17, 1408:4, 1419:4, 1421:13, 1421:17, 1421:22, 1424:16, 1424:20, 1425:5, 1425:18, 1425:24, 1426:2, 1426:10, 1426:13, 1426:19, 1426:23, 1426:24, 1427:3, 1427:4, 1433:25, 1434:22, 1437:17, 1437:20, 1439:23, 1440:7, 1447:14, 1439.23, 1440.7, 1447.14, 1447.18, 1449:15, 1458:8, 1458:13, 1460:12, 1460:14, 1460:17, 1460:18, 1460:22, 1460:25, 1461:5, 1461:9, 1476:21, 1478:17, 1478:17, 1479:17 1479:22, 1488:2, 1488:5, 1491:1, 1491:5, 1492:1,

1492:11, 1492:17, 1492:19, 1492:23, 1493:2, 1493:4 common - 1388:16, 1389:19, 1398:14, 1404:21, 1404:23, 1406:21, 1407:1, 1409:18, 1412:1, 1439:9, 1469:24, 1470:2, 1470:8 commonality - 1463:15 commonly - 1404:18, 1464:19 communicate - 1467:21, 1467:24 communicating -1467:20 communication -1462:10, 1463:21, 1464:14, 1467:6, 1467:8, 1468:1, 1485:25 communications -1457:6, 1468:20 compared - 1429:3 competent - 1441:11 complete - 1419:6, 1490:17 completed - 1406:15, 1430:20, 1461:23 completely - 1413:25 complicate - 1446:1 components - 1491:17 comprehensive -1452:19 computer - 1435:16 conceivable - 1428:13 concentration - 1452:2 concern - 1426:14 **concerned** - 1421:9 concerning - 1458:21 conclude - 1378:4, 1415:7, 1451:17, 1451:19, 1489:9 concluded - 1466:21 conclusion - 1442:16, 1442:20, 1445:8 conclusions - 1376:8, 1475:22 conclusive - 1427:23, 1428:3, 1444:20, 1489:12 conclusively - 1489:9 concrete - 1376:9, 1377:2 concurrently - 1430:3 conduct - 1481:18 conducted - 1484:20 conducting - 1430:5, 1484:11 conference - 1465:21 confessions - 1420:1 confining - 1434:24 confirm - 1403:8, 1480:12 confusion - 1452:13 Congram - 1369:6 **conscious** - 1379:5, 1380:22 consciousness -1379:7, 1379:8 consensual - 1389:8, 1490:9 consider - 1380:14, 1380:15, 1383:1, 1487:20 considerably - 1394:10 consideration - 1385:14, 1420:22, 1483:7 considered - 1450:10

consistent - 1395:14,

consultation - 1490:5

consultant - 1442:9

1477:13, 1490:19

consulted - 1381:11, 1381:12, 1470:23. 1472:21 contact - 1375:25 1379:20, 1394:13, 1395:4. 1424:7, 1462:6, 1462:19, 1467:2, 1469:22, 1481:24, 1486:10, 1486:17, 1487:11, 1492:6 contacted - 1466:20, 1467:15, 1467:18, 1484:18, 1485:14, 1492:3 contacts - 1468:17 contain - 1451:20, 1488:15, 1488:19, 1488:25, 1489:2, 1494:5 contained - 1396:9. 1440:15, 1456:4, 1459:18 container - 1396:6 containers - 1404:25, 1457:5 contains - 1447:6 **content** - 1434:2, 1436:12, 1440:16, 1478:6, 1478:15, 1482:12 contents - 1418:10, 1432:21, 1433:18, 1485:13, 1489:14, 1489:20 context - 1400:5, 1404:10, 1405:23, 1406:6 continual - 1465:14 continue - 1441:4, 1466:12 continued - 1373:6, 1468:17 Continued - 1371:3 continuing - 1463:21, 1463:22, 1464:3 contour - 1375:22 contribute - 1417:24, control - 1466:11 conversation - 1463:15 convicted - 1453:16 Conviction - 1415:22, 1416:9, 1417:8, 1417:22, 1417:24, 1418:15, 1419:7, 1419:12, 1419:14, 1420:4, 1423:12, 1442:7, 1443:4, 1443:14, 1467:7, 1469:5, 1474:24, 1475:18, 1484:21, 1409:7 **conviction** - 1415:22 1484:21, 1492:7 Conviction - 1368:4 convictions - 1419:18 1439:5, 1441:7, 1442:14 convinces - 1442:4 convincing - 1417:14 cooling - 1391:5 coopt - 1487:11 copies - 1425:13, 1477:5, 1477:20, 1477:21, 1478:4 copy - 1403:15, 1478:8 **corner** - 1398:20, 1403:12, 1466:3 Coroner - 1408:17, 1467:10, 1467:12 Coroner's - 1408:19, 1409:9, 1409:10 Coroners - 1422:25 Correct - 1387:1 correct - 1376:7, 1378:16, 1379:9, 1386:4, 1389:12, 1389:22, 1390:23, 1391:14, 1394:24, 1400:12, 1401:2, 1402:10, 1404:1, 1404:20, 1411:10, 1412:4, 1412:15, 1427:9, 1427:13, 1427:23

1431:16, 1431:25, 1432:22, 1433:9, 1434:14, 1434:20, 1435:4, 1435:25, 1439:11, 1439:12, 1442:11, 1444:21, 1446:6, 1448:4, 1451:5, 1459:17, 1460:8, 1461:21, 1463:19, 1468:7, 1470:22, 1471:11, 1476:20, 1477:15, 1479:14, 1480:4, 1481:1 1483:9, 1488:20, 1489:22, 1490:18, 1494:5 corrected - 1428:12 correctly - 1409:2 counsel - 1370:3, 1448:6, 1448:9, 1461:13, 1465:20, 1474:23, 1474:25, 1475:7, 1477:5, 1477:18, 1477:20, 1478:5, 1484:4, 1489:13, 1492:12 Counsel - 1369:2, 1369:3, 1369:4, 1369:5, 1440:10. 1484:4 **country** - 1469:1 **couple** - 1488:8, 1491:11 course - 1373:15, 1377:12, 1392:19, 1397:14, 1408:1, 1418:16, 1422:7, 1422:8, 1455:15, 1464:7, 1484:24, 1489:19 court - 1387:14. 1416:15, 1417:14, 1418:24, 1419:1, 1442:5, 1463:8, 1464:18, 1464:20, 1464:23, 1465:1, 1465:4, 1479:25 Court - 1369:13, 1446:18, 1467:4, 1467:16, 1471:8, 1471:17, 1471:20, 1471:22, 1479:25, 1483:13, 1491:2, 1494:1 1494:3, 1494:14, 1494:19 courthouse - 1425:8, 1464:9, 1464:10 Courtroom - 1477:24 courtroom - 1479:17 courts - 1480:15 **cover** - 1458:3, 1477:19, 1477:24 credibility - 1417:7 Crick - 1435:8 Crime - 1457:3 crime - 1384:2, 1453:23, 1456:13, 1456:19, 1457:1, 1460:2 crimes - 1422:10, 1437:1 criminal - 1390:2, 1413:5, 1413:8, 1443:15, 1476:2, 1477:1, 1479:17, 1487:9 Criminal - 1477:24, 1479:23 criminologist - 1486:16 Criminology - 1485:9 critical - 1394:4, 1420:2, 1421:4, 1421:9, 1422:15 criticism - 1442:19, 1444:6, 1444:16, 1445:7, 1446:16 cross - 1417:15, 1439:4, 1439:17, 1439:18, 1439:25, 1440:5, 1440:11, 1440:15, 1441:3, 1470:14 cross-examination -1417:15, 1439:17, 1439:18, 1439:25, 1440:5, 1440:15, 1441:2

cross-examined -

1429:19, 1431:10,

1439:4, 1470:14 cross-examining -1440:11 Crown - 1373:20, 1405:25, 1447:24, 1448:6, 1448:9, 1465:16, 1465:18, 1465:20, 1465:23, 1466:9, 1472:19, 1472:21, 1473:25 Crown's - 1448:7 cry - 1380:23 Csr - 1369:13, 1369:14, 1494:2, 1494:12, 1494:13, 1494:17, 1494:18 curtail - 1466:3 customarily - 1465:21, 1482:15 customary - 1440:1, 1468:1 cut - 1377:11, 1381:5 **cutting** - 1377:9, 1377:11, 1377:12 1377:15, 1377:18, 1377:23

D

D-3 - 1402:16

Dalton - 1413:18, 1413:21, 1413:23, 1413:21, 1413:23, 1413:25, 1414:6, 1416:1, 1442:8, 1442:13, 1442:19, 1442:22, 1443:3, 1443:9, 1470:17, 1470:23, 1473:3, 1473:17, 1473:24, 1474:14, 1474:18, 1483:13 data - 1470:24 date - 1393:9, 1415:5 dated - 1415:2, 1482:8, 1484:5 Dave - 1458:5 David - 1368:4, 1370:2 1427:9, 1428:21, 1448:2, 1451:17, 1453:14 days - 1422:17, 1455:22, 1463:19 dead - 1392:4, 1393:2, 1393:5 deal - 1385:13, 1403:4, 1415:6, 1415:17, 1429:2 dealing - 1375:12, 1423:22, 1423:24 dealt - 1441:22, 1481:3 death - 1374:11 1374:15, 1374:19 1374:21, 1374:22 1374:24, 1375:6, 1375:7, 1375:8, 1379:11, 1380:19, 1380:20, 1391:2, 1391:4, 1392:11, 1392:14, 1392:17, 1409:19, 1414:7, 1418:9, 1442:16, 1442:17, 1443:15, 1443:16, 1444:23, 1462:7, 1473:2, 1482:14 Death - 1390:5 **deaths** - 1413:8 **debate** - 1486:22, 1487:7 **Decade** - 1477:23 deceased - 1378:15 1379:19, 1380:6, 1414:13, 1430:23, 1444:17 deceased's - 1374:6 **December** - 1478:3 decide - 1423:9.

1423:10, 1455:13

1471:25

decided - 1423:11,

decides - 1419:4



decision - 1382:17, 1408:19, 1490:4, 1490:9 decisions - 1481:17 declined - 1469:16, 1482:12, 1482:23 decomposed - 1391:1, 1392:16 decomposition -1392:10 **Decomposition -**1390:14 deemed - 1486:18 defence - 1472:12 1472:14, 1474:4, 1474:6, 1474:10 defensive - 1446:10 definable - 1399:22 define - 1464:22 definition - 1399:25 degradation - 1452:5 degree - 1388:7, 1393:16, 1424:2, 1436:25, 1492:5 **delay** - 1423:21, 1423:25, 1475:4, 1475:10, 1475:16 Delta - 1454:6 Demayo - 1472:20 **Demayos** - 1472:20 demeán - 1383:7 demonstrate - 1418:3 demonstrated - 1428:21, 1490:1 demonstration -1385:25 denigrate - 1473:21 dependent - 1448:18 depicts - 1403:18 deploy - 1420:16 deployed - 1430:12 deposit - 1390:22 1393:9, 1393:25, 1415:3 deposited - 1392:13 depths - 1381:15 describe - 1387:16, 1406:2 described - 1389:11. 1393:19, 1399:18, 1430:19, 1447:22, 1459:24, 1476:10 describes - 1460:3 Description - 1371:2, description - 1378:24, 1407:12, 1413:13 **desire** - 1383:6, 1383:8, 1384:2 destroys - 1391:6 detect - 1489:8 detectable - 1451:20, 1453:7, 1488:25, 1489:2 Detectable - 1453:1 detected - 1384:24, 1451:23 Detective - 1405:24, 1410:4 determinations - 1460:7, 1481:18 determining - 1438:6 detriment - 1487:13 development - 1430:13 devised - 1430:16 dialogue - 1456:18 die - 1444:10 difference - 1436:8 differences - 1440:9 different - 1380:16. 1392:25, 1393:1, 1436:1, 1441:20, 1441:25, 1462:21, 1462:21 1462:21, 1468:23, 1470:4

1473:1 differentiate - 1454:2 differentiated - 1453:21 differing - 1392:23, 1473:5, 1483:25, 1484:1 difficult - 1376:15, 1379:3, 1380:3, 1393:4, 1415:5, 1416:24, 1421:3, 1446:6, 1464:22 diminish - 1383:7 direct - 1484:6, 1485:22 Director/media - 1369:6 disagree - 1419:9, 1441:12, 1445:20, 1470:9, 1472:11 disagreement - 1441:13 disappearance -1393:20 discard - 1490:5 discarded - 1454:25 1455:5, 1489:17, 1489:21, 1489:24, 1490:12 discarding - 1490:4 discover - 1427:19 discovered - 1435:11, 1436:3 discovering - 1435:8, discrepancy - 1473:8 discuss - 1464:18, 1465:3, 1469:1 discussed - 1381:7. 1381:12, 1381:19, 1428:25, 1468:8, 1482:21 discussing - 1417:6, 1462:22 discussion - 1457:8, 1457:10, 1458:20, 1464:11, 1465:6, 1469:17 discussions - 1462:6, 1465:17, 1481:23, 1487:5 **Dishonest** - 1419:8, disparage - 1473:21 dispassionate - 1421:8 displayed - 1381:2 disputes - 1482:15 distant - 1425:22 distinction - 1409:4 distinguish - 1436:14 distinguished - 1418:5 distinguishing 1444:12, 1444:24, 1445:1, 1445:23 diverge - 1470:12 division - 1408:25 Dna - 1435:10, 1435:24, 1436:3, 1436:9, 1436:12, 1436:21, 1448:18, 1455:17, 1476:1, 1476:5, 1476:12, 1476:14, 1476:18, 1476:25, 1477:12, 1477:16, 1477:23, 1478:1, 1479:13, 1479:16, 1480:15 Doctor - 1374:5, 1382:21, 1384:16 1384:17, 1389:20, 1389:24, 1391:10, 1391:20, 1392:8, 1395:7, 1405:23, 1407:1, 1407:17, 1408:5, 1410:2, 1411:25, 1417:17, 1418:6, 1421:1, 1421:24, 1424:15, 1434:1, 1435:6, 1436:24, 1449:9, 1450:23, 1451:14, 1452:6, 1453:18, 1472:8, 1476:19, 1478:21, 1480:23, 1481:22, 1482:5, 1487:23

Document - 1369:7,

1369:8, 1369:9 document - 1374:4. 1384:9, 1384:11, 1390:1, 1399:11, 1402:7, 1402:8, 1402:17, 1403:8, 1403:14, 1404:8, 1405:7, 1410:3, 1425:14, 1446:7, 1449:7, 1451:8, 1451:9, 1452:21, 1453:15, 1458:7, 1477:10, 1477:21, 1479:19, 1482:5, 1484:18, 1485:3, 1485:4 documentary - 1424:20 documented - 1482:11 documents - 1482:1 dog - 1443:21 Donald - 1369:14. 1494:2, 1494:18 done - 1382:6, 1406:24, 1407:10, 1408:2, 1408:21, 1409:4, 1409:6, 1409:9, 1409:16, 1411:17, 1411:21, 1411:22, 1414:2, 1424:14, 1428:21, 1429:22, 1431:11, 1433:3, 1433:14, 1433:24, 1434:12, 1434:18, 1435:3, 1438:18, 1438:20, 1443:3, 1444:19, 1446:5, 1446:13, 1454:2, 1456:23, 1456:25, 1467:25, 1468:13, 1484:22, 1484:24, 1485:1, 1485:17 doorstep - 1409:25 **double** - 1435:9, 1435:19, 1476:9 doubt - 1461:21 **Douglas** - 1369:2 **Dowling** - 1381:20 **down** - 1402:12, 1411:7, 1433:2, 1443:23, 1459:7, Dr - 1381:20, 1426:16, 1427:6, 1435:25, 1439:10, 1441:1, 1444:4, 1444:8, 1444:16, 1445:7, 1445:10, 1445:16, 1445:20, 1447:21, 1448:3, 1448:22, 1448:25, 1449:11, 1449:12, 1455:21, 1457:7, 1458:15, 1458:17, 1461:12, 1468:8, 1468:10, 1468:14, 1468:15, 1468:17, 1468:18, 1468:22, 1477:11, 1479:5, 1482:12, 1482:22, 1482:25, 1483:11, 1486:6, 1486:25, 1491:11, 1491:24, 1492:2, 1492:13 **draw** - 1376:18, 1395:20, 1475:23, 1482:2, 1485:3, 1487:21 drawn - 1374:8, 1482:1 dreamed - 1481:9, 1481:11, 1481:21 dress - 1459:7, 1459:11 drew - 1484:4 dry - 1405:8 dubious - 1443:9 due - 1380:19, 1380:20, 1419:14, 1472:13, 1475:18, 1475:19 **during** - 1380:5, 1383:4, 1410:15, 1413:2, 1429:18, 1457:22, 1461:2, 1464:7, 1481:24 dying - 1443:23, 1472:6

early - 1484:14, 1485:17 ease - 1426:9 Easily - 1398:22 easy - 1421:2, 1421:4 Eddie - 1370:8 edge - 1377:8, 1377:9, 1377:11, 1377:12 1377:15, 1377:18, 1377:24 edged - 1377:7, 1377:8 edition - 1482:8 editorial - 1440:15 Edmonton - 1381:22 Edmund - 1371:3, 1373:6 Edward - 1368:7 effect - 1473:19, 1489:16 eight - 1443:3, 1443:7, 1473:17, 1474:18 either - 1382:3, 1417:3, 1425:2, 1430:21, 1431:21, 1432:8, 1437:15, 1438:19, 1454:17, 1465:22, 1482:22 ejaculate - 1393:13, 1394:9 electronically - 1426:9 element - 1383:5, 1383:22 Ellerman - 1369:9 **elsewhere** - 1487:18 Elson - 1370:7, 1371:5, 1427:3, 1427:4, 1427:5, 1434:1, 1434:10, 1437:25, 1440:25, 1447:18, 1447:20 1447:18, 1447:20, 1448:22, 1451:1, 1488:9 Email - 1458:4 embalmed - 1392:18, 1392:19 embalming - 1390:16, eminent - 1483:3 emphasize - 1424:12, empirical - 1430:15 Emson - 1371:3, 1373:6, 1426:16, 1427:6, 1435:25, 1441:1, 1444:8, 1447:21, 1448:3, 1448:22, 1448:26, 148:27, 1488:47 1455:21, 1457:7, 1458:17, 1461:12, 1477:11, 1479:5, 1486:6, 1486:25, 1488:8, 1491:11, 1491:24, 1492:2, 1492:13 enclosed - 1396:11 encountered - 1384:4, end - 1378:4, 1387:4, 1387:8, 1419:5, 1419:14, 1420:15, 1453:24, 1463:4 endeavour - 1486:19 endeavoured - 1435:18 endometrium - 1445:11, 1445:18 enforcement - 1422:5 engage - 1466:10, 1469:16 engaged - 1429:8 England - 1436:5, 1472:5, 1472:7, 1477:17, 1480:5 enhanced - 1375:11, 1401:20 enlarge - 1451:10 enlarged - 1401:20, 1449:21 ensure - 1478:13 enter - 1482:15

entered - 1393:13.

enterprise - 1482:17 entire - 1384:25, 1448:10 entirely - 1444:14, 1445:4 **entirety** - 1479:6, 1479:8 **epileptics** - 1413:9 equally - 1437:8, 1481:14 equipment - 1397:16, 1397:17, 1431:15 equipped - 1431:14 equivalent - 1420:17 erosion - 1388:13 **Esq** - 1369:3, 1369:4, 1369:5, 1370:6, 1370:7, 1370:8, 1370:9, 1370:11 essence - 1461:22. 1475:9 essential - 1447:24, 1448:12 establish - 1423:20, 1467:19, 1468:12 established - 1424:18, 1446:8, 1449:24 establishment - 1422:9 estimate - 1380:3, 1380:4, 1391:17 estimating - 1418:9 Et - 1404:20 Eugene - 1484:3 event - 1431:20, 1441:3 events - 1459:23 1464:7, 1486:4, 1489:25 Evidence - 1372:7 1477:23, 1478:1, 1491:8 evidence - 1374:2, 1376:19, 1381:10, 1393:15, 1399:16, 1405:24, 1417:14, 1419:15, 1419:21, 1421:5, 1421:8, 1422:12, 1424:21, 1426:5, 1427:14, 1427:16, 1427:22, 1427:24, 1428:3, 1428:11, 1428:13, 1430:20, 1435:10, 1437:3, 1439:8, 1439:12, 1440:13, 1443:4, 1444:5, 1444:15, 1444:25, 1445:5, 1447:1, 1448:18, 1450:19, 1450:24, 1454:18, 1460:6, 1461:23, 1462:14, 1464:18, 1464:20, 1465:3, 1465:4, 1469:18, 1470:10, 1471:17, 1471:22, 1472:12, 1473:15, 1473:25, 1475:15, 1476:1, 1477:7, 1477:16, 1479:14, 1479:16, 1480:4, 1480:15, 1484:8, 1486:23, 1488:21, 1489:17, 1489:21, 1489:23, 1490:15, 1492:20 evolving - 1393:20 exactly - 1398:11 Exactly - 1375:5, 1459:25 examination - 1382:4, 1382:9, 1384:23, 1385:5, 1385:8, 1406:18, 1406:25, 1408:17, 1417:15, 1430:5, 1435:1, 1435:3, 1439:17, 1439:18, 1439:25, 1440:2, 1440:5, 1440:6, 1440:15, 1441:2, 1443:2, 1445:18, 1455:12 examination-in-chief -1440:6 examinations - 1408:21 **examine** - 1384:25



Ε

1468:22

examined - 1385:10, 1407:11, 1433:9, 1439:4, 1443:5, 1443:11, 1450:16, 1456:3, 1462:2, 1470:14, 1489:25 **Examiner** - 1381:21, 1469:23, 1483:4 examiner's - 1402:1, 1403:9 **Examiners** - 1422:25 examining - 1440:11 example - 1375:20, 1396:16, 1416:13, 1427:18 exceedingly - 1391:9, 1472:6 except - 1470:24 exception - 1378:14. 1424:24, 1426:5, 1461:25, 1486:11 exchange - 1464:23. 1469:21 excluded - 1464:19 Excuse - 1433:25 excused - 1492:13 **Executive - 1369:6** exercise - 1466:10 exhaustively - 1450:16 Exhibit - 1372:3, 1372:6, 1402:16, 1425:19, 1425:24, 1425:25, 1426:20, 1490:25, 1491:7 exhibit - 1382:17 1402:24, 1412:7, 1424:21, 1426:8, 1426:17, 1490:24, 1491:3 exhibits - 1404:12, 1407:10, 1414:21, 1414:23, 1424:19, 1425:3, 1425:7, 1425:9, 1425:12, 1425:16, 1426:3, 1462:4 Exhibits - 1372:1 existed - 1430:13 expect - 1374:25, 1379:9, 1388:19, 1389:1, 1389:10, 1394:12, 1460:19 **expecting** - 1383:1, 1388 24 expedition - 1424:3 **experience** - 1389:15, 1415:21, 1420:1, 1420:8, 1420:9, 1431:3, 1439:2, 1439:25, 1456:21 experienced - 1389:18, 1470:8, 1474:10 expert - 1384:1, 1417:2, 1450:17, 1452:16, 1452:17, 1454:5, 1469:2, 1470:16, 1483:12, 1486:14, 1488:22 expertise - 1399:25. 1420:17, 1421:10, 1421:21, 1421:25, 1428:5, 1437:14, 1440:19, 1452:18 experts - 1390:21, 1391:13, 1391:18, 1417:18, 1422:14, 1422:23, 1423:5, 1440:22, 1472:15 explain - 1446:11, 1446:14, 1459:9 explained - 1375:24 explanation - 1452:12 exponentially - 1437:6 exposure - 1380:19 express - 1446:19, expressed - 1416:20,

1426:6, 1428:8, 1444:6, 1445:7, 1445:8, 1489:3 expresses - 1444:16 expression - 1452:18, 1454:16 extended - 1399:24 extensive - 1374:17 extreme - 1391:7 eye - 1421:9 eyewitness - 1378:1

F

face - 1422:2, 1422:4 faced - 1420:10, 1420:11 facing - 1376:25 fact - 1375:24, 1403:11, 1418:2, 1418:13, 1418:14, 1425:7, 1425:11, 1427:11, 1428:22, 1439:17, 1440:5, 1442:4, 1443:16, 1445:17, 1446:16, 1447:13, 1447:22, 1452:8, 1454:15, 1455:9, 1459:14, 1459:15, 1459:18, 1459:20, 1460:10, 1472:3, 1474:6, 1474:19, 1474:25, 1475:12, 1477:14, 1479:15 factored - 1420:21 factors - 1376:10, 1420:3 facts - 1377:2, 1432:11, 1442:1, 1442:21, 1465:9, 1470.6 **Fainstein**- 1458:5, 1458:18, 1459:3 Fainstein's- 1458:14 **Fair**- 1374:16, 1378:3, 1380:18, 1382:11, 1392:7, 1394:3, 1397:23, 1398:1, 1398:17, 1400:1, 1400:4, 1401:9, 1402:6, 1403:2, 1405:2, 1408:24 fair - 1373:18, 1374:10, 1374:10, 1375:1, 1375:7, 1375:7, 1375:18, 1376:18, 1377:14, 1377:25, 1378:23, 1379:4, 1379:7, 1379:22, 1380:10, 1389:4, 1393:21, 1394:14, 1398:25, 1409:20, 1416:4, 1416:11, 1450:22 fairly - 1419:6, 1421:2, 1463:18, 1477:8 fairness - 1389:1, 1429:14, 1444:18, 1478:18, 1481:25 fall - 1443:23 falling - 1383:2 false - 1419:21, 1419:25 familiar - 1386:11, 1437:4, 1441:19, 1442:8, 1476:23, 1480:18, 1485:8, 1485:11 far - 1382:10, 1418:24 fashion - 1401:1 fault - 1385:20 faulted - 1422:3 favour - 1418:19 faxed - 1477:3 February- 1455:23, 1492:21, 1492:24 Federal- 1484:11, 1484:20 federal - 1486:16 fell - 1383:24 felt - 1455:6, 1469:3 female - 1393:14 **Ferris**- 1444:4, 1444:16, 1445:7, 1445:10, 1445:21

Ferris'- 1445:16 **few** - 1380:22, 1383:18, 1409:8, 1413:12, 1431:3, 1449:2, 1449:5, 1460:19, 1479:8 fibres - 1381:16 fiction - 1481:8, 1481:11, 1481:12 1481:14, 1481:15, 1481:16 field - 1428:5, 1440:19, 1441:10, 1481:13 figure - 1483:10 file - 1468:9, 1477:9, 1478:12 filed - 1471:8 files - 1485:1 final - 1458:3, 1485:3, 1486:25 Finally - 1415:6 finally - 1452:4, 1452:5, 1471:3, 1472:1 findings - 1381:3, 1383:19, 1414:4, 1414:11, 1424:9, 1441:13, 1441:14, 1441:21 fine - 1415:13, 1436:19 finger - 1386:9, 1386:13, 1386:16, 1386:19 fingernail - 1432:25 fingers - 1386:14 finished - 1408:6, 1412:11 **first** - 1374:1, 1380:22, 1420:5, 1425:22, 1436:21, 1452:20, 1456:20, 1466:19, 1470:22 1477:16, 1479:10, 1479:16, 1480:5, 1480:12 First- 1385:13 Firstly- 1441:19 Fisher- 1370:11, 1373:9, 1378:21, 1378:22, 1385:7, 1390:1, 1400:5, 1401:12, 1425:9, 1448:4, 1448:7, 1448:15, 1448:1 1448:17, 1453:1, 1453:4, 1453:12, 1467:8, 1469:8, 1469:15 Fisher's- 1390:4, 1391:21, 1401:18, 1402:15, 1405:24, 1410:5 Fitzpatrick- 1369:16 five - 1478:9, 1478:18 Five- 1473:3 flashlight - 1375:21 flee - 1459:7 flew - 1472:7 floor - 1402:1, 1407:21, 1412:17, 1412:18, 1429:14 fluid - 1393:10, 1394:13, 1394:18, 1415:2, 1427:18, 1433:20, 1434:2, 1434:5, 1434:7, 1453:9, 1453:21, 1454:20, 1489:7 fluids - 1428:16, 1453:10, 1488:13, 1488:24, 1489:1 following - 1390:12, 1391:3, 1400:19, 1474:24, 1492:6 follows - 1451:24 footnote - 1485:23 force - 1389:21, 1422:11 forced - 1389:3 forceful - 1417:1 forcefully - 1418:22

forces - 1422:2 foregoing - 1494:4 foreign - 1433:13 forensic - 1382:9, 1409:1, 1409:13, 1417:13, 1422:20, 1424:13, 1430:19, 1436:4, 1436:9, 1436:10, 1436:22, 1438:10, 1441:10 1441:11, 1441:15 1442:10, 1447:5, 1470:9, 1472:22, 1476:18, 1481:13, 1483:24 Forensic- 1478:1 forgive - 1441:8 form - 1471:18, 1471:19 formal - 1404:3, 1467:6, 1467:8 formalized - 1404:24. 1404:25 formally - 1424:22, 1426:4 former - 1483:3 forward - 1475:3 forwarded - 1456:8, 1457:16 Four- 1491:5, 1491:6 four - 1472:14 fragmented - 1490:22 frame - 1393:23 Fraser- 1485:10 free - 1383:1 friend - 1444:6 Friend- 1429:13 friendship - 1465:15 frozen - 1415:5, 1456:2 frustrated - 1475:2 fulfilled - 1432:14 full - 1397:23, 1445:15, 1477:21, 1478:5 future - 1455:16

G Gail - 1385:4, 1385:8, 1400:15, 1403:20, 1405:3, 1430:9, 1430:12, 1434:12, 1444:7, 1444:10, 1453:16, 1480:24, 1481:19, 1482:13 gain - 1419:20, 1440:7 gained - 1413:14, 1439:1 gamut - 1456:15 garbage - 1403:24 1404:17, 1404:22, 1407:2, 1412:1 garment - 1381:17, 1432:10 gather - 1407:2, 1462:5 gathered - 1457:14 gathering - 1457:23 general - 1373:24, 1391:6, 1415:5, 1416:5, 1421:18, 1463:14, 1464:11, 1465:7, 1470:9 **Generally** - 1410:23 **generally** - 1381:10, 1385:14, 1399:21, 1413:13, 1429:21 genital - 1435:1 genius - 1417:11 Gibson - 1370:9, 1371:6, 1448:24, 1449:3, 1449:17, 1458:10, 1458:15, 1458:16 Given - 1406:19, 1468:22 given - 1406:19, 1414:6, 1426:6, 1450:24, 1452:19, 1454:18, 1464:19, 1465:4, 1483:18

glove - 1432:4 gloved - 1431:24, 1432:1, 1432:17 gloves - 1431:16, 1431:17, 1432:7, 1432:9 Government - 1370:4, 1487.9 gradual - 1430:14, 1480:14 Graham - 1381:20 grateful - 1478:7 gratuitous - 1382:23 Gratuitous - 1382:25 great - 1381:23, 1403:4, 1414:8, 1473:13, 1487:7 greater - 1409:7 greatly - 1476:14 green - 1431:12 **grounds** - 1430:15 **group** - 1427:20, 1428:1, 1428:7, 1428:14, 1453:8, 1468:16, 1469:25, 1470:3, 1472:10 grouping - 1428:7, 1446:2 guess - 1422:1, 1424:5, 1456:17, 1457:9, 1457:14, 1457:20, 1458:12, 1458:25, 1459:15, 1462:16, 1480:23 **guidance - 1440:8** gurney - 1402:10

Н

hair - 1433:8, 1433:12, 1433:15 half's - 1414:10 Halifax - 1456:23 hand - 1400:23, 1400:25, 1410:25, 1431:24, 1432:1 handed - 1376:6, 1378:5, 1378:6, 1378:9, 1382:15, 1400:9, 1400:10, 1400:19, 1401:13, 1401:16, 1431:21, 1431:23 handedness - 1376:14 handing - 1432:4 handing - 1432:4 handle - 1395:9, 1398:7, 1425:10, 1490:24, 1490:25, 1491:10 handled - 1396:9, 1474:14, 1476:16 hands - 1461:17, 1490:10 handy - 1405:1 hard - 1402:14, 1423:10, 1439:2 hardware - 1398:20 Hardy - 1369:3 Harry - 1371:3, 1373:6 hatred - 1383:8, 1384:3 heads - 1391:1 hear - 1457:9 heard - 1386:9, 1444:5, 1464:20 hearing - 1429:1 1467:4, 1473:6, 1474:1, 1474:5[°] held - 1376:11, 1377:23 helical - 1476:9 helix - 1435:9 help - 1380:9, 1380:24, 1396:23, 1413:16, 1414:8, 1420:25, 1457:17 helpful - 1413:11 helps - 1390:16

hereafter - 1480:13

hereby - 1494:4



information - 1379:18.

herein - 1494:6 Hersh - 1370:2 highlight - 1384:13, 1395:10, 1396:20, 1405:22, 1452:22 highlighted - 1459:2 Hinz - 1369:13, 1494:2, 1494:13 history - 1476:25, 1483:9 Hodson - 1369:2, 1371:8, 1405:20, 1425:5, 1425:6, 1425:20, 1426:11, 1426:14, 1434:23, 1444:6, 1449:21, 1477:18, 1488:7, 1491:9, 1491:24, 1492:19, 1493:1, 1493:3 home - 1435:19 homicide - 1383:22, 1407:25, 1409:24, 1411:19, 1429:11, 1429:23, 1429:24, 1430:2, 1431:5, 1431:21, 1438:2, 1443:24, 1448:17, 1461:24, 1473:4 homicides - 1383:4, 1383:16, 1408:10, 1431:1 homosexual - 1383:22 honest - 1418:17, 1418:19, 1419:13 Honourable - 1368:6 **hope** - 1373:5, 1417:24, 1419:13, 1435:7 Hospital - 1396:21, 1403:13 hospital - 1397:11. 1397:12, 1408:25, 1409:5, 1409:9, 1414:9 hospitals - 1408:14, 1408:16, 1408:22, 1409:17 hotel - 1492:25 Hotel - 1368:17, 1493:1, hour - 1414:9, 1476:22 hours - 1390:18, 1390:23, 1391:13, 1392:13, 1393:1, 1393:3, 1393.5 household - 1398:14 households - 1398:25 houses - 1399:2 human - 1450:1, 1464:14, 1481:9 hypotheses - 1376:2, hypothesis - 1460:1, hypothesize - 1393:17 hypothesized - 1404:16 I

Id - 1372:5, 1426:22 idea - 1397:22, 1457:20 identical - 1395:18, 1490:20 identifiable - 1390:15, 1392:15 identification - 1411:1, 1411:2, 1431:8, 1431:23, 1432:17, 1437:2 Identification - 1406:10, 1406:16 identified - 1424:22, 1429:13, 1429:15 identifies - 1480:16 identify - 1419:25 ii - 1452:2

iii - 1452:5

ill - 1472:6 illness - 1472:14 imagined - 1481:1 immediate - 1379:20 immediately - 1379:11 immunohematologist -1428:19, 1450:19, 1454:22 implied - 1446:16 imply - 1424:2 important - 1417:9 importantly - 1424:10 impossible - 1376:16 impression - 1484:9 Improper - 1416:11, 1416:12 inaccurate - 1417:23 inadequate - 1415:21, 1474:4 inarticulate - 1417:11 incident - 1462:7 incidentally - 1439:15 incision - 1382:4 include - 1429:9, 1431:15 includes - 1416:2, incompetence - 1441:24 incorrect - 1411:8, 1474:1, 1474:3 increased - 1401:6, increasing - 1436:12, 1476:14 indeed - 1432:16, 1467:21, 1468:9, 1469:21, 1486:13 independent - 1422:9, 1422:11, 1422:19, 1423:3, 1423:12, 1423:13, 1424:7, 1486:2 Index - 1371:1, 1372:1 indicate - 1410:19 indicated - 1406:20, 1427:7, 1427:17, 1429:17, 1436:24, 1437:11, 1444:19, 1450:13, 1461:19, 1462:13 indication - 1389:21, indications - 1486:9 indicators - 1388:18, 1388:22, 1389:2 indictable - 1423:11 individual - 1378:9, 1379:2, 1379:5, 1380:8, 1380:22, 1380:23, 1399:17, 1407:3, 1407:7, 1414:13, 1431:9, 1431:10, 1432:10, 1453:6, 1488:14 individually - 1405:3, 1406:22, 1411:9 individuals - 1373:18, 1377:14, 1413:19, 1453:25 indoors - 1448:20 indulgence - 1477:9 inexperienced - 1420:23 inference - 1376:22, 1376:24, 1438:18 inferences - 1376:9, 1376:18, 1412:20 inflammation - 1388:7, 1388:11 inflict - 1383:6 inflicted - 1374:15.

1374:24, 1443:21

infliction - 1376:21

influence - 1487:4

informants - 1419:17

1382:20, 1413:14, 1418:17, 1450:11, 1461:1, 1463:10, 1463:13, 1464:24, 1477:7, 1483:18 informed - 1427:15, 1438:20, 1443:1, 1444:15, 1454:22, 1455:9, 1456:14, 1456:20, 1457:2, 1457:25, 1475:5, 1487:22 initial - 1394:9, 1443:5, injuries - 1376:13, 1377:3, 1377:13, 1378:13, 1378:23, 1379:10, 1379:18, 1379:23, 1381:14, 1384:24, 1387:7, 1395:14, 1395:15, 1395:19, 1414:1, 1442:23, 1443:20 **injury** - 1374:6, 1374:10, 1374:23, 1375:11, 1375:13, 1376:21, 1377:10, 1380:12 1380:20, 1381:3, 1381:16, 1386:3, 1386:6, 1386:14, 1389:6, 1389:17, 1473:2, 1473:4 Inland - 1369:16 inner - 1385:17, 1385:18, 1385:22, 1386:1, 1389:21 innocence - 1467:19. 1468.12 innocuous - 1443:17 inquiry - 1405:25, 1440:9, 1456:17, 1464:8, 1465:24, 1466:7, 1475:13, 1475:14, 1487:2 Inquiry - 1368:2, 1368:24, 1425:4, 1482:2 insofar - 1417:25, 1421:25 instance - 1469:22 instances - 1374:25, 1384:7 instant - 1391:4 insufficient - 1451:25 intact - 1398:3, 1398:4, 1398:7, 1398:9, 1490:17, 1490:21, 1491:23 Intact - 1390:17 intend - 1473:13, 1479:7 intercourse - 1389:3, 1389:6, 1389:19, 1390:25, 1391:4, 1394:12 interested - 1381:4 1400:7, 1402:9, 1402:11, 1404:8, 1404:9, 1410:5 interim - 1469:7 Intermittent - 1463:23, 1463:25 intermittent - 1464:1, 1464:2 internal - 1382:4 internationally - 1480:17 internet - 1477:3 interpret - 1446:6 interpretation - 1376:13, 1414:1, 1414:5, 1418:7, 1418:18, 1424:10, 1441:13, 1441:14, 1442:23, 1470:10, 1473:23, 1474:1, 1482:19, 1482:20 interpretations -1441:20, 1442:1 interval - 1443:8 intervened - 1446:17,

interview - 1484:15, 1485:16 intimate - 1463:24 introduce - 1416:24 introduced - 1477:17, 1479:17 introduction - 1476:25. 1480:5, 1480:14 investigated - 1481:5 investigating - 1438:13 investigation - 1373:17, 1413:5, 1422:7, 1436:10, 1436:11, 1464:3, 1481:19, 1484:12 Investigation - 1390:5 investigations - 1409:20, 1415:21 investigators - 1415:25, 1464:12 involved - 1383:16, 1412:13, 1413:19, 1414:3, 1422:1 involves - 1374:1 involving - 1431:2 Irene - 1369:12 Isabelle - 1369:8 isolated - 1486:4 issue - 1400:6, 1475:12, 1488:10 issues - 1443:14 item - 1406:9, 1411:3, 1431:10, 1431:20 items - 1403:19, 1403:25, 1406:13, 1406:22, 1410:17, 1411:10, 1426:4 itinerant - 1422:23 itself - 1416:15, 1420:9, 1475:15, 1477:10

jail - 1473:17, 1474:18, 1474:21 **January**- 1368:22, 1452:23, 1461:24, 1466:8 Jay- 1370:6 Jerry- 1369:15 jives - 1451:14 **John**- 1369:4 Jordan- 1369:3 Journal - 1478:3 **Joyce**- 1370:3 **judge** - 1417:8, 1471:5, 1471:24 judge's - 1472:14 Judicial- 1425:3 June- 1472:4, 1482:8, 1484:5 junk - 1416:13, 1416:17, 1416:24 jury - 1390:3, 1417:8 Justice- 1368:6, 1475:13, 1475:22, 1484:11, 1484:20 justice - 1415:11, 1415:16, 1417:5, 1422:22, 1486:16 justified - 1474:3

K

Kara - 1369:8 Karen - 1369:13, 1494:2, 1494:13 Karst - 1370:8 keep - 1461:14, 1487:4 Kennedy - 1471:13, 1472:16, 1472:21, 1474:20, 1474:23, 1475:2

1475:6, 1475:8 kept - 1458:2, 1485:1, 1486:5 key - 1436:10 kill - 1383:8 killing - 1453:16 Kim- 1485:9 kin - 1409:7 kind - 1454:20 kit - 1404:16, 1404:19, 1430:4, 1430:8, 1430:14, 1430:16, 1430:19, 1432:20, 1433:2, 1434:14, 1434:25 kitchen - 1398:16 kits - 1404:3 Kleiv - 1401:14, 1405:24, 1407:8, 1410:4, 1412:12, 1437:13, 1437:15, 1438:4, 1462:11, 1462:20 Kleiv's - 1412:5 knees - 1386:7 Knife - 1372:7, 1491:8 knife - 1376:11, 1377:4, 1377:6, 1377:8, 1377:23, 1395:8, 1395:11, 1395:17, 1398:1, 1398:4, 1398:5, 1398:7, 1398:8, 1398:14, 1398:21, 1425:10, 1444:11, 1462:4, 1463:14, 1490:14, 1490:16, 1490:17, 1490:19, 1490:21, 1490:22, 1490:24, 1491:1, 1491:10, 1491:13, 1491:16, 1491:19, 1491:20, 1491:21 Knowing - 1386:17 **knowledge** - 1374:17, 1419:22, 1432:11,

Knowing - 1386:17 knowledge - 1374:17, 1419:22, 1432:11, 1433:10, 1436:15, 1436:16, 1437:6, 1437:13, 1437:20, 1447:9, 1448:12, 1448:16, 1450:21, 1453:19, 1454:1, 1458:23, 1494:6 knowledgeable -

1438:9, 1438:20, 1439:15 known - 1428:1, 1435:24, 1450:9, 1454:3, 1454:7, 1454:12, 1487:18 knows - 1412:8, 1435:17 Knox - 1370:5, 1371:7, 1460:17, 1460:18, 1461:11, 1461:13, 1478:17, 1479:4, 1488:1, 1492:2

Krogan - 1370:4, 1460:15, 1460:16 **Kujawa** - 1370:6

L

lab - 1451:16, 1451:18, 1456:13, 1456:19, 1457:1 Lab - 1396:21, 1457:3 laboratories - 1438:10 laboratory - 1382:10, 1396:19, 1396:25, 1397:16, 1404:4, 1476:16, 1488:23 lacerations - 1387:22, 1388:1 lack - 1420:1, 1420:8 Lack- 1420:8 Lamer - 1475:14, 1475:22 Lana- 1370:4 laneway - 1459:7 large - 1386:23, 1389:16,



1446:24

1415:16, 1422:10, 1423:7,

1423:9, 1423:10, 1423:12, 1437:1, 1474:20

Large- 1372:4, 1426:21 **Larry**- 1370:11, 1448:3, 1448:14, 1448:15, 1453:12 larynx - 1442:24 last - 1403:8, 1403:11, 1420:6, 1421:19, 1422:17, 1426:14, 1435:18, 1441:21, 1456:22, 1458:11, 1458:12 Lastly- 1490:14 late - 1470:25, 1484:13, 1487:7 latter - 1385:15 law - 1376:8, 1424:3, 1471:15, 1475:20, 1476:2 Law- 1478:3 lawyer - 1484:11, 1486:16 lawyers - 1390:2, 1449:1 lay - 1415:20 layer - 1422:18, 1423:20 laying - 1382:3 lays - 1433:2 lead - 1415:22, 1415:25, 1416:8, 1417:21, 1420:3, 1448:2, 1455:20, 1477:6, 1478:16 lead-in - 1448:2 leading - 1421:20 leads - 1437:10 learned - 1446:9 least - 1390:20, 1391:12, 1412:25, 1482:19 leave - 1398:18 led - 1418:14 left - 1374:6, 1376:6, 1377:25, 1378:6, 1378:9 left-handed - 1376:6, 1378:6, 1378:9 legal - 1396:22, 1442:25, 1446:24, 1476:18 Legal- 1390:4 Legere- 1480:20, 1481:4 legs - 1386:15, 1394:23 Leicester- 1436:5 length - 1376:5, 1439:4, 1444:9, 1473:13 lenient - 1440:21 lesions - 1381:13, 1381:18 less - 1432:24, 1482:22 letter - 1449:9 level - 1424:14 liable - 1414:10 Liaison- 1369:6 lid - 1487:5 Lieutenant- 1400:20, 1401:17, 1406:12, 1437:12, 1437:15, 1438:3, 1456:2, 1456:5, 1462:20 **life** - 1383:4, 1389:25, 1425:1, 1481:6, 1481:10, 1487:15 lifetime - 1439:1 light - 1373:21, 1489:5 likely - 1375:6, 1474:12 limited - 1420:17, 1454:19 limits - 1466:2 line - 1384:14, 1384:21, 1387:17, 1400:7, 1404:12, 1410:5, 1420:15, 1460:8 Line- 1385:9

lines - 1390:10, 1455:1,

lining - 1445:11 link - 1480:20

lips - 1386:24

1492:3

list - 1415:16, 1416:8, 1419:6, 1419:7, 1419:24, 1488:3, 1488:23 listed - 1433:5 listened - 1440:14, 1440:16, 1440:19 live - 1430:21 lived - 1444:7 living - 1391:15, 1392:4, 1393:3 location - 1386:3, 1395:23 Lockyer- 1439:3, 1441:6, 1442:6, 1446:15, 1447:11, 1447:21, 1449:14, 1458:5, 1470:14, 1473:16, 1474:17, 1475:14 Lockyer's- 1415:9, 1446:22, 1448:1, 1459:13 long-standing - 1382:2 look - 1377:9, 1402:6, 1402:18, 1405:2, 1444:2, 1451:13, 1461:1, 1478:9, 1478:25 looked - 1387:19. 1395:24, 1396:7, 1403:11, 1462:4, 1490:16, 1491:14, 1491:15 looking - 1384:10, 1386:18, 1403:15, 1470:19, 1476:22, 1480:3, 1480:24, 1491:12 Lord- 1390:11, 1392:8, 1402:21, 1405:8, 1408:9, 1415:7, 1421:20, 1424:17, 1425:17, 1426:1 **Lordship-** 1392:9, 1422:8, 1434:4, 1437:19, 1439:22, 1440:24, 1492:8, 1492:15 Lordship's- 1379:17 loss - 1393:16, 1445:14 low - 1452:3 lumps - 1463:14 lunch - 1461:15, 1476:22, 1477:3 lung - 1381:15, 1444:8, 1444:10 ly - 1441:25

М

Maccallum - 1368:7, 1371:9, 1373:3, 1391:23 1392:2, 1402:19, 1402:22, 1392.2, 1402.19, 1402.22, 1405.10, 1405.17, 1408:4, 1421:13, 1421:17, 1421:22, 1424:16, 1424:20, 1425:5, 1425:18, 1425:24, 1426:1, 1426:13, 1426:19, 1420:2 1426:13, 1426:13, 1426:24, 1427:3, 1433:25, 1434:22, 1437:17, 1437:20, 1439:23, 1440:7, 1447:14, 1447:18, 1449:15, 1458:8, 1458:13, 1460:14, 1460:17, 1460:22, 1461:5, 1461:9, 1478:21, 1479:1, 1488:2, 1488:5, 1491:5, 1492:1, 1492:11, 1492:17, 1492:23, 1493:2, 1493:4 machinery - 1421:2 Macmillan - 1451:11 Madam - 1425:18, 1426:7 magnitude - 1379:2 maintained - 1433:15, 1433:17 major - 1380:20,

majority - 1409:11, 1413:12, 1413:15, 1424:13 malicious - 1416:7 mammalian - 1456:4 mammalian-type -1456:4 Manager - 1369:7 mandatory - 1414:15, 1414:18 Manitoba - 1478:3, 1483:4 manner - 1466:10, 1487:10 mark - 1426:8 marked - 1397:1, 1397:24, 1402:15, 1425:3, 1425:13, 1490:23, 1490:25, 1491:3 Markesteyn - 1439:11, 1449:12, 1449:13, 1449:16, 1468:10, 1468:14, 1468:17, 1468:22, 1482:22 1482:25, 1483:12 Markesteyn's - 1482:13 marking - 1424:18, 1425:15, 1426:3 marks - 1381:5, 1382:22, 1383:3 maroon - 1395:9 material - 1414:24 1433:9, 1438:16, 1442:3 materials - 1461:16 matter - 1388:24, 1407:13, 1408:18, 1409:18, 1411:6, 1411:9, 1414:5, 1418:2, 1418:3, 1418:7, 1425:9, 1434:18 1434:19, 1444:21, 1446:9, 1459:14, 1459:15, 1459:18, 1459:20, 1459:23, 1460:9, 1460:10, 1462:21, 1471:9, 1482:22, 1487:6, 1492:23 mattered - 1448:19 matters - 1415:7, 1437:1, 1437:4, 1446:1 mature - 1389:7, 1389:17 maximum - 1430:1 mean - 1374:11, 1374:20, 1377:19 1418:18, 1434:2, 1441:15, 1446:12, 1451:21, 1453:23, 1459:25, 1462:25, 1483:21, 1488:17 means - 1383:11, 1446:11 measure - 1396:14. 1396:15, 1396:16. 1396:18, 1396:25, 1397:3, 1397:4, 1397:5, 1416:23 measured - 1396:10 measurement - 1397:21 measuring - 1416:21 mechanics - 1462:7, 1473:2, 1473:4 media - 1466:24, 1482:16, 1483:8, 1486:20, 1486:24 medical - 1403:9. 1417:16 Medical - 1381:21. 1390:4, 1396:21, 1396:22, 1422:24, 1469:23, 1483:4

1457:25, 1468:16, 1469:25, 1470:3 memo - 1458:14, 1458:21. 1484:3 memorandum - 1451:10, 1459:19, 1459:21 **memory** - 1374:3, 1382:6, 1395:16, 1395:21, 1395:25, 1396:8, 1396:12, 1396:13, 1398:11, 1413:10, 1416:14, 1416:18, 1417:19, 1456:1, 1472:4, 1486:2, 1489:23 men - 1453:15 menstrual - 1445:9, 1445:23 menstruation - 1445:12, 1445:15 mention - 1454:10 mentioned - 1456:11 mercy - 1484:13 merits - 1469:18 Meyer - 1369:14, 1494:2, 1494:18 microscopic - 1445:17 mid-'80s - 1480:6 middle - 1400:24 might - 1373:10, 1375:24, 1376:9, 1379:2, 1380:6, 1380:15, 1380:16, 1381:9, 1382:20, 1388:19, 1389:1, 1389:10, 1390:22, 1393:16, 1393:25, 1394:12, 1398:24, 1399:2, 1399:19, 1402:18, 1413:6, 1413:11, 1415:11 1415:14, 1417:18, 1419:4, 1424:11, 1425:11, 1438:7, 1444:22, 1445:6, 1446:24, 1449:20, 1451:23, 1455:9, 1460:20, 1462:21, 1463:1, 1463:3, 1465:10, 1465:12, 1468:13, 1469:8, 1478:7, 1478:19, 1484:17, 1485:16, 1487:19, 1487:22, 1488:24 Might - 1426:7 **Milgaard** - 1368:4, 1370:2, 1370:3, 1427:9, 1428:21, 1439:8, 1448:2, 1450:5, 1450:9, 1450:14, 1451:17, 1451:21 1452:24, 1453:3, 1453:14, 1467:7, 1467:17, 1468:11, 1468:24, 1469:2, 1481:25, 1484:13, 1487:14, 1492:3 Milgaard's - 1427:12, 1450:4, 1451:19, 1469:5 **Miller** - 1385:4, 1385:8, 1394:19, 1405:3, 1444:7, 1444:10, 1453:16, 1455:1, 1480:25, 1481:20, 1482.14 Miller's - 1400:15, 1403:20, 1430:9, 1430:12, 1434:12 mine - 1447:13, 1447:23 minimum - 1430:1 minus - 1380:13, 1447:9 minute - 1391:23 1408:4, 1476:15, 1482:6 minutes - 1380:1 1380:5, 1380:20, 1380:21, 1380:22, 1426:24, 1460:20, 1478:9, 1478:19, 1478:25 Miramichi - 1480:18

medium - 1391:8

members - 1457:11,

melted - 1462:2

miscarriages - 1415:16, 1422:22 misinterpreted -1443:21, 1443:24 missing - 1423:16, 1423:17 mistaken - 1419:25, 1485:21 mistrial - 1472:13 misunderstand - 1486:6 model - 1421:24, 1423:2 modify - 1388:3, 1436:7 moist - 1434:6 moment - 1441:9, 1445:20, 1445:21, 1470:13, 1472:23, 1473:15 Monday - 1429:12, 1431:11 morning - 1373:22, 1375:12, 1380:13, 1419:3, 1425:8, 1429:17, 1440:17, 1447:9, 1461:2, 1462:5, 1470:5, 1470:15, 1477:15 mortician - 1399:13 1399:19, 1400:3, 1407:14 mortuary - 1403:12 most - 1380:20, 1390:2 1397:15, 1409:19, 1413:7, 1416:5, 1416:19, 1422:4, 1424:10, 1442:14, 1442:18, 1447:10 motility - 1433:23, 1434:11, 1490:2 moved - 1475:3 moves - 1412:24 murder - 1463:17, 1480:16 murders - 1480:18, 1480:21, 1481:4 must - 1490:3

N

name - 1373:8, 1449:3, 1449:19, 1461:12, 1472:19 names - 1443:19 narrow - 1377:16 national - 1422:24, 1430:16 nationally - 1480:17 natural - 1379:4, 1379:12 nature - 1373:24, 1375:13, 1425:10, 1457:4, 1457:6, 1462:8, 1462:14 near - 1455:25, 1457:23 neat - 1395:11 necessarily - 1438:8, 1441:17, 1441:23, 1456:12, 1472:10, 1488:17 necessary - 1437:7, 1447:4, 1478:24 neck - 1378:15, 1382:22, 1388:11, 1414:1, 1442:23 need - 1378:21, 1417:12, 1428:18, 1461:18, 1463:5, 1485:21 needed - 1431:13 needs - 1405:17 Neil - 1485:8 neutral - 1440:12 **never** - 1376:15, 1381:2, 1381:6, 1398:4, 1398:6, 1414:20, 1427:15, 1428:24, 1428:25, 1454:9,

1454:21, 1458:20, 1475:4,

<u>1481:1, 1487:15, 1</u>490:21



1429:15, 1430:15, 1431:13, 1433:6, 1433:20, 1433:21, 1434:6, 1435:17, 1436:13, 1439:24, 1440:7, 1440:12, 1441:15, 1442:7, 1375:23, 1395:14, 1395:24, 1397:8, 1397:9, new - 1469:10, 1471:22, 1441:16, 1443:13, 1456:19, 1457:2, 1470:9, 1475:7 P New - 1480:19, 1481:5 1398:19 Newfoundland objection - 1424:11 objective - 1422:14 P-1 - 1490:25 1470:17, 1471:8, 1471:14, **P-3** - 1372:3, 1426:20 1442:16, 1443:20, P-4 - 1372:6, 1491:7 1471:17, 1471:20, 1472:7, objects - 1397:11 1444:12, 1444:20, 1445:2, 1445:23, 1446:10, obscure - 1414:11 pad - 1386:9, 1386:13, 1483:11 news - 1448:25, 1449:2 obscured - 1384:19 1386:16, 1386:19 **Page** - 1371:2, 1372:2, 1384:12 1455:12, 1457:15, 1460:4, 1472:17, 1472:20, 1473:1, Next - 1378:13 observation - 1382:24, **next** - 1384:10, 1393:18, 1400:8, 1401:12, 1409:7, 1410:6, 1415:12, 1433:22, 1390:13 page - 1384:10, 1390:1, 1390:12, 1391:25, 1399:11, 1402:19, 1405:7, 1405:12, 1410:3, 1410:6, observed - 1432:5 1473:23, 1474:10, obtainable - 1398:22 1474:20, 1474:22 1475:21, 1475:23, 1478:12, 1478:13, 1437:10, 1452:4, 1463:7, obtained - 1425:8, 1471:23, 1492:21 1480:16, 1485:5, 1485:21, 1488:2, 1488:11, 1490:20, 1452:4, 1452:21, 1458:11, 1458:12, 1477:19, nice - 1457:1 obvious - 1386:17, night - 1435:18 1409:24, 1429:6, 1440:9, 1436.12, 1477.19, 1477:24, 1479:19, 1479:24, 1480:3, 1480:7, 1480:11, 1480:16, 1484:6, 1484:7, 1485:12, 1485:20, Nobody - 1467:23 nobody - 1487:23 non - 1389:8, 1428:4, 1480:23 1491:18 Obviously - 1415:19 obviously - 1385:1, 1385:11, 1403:8, 1406:24, One - 1393:16, 1417:11, One - 1393.10, 1417 1449:19, 1458:3 ongoing - 1456:18, 1463:1, 1470:1 onset - 1445:15 1428:9, 1450:6, 1450:10, 1411:16, 1417:10, 1429:9, 1451:18, 1451:21, 1485:24 1488:18, 1489:10, pages - 1477:4, 1479:19, 1434:9 occasion - 1382:7, 1422:21, 1436:21, onward - 1410:6 1479:20, 1480:13, 1494:4 1489:11 **open** - 1446:20, 1447:7, 1447:25, 1448:14, non-consensual pain - 1378:16, 1378:17, 1378:18, 1379:11, 1461:25, 1463:9 1389:8 1448:20, 1475:22 occasions - 1462:18, 1379:15, 1380:24, 1383:7 non-secretor - 1428:4 opening - 1386:24 1428:9, 1450:6, 1450:10, 1463:11, 1486:20 painful - 1378:23 1451:18, 1451:21, 1488:18, 1489:10, occur - 1374:19, 1389:8, 1393:22, 1419:4, 1439:5 1387:4, 1387:8, 1388:2, pair - 1394:25 1388:4 panel - 1422:20, 1422:24 panties - 1394:18, 1394:25 1489:11 occurred - 1379:25, operate - 1486:20 1383:19, 1391:3, 1404:9, 1443:8, 1443:16, 1444:22, 1446:20, 1447:7, 1447:25, operated - 1484:22 None - 1437:17, 1437:18 none - 1375:2, 1375:11, 1379:18, 1379:23, 1388:18, 1388:22, 1437:16, 1437:21 operating - 1408:13 operation - 1373:14 paper - 1476:23. 1477:19, 1477:25, 1478:8, operation - 1373:14 operative - 1486:10 opinion - 1381:9, 1382:14, 1390:21, 1395:13, 1414:5, 1414:22, 1479:5, 1479:15, 1485:8 1448:13, 1448:20 occurrence - 1389:16, paragraph - 1390:9, **normal** - 1379:2, 1380:15, 1394:11, 1463:17, 1463:19 1451:13, 1459:20 occurring - 1441:7 Pardon - 1491:22 1394:22, 1403:23, 1464:14, 1492:16 occurs - 1392:11 1416:5, 1418:3, 1439:1, Parent - 1479:21, October - 1478:1 1439:13, 1439:14, 1442:4, 1479:22, 1480:12, 1481:3 Normally - 1463:3 normally - 1397:10 paring - 1398:14 Parliament - 1423:10 offences - 1423:11 1444:9, 1444:20, 1446:5, offend - 1435:7 1446:8, 1447:6, 1455:11, notably - 1446:17 note - 1388:6, 1388:9, offer - 1486:14 1459:23, 1460:10, 1466:3 part - 1375:17, 1383:14, 1397:15, 1397:17, 1417:15, 1426:12, 1430:25, 1431:15, 1432:20, 1450:18, 1469:2, 1469:18, 1469:25, 1470:17, 1471:12, 1473:1, offered - 1470:16, 1412:15, 1438:15, 1438:16, 1486:5 offering - 1487:12 office - 1395:22, 1403:24, 1461:3, 1465:23, 1466:9, 1477:2 1473:8, 1474:2, 1483:12, 1486:14, 1487:4 notes - 1400:23 opinions - 1392:24, 1392:25, 1465:1, 1466:12, 1469:21, 1469:22, 1470:4, 1473:5, 1482:13, 1483:24, 1452:20, 1484:19 partial - 1398:5 1400:24, 1400:25, 1412:12, 1412:14, 1426:15, 1494:6 officed - 1381:21 Officer - 1369:15, 1406:11, 1437:13, participated - 1443:20 particular - 1381:4, nothing - 1388:14, 1416:16, 1443:7, 1443:17, 1446:11, 1456:6 1409:22, 1409:24, 1411:16, 1430:24, 1439:7, 1483:25, 1484:1, 1487:12 1437:15, 1438:3, 1462:20 opportunity - 1479:11 officer - 1411:1, 1411:2, opposed - 1383:8, 1452:9, 1453:22, 1462:22 notice - 1377:13 1430:23, 1431:23, November - 1471:1, 1399:13, 1399:19 particularly - 1389:18, 1390:3, 1417:5, 1440:22, 1441:3, 1457:4, 1487:8 1431:24, 1432:2, 1432:3 opposite - 1387:8, nowadays - 1401:6 officers - 1429:18, 1429:21, 1431:7, 1432:5, Nowadays - 1434:22, option - 1373:13 parties - 1467:18 1432:7, 1432:18, 1437:18, oral - 1435:3 partly - 1391:1, 1392:16, 1437:24, 1462:19, 1463:16, 1464:12 **Official** - 1369:13, Number - 1453:5, order - 1376:7, 1409:10, 1455:11 1453:11, 1453:13 1447:5, 1447:25, 1448:15 parts - 1468:25 number - 1376:2, ordered - 1471:22 passage - 1449:22 passed - 1381:17, 1382:7, 1382:8 1376:10, 1377:13, 1394:9, 1394:25, 1395:9, 1396:22, 1396:24, 1399:11, 1401:5, 1402:20, 1405:18, organization - 1437:5, 1446:23, 1456:21 origin - 1449:24 1494:1, 1494:3, 1494:14, 1494:19 official - 1484:19 passing - 1440:2 past - 1483:23 often - 1374:18, 1397:16, original - 1401:25, 1405:19, 1416:7, 1416:15, 1426:8, 1426:16, 1430:17, 1453:3, 1454:24, 1455:22, 1414:4, 1464:6, 1470:10, 1402:17, 1439:14, patch - 1449:25 1473:25, 1474:5, 1474:7, 1472:10 pathological - 1374:17, 1474:9, 1474:13, 1474:14, 1475:17, 1476:15 once - 1382:14, 1393:22, 1475:15 1458:9, 1460:4, 1460:5, 1423:3 pathologist - 1408:12 1460:6, 1475:25, 1480:20, 1482:1, 1489:13, 1489:16 one - 1377:3, 1378:8, otherwise - 1429:7 1413:2, 1424:8, 1430:22, 1380:15, 1383:11, 1383:18, 1383:21, 1431:22, 1432:8, 1441:24 Ottawa - 1456:25 numbers - 1384:19, ought - 1414:15, 1442:2, 1442:10, 1442:20, 1383:25, 1388:19, 1394:1, 1443:9, 1467:12, 1467:13, 1479:20 1414:17 Numbers - 1372:5, 1395:1, 1395:18, 1396:19, outset - 1390:22 1472:18, 1474:6, 1483:3 1397:1, 1398:11, 1399:22, 1401:7, 1405:12, 1407:5, pathologist's - 1399:22, 1406:8, 1410:24, 1423:4, outside - 1380:12 1426:22 1380:16, 1420:6, 1420:25 numerical - 1416:21 1414:2, 1418:19, 1418:23, 1419:1, 1419:22, 1420:10, 1420:11, 1421:7, 1426:14, 1427:17, 1427:18, 1424:9 overcome - 1422:16 overlap - 1422:8 overly - 1400:7 pathologists - 1382:1, 1382:12, 1390:7, 1408:20, 1418:9, 1422:20, 1441:12, O

1472:9, 1472:15, 1472:22, 1472:25, 1474:7, 1474:11 pathology - 1408:15, 1417:13, 1417:25, 1418:1, 1424:13, 1439:6, 1440:19, 1441:8, 1441:10, 1441:16, 1441:17, 1442:15, 1443:4, 1446:10, 1447:5, 1473:18, 1473:25, 1474:4, 1474:15, 1474:16, 1474:19, 1475:18, 1476:18, 1481:7, 1481:13 patience - 1424:15 patient - 1427:21, 1430:22, 1430:23 patients - 1429:10 pattern - 1383:15 patterning - 1383:17 Paul's - 1396:3, 1396:20, 1397:8, 1403:12, 1410:1 peculiar - 1413:9 penial - 1389:6, 1389:19 Penkala - 1400:11, 1400:20, 1401:11, 1401:17, 1406:13, 1412:13, 1412:16, 1437:12, 1437:15, 1438:3, 1456:2, 1456:5, 1462:11, 1462:20 1402.20 Pentella - 1400:11 people - 1376:25, 1415:20, 1416:25, 1420:23, 1430:17, 1437:7, 1488:2, 1445:5, 1447:1, 1456:19, 1473:9 percentage - 1393:24 perfecting - 1475:16 perfection - 1432:13 perfectly - 1478:15 performed - 1434:15, performing - 1429:4, 1429:6, 1429:8 Perhaps - 1478:17 perhaps - 1383:4, 1422:24, 1426:5, 1428:15, 1447:3, 1468:10, 1477:18, 1486:4, 1487:18, 1490:20 period - 1474:21 peripherally - 1468:15 permit - 1409:6 permitted - 1418:25, 1464:17 person - 1390:25, 1392:5, 1399:12, 1427:24, 1428:1, 1428:3, 1428:6, 1432:4, 1438:5, 1438:13 1443:23, 1452:8, 1452:17, 1486:23, 1488:18, 1489:9 personal - 1419:22. 1456:21, 1485:25 personalities - 1417:1 personally - 1421:10, 1489:21, 1490:11 persons - 1429:10, 1481:24 pertinent - 1454:14 petechiae - 1387:11, 1387:14, 1387:20, 1387:25 phenomenon - 1441:19 Phipps - 1390:4 phone - 1461:1 photo - 1397:23, 1403:11 photograph - 1376:4 1382:21, 1395:8, 1396:14, 1406:19, 1490:14



own - 1421:15

object - 1375:17,

presuming - 1452:16

presumption - 1451:5

pretrial - 1465:21

presumptively - 1391:2

photographic - 1456:24 Photographs - 1372:4, **photographs** - 1375:11, 1401:19, 1401:22, 1407:18, 1407:20, 1410:16, 1424:25, 1425:7, 1426:12, 1429:16 **photos** - 1401:25, 1402:5, 1425:25 phrase - 1470:7 physical - 1395:23, physically - 1490:12 physician - 1430:21 pick - 1434:7 picture - 1490:21 piece - 1381:10, 1397:4, 1423:14, 1423:15, 1423:16 **pieces** - 1460:6 **pierced** - 1444:10 pile - 1407:21, 1412:17, 1412:18, 1429:14 pin - 1448:1, 1448:15 pipette - 1433:21, 1434:8 Pitchfork - 1477:23, place - 1389:3, 1401:2, 1410:21, 1421:3, 1464:21, 1492:16 **placed** - 1406:9, 1406:13, 1419:15, 1467:23 places - 1411:2 plastic - 1396:11, 1396:16, 1406:10, 1406:14, 1407:3, 1431:12 play - 1416:4, 1462:15, 1467:11 played - 1373:18, 1416:14, 1467:14 pleased - 1373:9, Pm - 1461:7, 1461:8, 1479:2, 1479:3, 1493:5 point - 1374:24, 1381:19, 1382:19, 1410:11, 1410:13, 1412:11, 1413:22, 1418:22, 1422:18, 1443:12, 1450:3, 1450:5, 1450:25, 1452:14, 1454:14, 1455:14, 1458:3, 1459:1, 1460:20, 1466:18, 1468:8, 1469:13, 1470:12, 1474:15, 1474:16, 1489:4 points - 1479:8 pole - 1438:23 Police - 1370:7, 1455:24 police - 1381:1, 1382:16, 1384:5, 1394:17, 1395:12, 1395:12, 1395:22, 1396:1, 1397:7, 1397:10, 1397:16, 1401:4, 1401:5, 1401:10, 1403:23, 1404:2, 1404:2, 1404:15 1404:2, 1404:15, 1404:18, 1406:17, 1407:16, 1411:9, 1411:23, 1413:1, 1414:19, 1422:2, 1422:11, 1429:18, 1429:21, 1430:23, 1431:7, 1431:9, 1431:12, 1431:22, 1431:24, 1432:7, 1437:4, 1437:8, 1437:18, 1437:24, 1457:11, 1457:25, 1462:1, 1462:6, 1463:2, 1463:7, 1463:16, 1464:5, 1464:12, 1481:16, 1487:3, 1490:6 policing - 1465:22, 1466:8 pool - 1434:7

poor - 1420:12, 1420:13 **portion** - 1378:21, 1384:13, 1404:11, 1415:17, 1459:2 **position** - 1377:1, 1394:22, 1440:12 positions - 1376:20 possession - 1382:19 possibilities - 1378:7, possibility - 1378:8, 1378:12, 1422:19, 1469:14, 1481:10 possible - 1422:22 1423:21, 1433:4, 1438:7, 1445:2, 1445:24, 1460:4, 1462:10, 1476:11, 1476:17 **Possibly** - 1457:25 **possibly** - 1383:3, 1383:7, 1421:9, 1463:10, 1464:2, 1471:21 post - 1465:17, 1466:6, 1466:18, 1481:24 post-preliminary -1466:6 postmortem - 1430:6 postponements - 1471:5 potential - 1376:10, 1378:14 potentially - 1380:2, 1380:10 practicable - 1476:8 practical - 1420:25, 1455:18, 1481:12 **practice** - 1382:1, 1382:2, 1382:7, 1382:12, 1403:23, 1404:21, 1404:23, 1406:21, 1407:7, 1408:21, 1411:18, 1412:1, 1429:2, 1429:3, 1431:4, 1432:17, 1440:8, 1454:7, 1474:12 practicing - 1441:16, 1441:17 pre - 1465:17 preceded - 1440:5 precise - 1470:24 precisely - 1454:13 preclude - 1390:14 preempted - 1429:7 prefer - 1418:24 preference - 1478:22 preliminary - 1378:22 1405:25, 1445:14, 1464:8, 1465:24, 1466:6, 1487:2 presence - 1411:14, 1445:9, 1445:22, 1450:1, 1450:12 **present** - 1389:2, 1390:3, 1406:7, 1426:3, 1440:13, 1446:23, 1468:18 presented - 1429:16 1443:5, 1444:5, 1477:25 presently - 1431:5 preserve - 1390:16, 1391:5, 1392:20 preserves - 1392:20 press - 1482:23, 1486:12 presumably - 1396:5, 1397:24, 1400:25, 1412:15, 1485:12, 1490:8 **Presumably - 1398:24** presume - 1396:1, 1396:2, 1396:9, 1398:23. 1399:1, 1419:23, 1428:8, 1433:2, 1433:18, 1434:15, 1434:17, 1438:14, 1454:10, 1455:4

pretty - 1395:10, 1483:10 previous - 1399:17, 1452:21 previously - 1373:6 primarily - 1407:9 primary - 1424:14 print - 1403:4, 1403:17 prison - 1492:7 problem - 1377:22 1418:7, 1420:10, 1420:11, 1420:21, 1422:2, 1422:4, 1477:2 problems - 1422:16, 1455:20, 1470:19 procedure - 1410:23, 1411:4, 1464:4 proceed - 1478:10 proceeding - 1491:4 Proceedings - 1368:13 1368:24, 1371:1, 1373:1 proceedings - 1399:17 1425:12, 1467:17, 1477:1 process - 1393:21, 1393:22, 1396:12, 1406:3, 1406:4, 1423:21, 1423:25, 1424:18, 1430:14, 1487:13, 1487:24, 1489:19 processes - 1424:3 produce - 1397:17, 1442:3 produced - 1446:8, 1456:6 productive - 1482:17 professional - 1415:20, 1468:16, 1468:25, 1469:19, 1473:22 professionally - 1381:24 professionals - 1464:15, 1469:12, 1472:10 proffered - 1395:13 prominent - 1383:23 promise - 1440:20 **proper** - 1452:11, 1452:17, 1465:2, 1469:4, 1486:24, 1487:20 properly - 1414:2, 1443:5, 1443:11 proportion - 1409:7 proportions - 1408:23 propose - 1422:9 proposing - 1421:24 proposition - 1441:18 propriety - 1469:9 prosecution - 1416:7, 1422:13, 1422:15, 1481:19, 1487:10 prosecutions - 1487:4 Prosecutor - 1405:25 prosecutor - 1373:21, 1465:20 prosecutors - 1481:17 protocol - 1433:3, 1433:5, 1433:7 provide - 1422:14 provided - 1404:3, 1426:16 providing - 1413:1 Province - 1494:3 province - 1415:12, 1420:6, 1420:13, 1487:17 provinces - 1441:22 pubic - 1394:14, 1395:4, 1433:8, 1433:12, 1433:15 public - 1440:9, 1473:22,

publication - 1426:12 published - 1478:2, 1478:3 pulled - 1459:5 purchased - 1398:19 pure - 1417:21 purpose - 1456:16 purposes - 1436:4, 1436:22 pursue - 1398:17, 1474:25 push - 1490:7 put - 1391:21, 1400:4, 1405:23, 1407:1, 1407:5, 1412:1, 1412:16, 1412:19, 1426:16, 1435:13, 1436:2, 1440:17, 1446:21, 1447:11, 1447:21, 1449:20, 1451:7, 1452:6, 1458:6, 1458:25, 1459:6, 1459:12, 1459:13, 1476:1, 1476:9, 1477:7 putting - 1421:3, 1430:15 puzzle - 1423:15, 1423:16 Q

Qb-1369:13 Qc - 1370:2 qualifications - 1437:22, 1437:24, 1447:4 qualified - 1441:11 qualify - 1374:14 quantify - 1394:5 quantities - 1453:1, 1453:7 quantity - 1451:25 Queen's - 1423:23, 1479:25, 1491:2, 1494:1, 1494:3, 1494:14, 1494:19 queried - 1469:8 quest - 1467:18 questioning - 1421:14, 1427:6, 1446:15 questions - 1373:23, 1373:24, 1385:20, 1387:15, 1413:14, 1415:8, 1415:10, 1421:20 1434:24, 1440:17 1448:23, 1449:3, 1450:24, 1460:13, 1460:16, 1460:19, 1463:10, 1463:12, 1469:6, 1475:25, 1478:10, 1478:20, 1486:7, 1488:3, 1488:4, 1488:8, 1488:9, 1488:11, 1489:6, 1490:16, 1491:25 quick - 1415:7, 1478:19, 1482:5, 1482:6 **quickly** - 1399:9, 1404:7, 1405:6, 1410:2, 1415:15, 1420:5 quit - 1408:7 quite - 1393:2, 1407:17 1414:3, 1417:10, 1424:12 1430:1, 1434:16, 1441:19, 1441:25, 1445:10, 1452:19, 1462:9, 1462:24, 1464:6, 1468:15, 1469:24, 1476:10, 1476:20, 1479:14 **quote** - 1391:24, 1392:17, 1488:22

R

racial - 1416:3

radically - 1455:10 raise - 1458:24, 1486:7 raised - 1442:6 range - 1390:21 rape - 1384:2, 1389:8, 1444:18, 1444:22, 1445:1, 1446:19, 1447:6, 1447:25, 1448:13, 1448:19 raped - 1459:4 rare - 1431:2, 1463:18 rarely - 1390:17 rather - 1399:24 1422:23, 1442:17, 1443:9, 1443:24, 1446:11, 1454:10 Rcm- 1457:3 **Rcmp**- 1370:9, 1449:4, 1451:11, 1456:9, 1456:21, 1457:14 re - 1423:18, 1443:2, 1486:3, 1491:17 re-assembled - 1491:17 re-emphasize - 1486:3 re-examination - 1443:2 reaction - 1379:4, 1379:12, 1380:14 reactivated - 1475:8 read - 1384:16, 1392:9, 1419:25, 1427:14, 1445:17, 1451:13, 1478:14, 1478:23, 1479:5, Reading- 1482:18 ready - 1460:23 real - 1418:6, 1425:1, 1426:5, 1462:17 really - 1397:22, 1423:18 reason - 1383:2 1419:17, 1440:20, 1443:1, 1452:9, 1455:5, 1458:24, 1458:25, 1464:13, 1486:7 reasonable - 1393:2, 1433:11, 1483:2 reasonably - 1446:24 reasons - 1386:17, 1419:7, 1426:6, 1429:6, 1452:8, 1452:18, 1474:20, 1474:22, 1475:5, 1488:23 reassured - 1405:11 recalled - 1416:18, 1481:23 **receive** - 1407:9, 1412:6, 1432:8, 1478:8 received - 1401:4, receives - 1379:10 recency - 1374:10, 1374:11 recognition - 1440:18 recognize - 1480:3 recollect - 1376:25, 1402:3, 1482:25, 1492:10 recollection - 1381:6, 1381:18, 1394:20, 1398:8, 1399:6, 1407:4, 1408:1, 1408:3, 1411:17, 1412:5 1430:8, 1430:11, 1435:21, 1436:20, 1462:9, 1462:12, 1467:2, 1467:24, 1468:14, 1492:8 recommend - 1419:5 recommendations -1456:18



Reconvened- 1373:2,

1427:2, 1461:8, 1479:3 record - 1394:25,

1430:20, 1430:24, 1455:4,

1456:1, 1468:21, 1473:14,

1401:16, 1404:14,

1486:9 recorded - 1388:5. 1391:18, 1401:1 records - 1393:1, 1400:18, 1401:13, 1404:19 recovered - 1416:14 rectal - 1434:20, 1435:1 red - 1375:4 reddish - 1388:6 redirect - 1488:6, 1488:8 redness - 1386:22, refer - 1477:17, 1477:19, 1477:22, 1479:18, 1480:9, 1480:10, 1485:19 reference - 1390:11. 1392:4, 1392:10, 1396:24, 1400:15, 1426:10, 1435:8, 1441:5, 1441:7, 1446:19, 1470:14, 1470:15, 1470:16, 1485:12, 1486:23 referred - 1475:14, 1485:5 referring - 1385:4 1439:24, 1480:6, 1482:7, 1489:13 refers - 1392:4, 1392:18 refrain - 1379:3, 1408:5 refused - 1467:21, regard - 1446:3 regarding - 1374:9 Regina- 1438:13, 1451:12, 1457:1, 1488:23 relates - 1415:18, 1424:6 relation - 1403:14, 1404:11 relationship - 1381:13, 1462:15, 1463:2 relationships - 1465:14 relative - 1376:19, 1419:15 relatively - 1475:7 release - 1467:7, 1492:7 released - 1469:7 relevant - 1382:20 Reliance- 1419:16, 1419:19 reluctant - 1473:21 relying - 1461:16 remain - 1374:21, 1420:20 remained - 1466:24 remaining - 1474:21 remember - 1383:21, 1383:25, 1398:13, 1401:21, 1401:22, 1404:15, 1407:7, 1408:11, 1411:5, 1435:12, 1443:20, 1466:20, 1466:22, 1466:23, 1467:9, 1472:19, 1472:23, 1473:6, 1473:18, 1473:20, 1487:16 remembered - 1466:4, 1466:16 removal - 1403:25, 1407:13 removed - 1382:15, 1400:20, 1403:19, 1404:12, 1405:4, 1412:21, 1414:9, 1438:1 removes - 1406:8, 1410:24 rendered - 1379:19 repeat - 1420:7, 1447:19, 1454:4 repeating - 1487:1 rephrase - 1476:11

replicating - 1436:11 replication - 1476:13 replied - 1455:1 reply - 1492:5 report - 1383:19, 1386:18, 1386:22, 1387:18, 1401:2, 1423:4, 1424:9, 1445:10, 1456:7 reported - 1381:2, 1479:23 Reporter- 1494:14, 1494:19 reporter - 1482:11 reporters - 1408:6 Reporters- 1369:13, Reporters'- 1494:1 represent - 1373:8 representative - 1407:16 representatives -1463:3, 1463:8, 1490:6 reproduction - 1456:24 reputation - 1487:17 required - 1434:13 requirement - 1433:8 requires - 1447:8 research - 1477:14 residence - 1492:16 resources - 1420:17 respect - 1380:18, 1381:23, 1391:11, 1412:12, 1415:9, 1421:14, 1423:1, 1429:10, 1432:17, 1434:25, 1435:10, 1439:4, 1442:20, 1444:3, 1458:6, 1460:1, 1467:16, 1472:8, 1476:1, 1482:13, 1484:12 respond - 1487:19 response - 1453:3 responsibility - 1382:16, 1401:8, 1407:9, 1412:6, 1490:3, 1490:7, 1490:10 restart - 1471:25 restating - 1480:23 restriction - 1467:20, 1467:23 result - 1439:5. 1455:11 resuscitation - 1414:10, 1414:14 retain - 1457:22 retained - 1457:16, 1483.19 retrial - 1471:4, 1472:7, 1472:13 retrieved - 1461:2 retrospect - 1432:19 return - 1461:4, 1492:15 returned - 1373:9 review - 1421:11, 1422:10, 1422:12, 1422:20, 1422:22, 1423:3, 1423:13, 1478:19, 1479:11, 1484:12, 1484:19 reviewing - 1484:8 reward - 1383:1 Rick- 1370:7 right-handed - 1376:6, Rochelle- 1370:10

role - 1431:12, 1462:15, 1467:10, 1467:13,

1467:14 roles - 1373:17

Ron- 1458:17

Ronald- 1458:5

room - 1380:15.

rooms - 1416:15

Rossmo- 1485:9.

1429:18, 1438:3

1485:15 round - 1375:20. 1375:21, 1375:25 routine - 1411:6, 1411:9, 1411:18, 1432:21, 1432:24, 1434:18, 1434:19 routinely - 1462:18 **Rpr**- 1369:14, 1494:2, 1494:18 rubber - 1434:8 rulers - 1397:12, 1397:15, 1397:17, 1397:19 run - 1448:25 rupturing - 1387:16 S saliva - 1427:18, 1427:19, 1427:22, 1428:1,

1428:2, 1428:8, 1428:15, 1451:19, 1452:23, 1453:9, 1489:11 1488:14 sample - 1393:12, 1453:25 1427:17, 1433:15, 1433:21, 1451:25, 1452:5, 1452:9, 1452:24, 1453:2, 1453:22, 1454:3, 1454:25, 1455:5, 1456:8, 1457:12, 1457:13, 1457:18, 1457:22, 1476:15, 1488:15, 1488:19, 1489:7 samples - 1455:24, 1457:23, 1462:1 sampling - 1422:23 Sandra - 1369:7 Saskatchewan -1368:18, 1370:4, 1405:8, 1420:11, 1471:13, 1487:9, 1494:4 Saskatoon - 1368:18 1370:7, 1407:25, 1408:13, 1420:15, 1455:23 satisfaction - 1449:23 1375:15 satisfactory - 1434:9 save - 1438:23, 1438:25, 1455:13 **saved** - 1438:12, 1438:15, 1489:20, 1490:2 saving - 1455:14, 1477:12 1455:19 **saw** - 1383:17, 1394:21, 1398:1, 1403:8, 1417:19, 1445:16, 1491:18, 1491:19 scene - 1412:23, 1413:1, 1413:11, 1413:15, 1414:16, 1453:23 scheduled - 1471:23 School - 1485:9 science - 1387:10, 1391:12, 1416:11, 1416:12, 1416:13, 1416:17, 1416:19, 1417:21, 1417:23 1417:25, 1418:1, 1418:12, 1487:10 1418:13, 1453:24, 1481:2, 1481:8, 1481:11, 1481:14, 1481:15 scientific - 1376:8, 1393:9, 1413:22, 1415:17, 1418:16, 1452:12, 1455:3, 1476:12, 1486:22 scientifically - 1393:12 scrapings - 1432:25 scream - 1379:12, 1380:10, 1380:24

1403:16, 1403:17, 1425:1 searching - 1413:10 second - 1425:23, 1458:12, 1472:13, 1483:12, 1485:23 1493:2 **second-last** - 1458:12 secondary - 1414:22 Secondly - 1444:16, 1489:13 secrete - 1428:15, 1428:16, 1451:3 secreted - 1451:6, 1454:9, 1454:11 secretor - 1427:8, 1427:13, 1427:25, 1428:4, 1428:9, 1428:14, 1428:22, 1450:6, 1450:10, 1451:2, 1451:6, 1451:18, 1451:21, 1452:9, 1453:7, 1453:12, 1453:14, 1454:16, 1488:10, 1488:18 1488:24, 1489:1, 1489:10, 1491:10 secretors - 1453:18, Section - 1406:16 section - 1451:12 **Security** - 1369:15 **see** - 1373:9, 1374:3 1395:7, 1396:14, 1406:19, 1411:23, 1413:11, 1428:20, 1451:14, 1463:7 seeing - 1384:11, 1402:24, 1403:1 seized - 1410:11, 1410:13, 1410:14, 1410:18, 1412:7 **seizing** - 1406:4, 1406:6 **seizure** - 1410:20 self - 1379:19 semen - 1433:9, 1446:2, 1450:1, 1450:13, 1453:9 semen-like - 1433:9 Semicircular - 1375:14, 1491:18 seminal - 1393:9, 1394:12, 1394:18, 1414:24, 1415:2, 1453:21 sending - 1457:24 sense - 1409:18, 1452:7, 1459:17 sent - 1408:17, 1408:20, 1410:7 1457:14, 1457:19 sentence - 1460:1 separate - 1386:15 1411:3, 1425:16, 1425:20 separately - 1425:3 Serge - 1370:6 series - 1421:19 Series - 1479:24 serious - 1409:19, 1420:24, 1473:8, 1483:6 serological - 1450:3 1476:18 serves - 1424:21 Service - 1370:7 service - 1431:9, session - 1473:22 set - 1442:1, 1470:5, 1470:20, 1492:21 setting - 1440:10 seven - 1472:25, 1473:5 1468:23 Several - 1451:22 sexual - 1383:5. 1383:22, 1384:2, 1388:19, 1388:23, 1389:7, 1389:17, 1394:11, 1430:4, 1430:8, 1430:14 1462:1, 1463:14 1431:6, 1432:20, 1433:2, snowbank - 1455:25,

1434:25, 1437:1 sexually - 1389:18 sharpened - 1377:18 Sheraton - 1493:1, shins - 1386:7 Short - 1378:1 short - 1423:18, 1423:19, 1457:20 shorthand - 1409:6, shortly - 1374:23, 1375:6, 1444:23 shot - 1425:22 show - 1375:22 1400:18, 1401:13, 1402:5, 1403:21, 1404:19, 1404:21, 1407:20, 1447:24, 1448:13, 1452:10, 1477:25, 1490:14, 1490:23, showed - 1388:7, 1388:13, 1426:15 shown - 1395:8, 1395:12, 1395:17, 1398:4, 1398:5, 1398:6, 1398:7, 1398:9, 1399:4, 1401:19, 1401:22, 1402:15, 1403:3, 1458:4, 1490:19, 1490:22 shows - 1479:16 sick - 1471:5, 1471:24 side - 1373:21, 1377:18, 1377:24, 1377:25, 1382:22, 1417:3, 1418:19, 1418:23, 1419:1, 1449:22 sided - 1377:6 signature - 1383:9 significant - 1389:6 similar - 1383:3, 1425:10, 1466:10, 1483:24, 1490:20, 1491:14, 1491:15, similarity - 1384:6 Simon - 1485:10 simple - 1396:18, 1407:17, 1435:16 **simply** - 1440:13, Sinclair - 1405:25, single - 1377:4, 1377:6 Single - 1377:7 single-bladed - 1377:4 single-sided - 1377:6 singled - 1459:1 sitting - 1368:16 sittings - 1492:22 situation - 1383:12, 1417:20, 1420:24 situations - 1451:22, skepticism - 1421:5 skili - 1494:6 skin - 1385:16 skip - 1480:10 slashes - 1378:15 sleeves - 1459:6 slight - 1445:14, 1477:2 slightly - 1377:15, small - 1386:23, 1387:17, 1388:13, 1420:12, 1468:16, 1469:25, 1470:3, 1472:9 **snow** - 1414:25, 1456:3,



1457:13, 1457:18

screen - 1403:5, 1403:6,

1434:13, 1434:16,

screaming - 1379:3

solicited - 1486:15 someone - 1396:15. 1399:14, 1399:19, 1447:4 sometime - 1446:18, 1476:3, 1480:6 sometimes - 1376:15, 1439:2. 1470:3 somewhat - 1435:22 **somewhere** - 1446:20 son - 1492:9 son's - 1467:19, 1492:7 soon - 1483:10 sophisticated - 1382:10 sopnisticated - 1382:10 Sorry - 1385:20, 1385:21 sorry - 1374:20, 1377:5, 1384:14, 1399:15, 1403:10, 1409:22, 1419:10, 1436:17, 1447:17, 1458:11, 1462:24, 1467:13, 1484:7, 1485:20, 1488:10 1485:20, 1488:10 sort - 1396:5, 1396:7, 1398:13, 1398:19, 1443:22, 1443:25 sounds - 1433:10 source - 1407:24, speaking - 1417:12 specialization - 1436:25, specific - 1373:23, 1383:14, 1390:11, 1401:7, 1433:10, 1462:9, 1462:12, 1467:2, 1468:13, 1488:21 **specifically** - 1381:11, 1401:16, 1411:5, 1411:23, 1432:5, 1469:15 specimen - 1438:11 1450:2, 1450:12, 1450:13, 1456:5, 1458:1, 1490:9 specimens - 1400:19, 1401:4, 1433:3, 1457:4 spectacular - 1418:14 speculation - 1398:18 spelled - 1387:13 spend - 1452:14 spent - 1473:17, 1474:18 sperm - 1390:22 spermatozoa - 1389:25, 1390:15, 1390:17, 1391:1, 1391:6, 1392:16, 1392:20, 1393:10, 1393:16, 1393:20, 1393:24, 1394:5, 1439:10, 1456:4, 1490:1 Sphml - 1396:20 spoken - 1492:4 St - 1396:3, 1396:20, 1397:8, 1403:12, 1409:25 stabbed - 1444:8, 1459:8, 1459:10 staff - 1408:15 Staff - 1369:1, 1369:11 stair - 1443:23 stamp - 1426:8 stamped - 1425:14 stand - 1428:12 standardized - 1397:18 standing - 1382:2, 1417:14 Starphoenix - 1482:8 start - 1384:14, 1471:23 started - 1400:23. 1443:2, 1469:6, 1471:6, 1471:24, 1481:8 starting - 1405:22, 1448:25 Starting - 1384:13 statement - 1378:1, 1392:21, 1447:12, 1447:22, 1450:7, 1460:9

1460:10 states - 1401:16, 1453:15 stating - 1438:16 station - 1395:22, 1396:1, 1406:17 status - 1427:8, 1427:13, 1454:16 stick - 1375:21 still - 1408:18, 1409:3, 1429:4, 1456:25, 1468:19, 1474:9, 1477:4 stomach - 1418:10 stopped - 1375:3 storage - 1455:20 store - 1398:20 story - 1481:6, 1482:7 street - 1492:25 strict - 1399:25 struck - 1375:17, 1423:15 structure - 1436:8, 1436:15, 1476:10 stuck - 1396:16, 1397:5 stuff - 1480:10 stumble - 1380:7 subdivision - 1451:12 subject - 1442:18, 1454:15, 1475:13, 1487:7 subsequent - 1382:4, 1394:17, 1395:16, 1458:1, 1474:2, 1475:19, 1489:6 subsequently - 1400:25, 1478:2 substance - 1438:1, 1438:6 subtle - 1386:23 sudden - 1389:3, 1389:14 suffering - 1405:8 suggest - 1376:2, 1378:7, 1382:2, 1392:11, 1394:1, 1419:6, 1426:7, 1432:6, 1432:11, 1450:18, 1465:25, 1471:7, 1472:24, 1476:19, 1484:19, 1486:8, 1489:11 **suggested** - 1382:20, 1383:6, 1415:14, 1422:21, 1423:3, 1447:12, 1457:21, 1473:16 **suggesting** - 1381:16, 1423:6, 1443:15, 1448:8, 1465:5, 1473:18, 1473:20 suggestion - 1382:18, 1407:18, 1419:3, 1421:1, 1424:5, 1484:15 suggests - 1444:17 suite - 1402:2, 1403:9, 1429:22, 1437:12 summarize - 1461:20, 1461:22 **summary** - 1423:12 supplies - 1489:1 supply - 1375:3, 1403:24, 1431:17 Support - 1369:11 support - 1442:3 supporting - 1442:3 Supreme - 1446:18, 1467:4, 1467:16 suspect - 1466:6, 1469:14 suspected - 1477:8 **suspicion** - 1446:19, 1446:25, 1447:6 sustained - 1377:13,

1380:12

swab - 1433:17,

1433:19, 1434:1, 1434:6

1452:25 swabs - 1434:20 sworn - 1373:6 symposium - 1478:1 syndrome - 1416:14, 1416:19, 1417:19 system - 1417:4, 1417:6, 1418:25, 1420:9, 1425:15, 1446:24, 1465:19

Т table - 1402:10 tails - 1390:17 talks - 1459:2 tape - 1397:4 Tdr- 1370:5 tear - 1386:3 tearing - 1386:23, 1387:3 tears - 1385:16 technical - 1388:10, 1476:12, 1477:2 technicalities - 1471:15 Technically- 1439:19 technically - 1401:23 Technician- 1369:16 technician - 1431:22, 1432:9 technique - 1476:17 techniques - 1436:13 technology - 1461:16, 1477:1 temperature - 1380:14 tend - 1391:5 tending - 1432:11 Terceira- 1477:23 term - 1382:25, 1386:11 1388:11, 1399:21, 1400:2, 1439:16, 1440:3 termed - 1476:13 1373:1 terminology - 1440:4 terms - 1373:17, 1376:13, 1393:25, 1415:2, 1415:10, 1416:21, 1479:12, 1487:11 **test** - 1427:19, 1428:21, 1446:10, 1455:18, 1469:17, 1489:8 tested - 1488:13 testified - 1432:25. 1434:11, 1446:4, 1448:3, 1455:21 testify - 1466:1 testifying - 1403:22, 1410:4, 1466:7 **Testimony**- 1368:15 **testimony** - 1429:4, 1444:4, 1450:25, 1465:24, 1466:3 testing - 1456:12, 1456:15, 1462:3 tests - 1453:20, 1454:19, 1454:23, 1455:15 text - 1386:10, 1392:22 textbooks - 1389:16 thawed - 1456:3 theirs - 1431:19 themselves - 1379:18, 1465:3 theory - 1448:7, 1448:9 therefore - 1490:3 Therefore- 1453:2 they've - 1431:17 thigh - 1385:18, 1385:22, 1386:1, 1389:21 thinking - 1420:8, 1441:2, 1463:11 Third- 1479:23

three - 1383:4, 1384:6, 1407:25, 1408:14, 1408:15, 1408:16, 1423:23, 1430:1, 1438:2 throughout - 1462:13 Thursday- 1368:22 timing - 1393:25, 1479:13 title - 1485:11 titled - 1477:22 today - 1429:3, 1429:5, 1429:6, 1437:2, 1439:24, 1485:16, 1488:21, 1492:20 Together - 1425:20 together - 1425:21, 1430:15 **Tony**- 1369:16 **took** - 1393:12, 1396:6, 1410:20, 1444:9, 1456:5, 1475:2 top - 1479:18, 1480:7 toque - 1425:11 tore - 1431:13 total - 1408:22, 1472:24 totally - 1380:16 touch - 1475:24 touched - 1374:2. 1418:7 trace - 1480:13 traced - 1476:24 trained - 1437:19 training - 1399:24, 1417:16, 1437:14, 1437:23 Transcript - 1368:13, **transcript** - 1378:20, 1390:10, 1399:10, 1484:8 transcription - 1494:5 transfusion - 1454:7 trap - 1470:19 treat - 1468:1 treated - 1401:24, 1483:6 **trial** - 1378:22, 1385:7, 1390:1, 1391:21, 1400:5, 1401:12, 1401:18, 1402:15, 1402:16 1402:25, 1403:1, 1410:5, 1417:2, 1417:18, 1427:12, 1439:9, 1439:14, 1440:1, 1440:8, 1440:10, 1443:6, 1443:11, 1444:4, 1448:4, 1464:9, 1466:7, 1466:18, 1466:21, 1469:10, 1471:6, 1471:22, 1472:13, 1472:25, 1474:7, 1474:9, 1474:13, 1474:14, 1474:23, 1481:25, 1487:2 tried - 1418:21, 1459:7, 1466:5, 1487:23 tries - 1433:6 trite - 1441:8 trouble - 1425:15, 1443:13 true - 1432:12, 1481:12, 1494:5 Truscott- 1418:15 Try- 1405:20 try - 1384:11, 1401:3, 1417:18, 1434:4, 1436:7, 1446:14, 1461:22, 1466:2, 1486:22 **trying** - 1420:16, 1450:22, 1452:6, 1472:19

thoroughly - 1387:19

thoughts - 1458:21,

thousands - 1398:24

1479:12

1490:7 tuning - 1415:13 Tunnel- 1415:24 tunnel - 1415:24 turn - 1399:9 turned - 1404:15, 1413:25, 1442:22 two - 1376:25, 1383:4, 1383:18, 1384:4, 1385:20, 1401:10, 1408:22, 1420:6, 1420:7, 1422:17, 1424:25, 1441:11, 1441:21, 1453:15, 1453:24, 1473:3, 1474:7, 1474:22, 1491:17 Two- 1372:4, 1425:25, 1426:21 type - 1383:9, 1383:17, 1427:21, 1440:3, 1451:2, 1452:8, 1453:4, 1453:17, 1453:25, 1455:12, 1456:4, 1462:16 types - 1416:3 typically - 1432:7 typing - 1479:17

U

ulcer - 1388:14 Umm - 1407:4, 1427:14, 1462:24, 1469:5 unadulterated - 1449:25 uncommon - 1383:14, 1388:8, 1464:10, 1470:2 unconscious - 1379:20, 1380:8 unconsciousness -1379:24 uncontaminated -1449:25 under - 1380:17, 1406:25, 1409:10, 1423:7, 1465:18 undergarments -1394:13, 1394:22 understood - 1400:14, 1408:24, 1427:16, 1427:22, 1428:11, 1428:12 undoubted - 1440:18 unexpected - 1389:2, 1389:14 unfairly - 1461:20 unfortunately - 1449:4 unintentional - 1489:15 unique - 1383:9, 1383:11 unjustified - 1475:11 unless - 1376:18, 1417:20 unreasonable - 1393:5 unsolved - 1480:20 untoward - 1418:18 unusual - 1388:15, 1389:5, 1389:9, 1475:11 up - 1376:4, 1382:21, 1391:13, 1392:12, 1404:15, 1404:21, 1417:14, 1425:23, 1434:8, 1447:15, 1449:1, 1449:8, 1451:7, 1453:24, 1458:7, 1466:18, 1468:17, 1469:13, 1477:18, 1482:4, 1484:2, 1485:20, 1488:10 upright - 1377:1, 1380:8 **useful** - 1423:1, 1424:12, 1438:12, 1438:21, 1438:24, 1438:25, 1455:14 usual - 1411:4 uterus - 1445:11



thirdly - 1445:7

٧

vagina - 1387:23, 1390:18, 1391:6, 1434:6 vaginal - 1385:10, 1386:24, 1387:4, 1387:8, 1391:8, 1432:21, 1433:17, 1433:18, 1434:2, 1434:5, 1438:11, 1453:9, 1454:25, 1489:14, 1489:19 valid - 1441:25, 1460:4, 1473:23 value - 1438:5 variable - 1391:9, 1408:17, 1429:25 variably - 1399:23 varies - 1390:24, 1394:10, 1464:20 various - 1377:14, 1454:12, 1460:7, 1467:18, 1471:4, 1478:5 vary - 1439:14 Veeman - 1369:5 verge - 1445:12 vessels - 1387:17 via - 1482:15, 1483:7 victim - 1376:20, 1410:8, 1429:23, 1429:24, 1430:3, 1431:5, 1431:21, 1434:16, 1438:2, 1444:25 victims - 1429:11 videotape - 1413:18, 1414:7, 1414:15 videotaping - 1412:25 view - 1413:22, 1415:10, 1421:8, 1422:19, 1450:3, 1474:15, 1474:16 viewed - 1491:16 viewing - 1423:19 violence - 1382:23 virtually - 1409:25, 1448:17, 1456:22, 1456:24 vis - 1381:3 vis-a-vis - 1381:3 vision - 1415:24, 1415:25 visit - 1449:4 vital - 1450:18 vogue - 1477:13 voice - 1442:24

W

volume - 1384:10 Volume - 1368:23

vulva - 1386:25

waist - 1395:2 Wait - 1408:4 walk - 1380:7 wall - 1387:23 wants - 1408:19 wariness - 1468:2 warm - 1380:16 warmth - 1391:7 warrant - 1373:11 waste - 1460:23 watch - 1411:23 Watson - 1370:6, 1435:8, 1488:3, 1488:4 ways - 1420:15 weapon - 1399:4 wear - 1417:1, 1432:7 wearing - 1431:19 week - 1391:2, 1392:16 weight - 1419:15 welcoming - 1430:16 Wempe - 1370:10 Werrett - 1458:6.

1458:15 wheels - 1415:14 whereas - 1440:3, 1457:15 whereby - 1451:22 whole - 1375:23, 1491:21 wife - 1472:5 wife's - 1414:6 Wilde - 1369:15 Williams - 1484:3, 1484:10, 1484:25 wish - 1479:8, 1489:5, 1489:18 witness - 1373:5, 1392:7, 1402:18, 1417:7, 1418:22, 1418:23, 1419:1, 1421:14, 1424:24, 1435:21, 1460:13, 1477:6, 1478:18 witnesses - 1419:8, 1419:11, 1419:13, 1440:22, 1465:3 Wolch - 1370:2, 1373:20 woman - 1388:8, 1389:7, 1389:17, 1389:18, 1391:8 womb - 1388:2, 1388:4, wonder - 1483:17 word - 1387:10, 1426:4 words - 1439:6, 1447:13, 1447:23, 1448:1, 1459:13, 1466:11, 1473:19, 1476:13, 1489:16 world - 1436:21 worn - 1410:8 worth - 1381:8 wound - 1381:15, 1381:17 write - 1384:5 Written - 1449:15 written - 1411:7, 1449:9, 1456:1, 1456:7, 1483:1 wrongful - 1415:22, 1416:8, 1417:24, 1417:24, 1418:15, 1419:7, 1419:11, 1419:17, 1420:3, 1439:5, 1441:7, 1442:7, 1442:14,

Υ

Wrongful - 1368:3

1443.14

year - 1456:22, 1470:25, year - 1456.22, 1470.25, 1471.4, 1471:24, 1472:2 years - 1389:7, 1389:17, 1415:12, 1416:16, 1423:23, 1443:3, 1443:7, 1469:10, 1473:17, 1474:18, 1475:1, 1481:7, 1483:5, 1486:4, 1486:11 yellowish - 1449:24 yesterday - 1373:10, 1373:16, 1374:2, 1374:5, 1376:5, 1380:18, 1381:15, 1389:5, 1389:24, 1393:19, 1400:22, 1408:24, 1412:22, 1415:9, 1415:15, 1418:8, 1418:22, 1423:14, 1427:6, 1427:16, 1428:11, 1428:13, 1433:1, 1435:6, 1436:24, 1438:11, 1439:3, 1439:12, 1439:24, 1441:6, 1442:6, 1444:5, 1446:4, 1446:15, 1446:21, 1447:12, 1451:1, 1458:4, 1473:16, 1474:17, 1477:16, 1484:5, 1485:6, 1488:12, 1489:5 Yesterday - 1395:7

1440:14, 1447:21, 1470:13 yesterday's - 1484:8 young - 1398:12, 1420:23 yourself - 1408:13, 1410:11, 1422:13, 1438:3, 1457:10, 1486:13

