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## Transcript of Proceedings

(Reconvened at 9:00 a.m.)
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Good morning.
ALL COUNSEL: Good morning.
MR. HARDY: Good morning, Mr. Commissioner.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Good morning.
MR. HARDY: We're ready to proceed with our next witness, Dr. Peter Markesteyn, I'll call Dr.

Markesteyn forward to be sworn in.
DR. PETER HERMANUS MARKESTEYN, sworn:
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Morning, sir.

## BY MR. HARDY:

Q
Good morning, Dr. Markesteyn, thank you for attending today to give testimony.

I understand that you currently reside in Winnipeg?

I do.
And how old are you, sir?
74 .
And am I correct that you are now retired?
I'm retired as the Chief Medical Examiner of Manitoba, that is correct.

And I understand that you worked throughout the majority of your career as a forensic pathologist? That is correct.

Q
A

Q

A
$Q$

A
Q
A
Q
A
Q


A
$Q$

And what does a forensic pathologist do?
A forensic pathologist is a pathologist who does not only determine what diseases do to people, but what people do to people or to themselves. It is, therefore, specifically dealing with the issues in the administration of justice.

And all relating, of course, to causes of death and circumstances of death?

The cause of death, the identity, and the time of death, place of death, and the circumstances, that's correct.

And you have been kind enough to provide us with a copy of a curriculum vitae, and perhaps we will turn to that now, the document number is 338018 . And do you recognize that, Dr. Markesteyn, as your CV?

Yes, I do.
And you've reviewed this document prior to today? Yes, I did.

And it contains accurate information?
It does.
I see, on the first page, I note you received your Doctors in Medicine in 1958?

That's correct.
And if we turn to page 4 of the document, it is
338021. I note at the top the date range noted, August 1982 to July 1999, Chief Medical Examiner, Manitoba Justice, Province of Manitoba, and Inspector of Anatomy, Manitoba Health, Province of Manitoba; that would be correct?

Yes, sir.
And what was your function as chief medical examiner during this time period?

The function of the chief medical examiner is identical in some aspects to that of a chief coroner, that is to determine the $W-5$ in any death that falls under our legislation, meaning to determine, as you said before, the identity, the time, the cause and manner of death, manner of death meaning homicide, suicide, accidents and so on, and to report, and give a report on this matter to the parties interested in these findings.

So that's above and beyond then, for example, a position such as a chief coroner or a regular forensic pathologist then?

A
A regular forensic pathologist may not have the position of a chief medical examiner. A pathologist, including a forensic pathologist, may determine the cause of death but is not in law, in
many instances, allowed to determine the manner of death. And a chief coroner, contrary to a chief medical examiner as we have in Alberta as well, the chief coroner holds his own inquest or her own inquest, whereas a medical examiner delegates, so to speak, the judicial function of the office to a provincial judge, who holds the inquest.

Okay. Am I correct that, presently, only certain provinces in the country have chief medical examiners?

A
$Q$ Well I assist the, in the administration of justice on occasion by either assisting the Crown or the defence in reviewing autopsies that have been done by other pathologists. And I also assisted the International Criminal Court in the Hague in the determination of the presence or absence of crimes committed in the Balkans, $I$ did that for a year, and I actually became the Chief Medical Examiner of Kosovo at that time.

A
Q

A .

And am $I$ correct that, most recently, you have been overseeing a public inquiry in Newfoundland? Yes, I'm actually almost -- well, the function is I'm holding an inquiry, an in-camera inquiry in the death of a person who killed herself and her child while awaiting extradition to go to the United States, and the purpose of that is to know or to try and find out whether the death of the child was preventable.

Okay. And I understand you came to be involved in the David Milgaard matter in approximately 1990; would that sound accurate?

That is correct, yes.
And how did that come about?
I was contacted by Mr. Asper on this matter, and he asked if $I$ would be kind enough to review some material that he had from Dr. Ferris, and I said I would do that.

And it was suggested, although I don't think he had a clear recollection by Mr. Asper in his testimony, that you may have contacted him or initiated your involvement in this matter; would that be correct?

That's not correct. I do not contact other lawyers in matters, at all, ever.

Q Okay. So the request came from Mr. Asper, then?

A
Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$ It must have.

And did you have an association with Mr. Asper, then, prior to your involvement in this matter? Not really, but $I$ may have dealt with his cross-examination on occasion, but $I$ had no professional relationship with Mr. Asper, no. And what did you understand, at the outset, was the purpose of your involvement?

The purpose of the involvement was to see if the opinion rendered by Dr. Ferris had forensic value. Okay. And I'm going to turn you to some correspondence, the document is 155505, and you'll note this is a letter directed to yourself from Mr. Asper dated May 1st, 1990. And I'm going to review this correspondence with you, it states at the outset:

"Please find enclosed the following documentation:

1) Photocopy of an application submitted by David Milgaard to the Federal Department of Justice pursuant to Section 690 of the Criminal Code, including the two reports of Dr. James Ferris; and
2) Excerpts from the transcripts relied
upon by Dr. Ferris in the preparation of his report.

While $I$ can appreciate that this is a fairly daunting task, nonetheless we would very much
appreciate your reviewing these
materials with a view to offering your
opinion on the report prepared by Dr.
Ferris. We submitted the original
application to the Department of Justice
in December of 1988, and to our
knowledge nothing has been done to
assess the validity of his opinion. As
you can imagine, the frustration level
of the Milgaard family rises by the
minute, and we hope that Dr. Ferris'
conclusions will find support from other
noted forensic pathologists, and
therefore cause the Department of
Justice to take heed.
I am intimately familiar with
the facts of this case, and if you have
any questions or require further
information, please feel free to contact me.

On behalf of the Milgaard family, please let me extend my gratitude for your concern in this matter."

And would this be the formal request, then, that initiated your involvement?
of other people, $I$ try to use that opinion as a frame for my own so that it does not become too confusing, one can use one report to read the other, and $I$ think $I$ did that here as well.

And did you understand that the Milgaard group, then, was hoping that you would support the findings of Dr. Ferris?

I would imagine that they would come to me with that hope, yes.

And I'm going to move through the documents chronologically. We next come to a press article dated May 12th, 1990, and if we could turn to document 220901 , please. And you'll note it is an article from the Winnipeg Free Press by Dan Lett, the title Coroner reviews Milgaard case. I'll just review a couple portions with you, the first two paragraphs, those state:
"Manitoba's chief medical
examiner has reviewed forensic evidence from the David Milgaard case to determine if the Stony Mountain Institution inmate was unjustly convicted of a 1969 murder.

Dr. Peter Markesteyn confirmed yesterday he has finished reviewing
scientific evidence from the Milgaard
trial and is preparing a report on his
findings."
And did you know, at the time, how Mr. Lett had
learned of your involvement?

Okay. So the 'scientific evidence' here is referring to Dr. Ferris' report then? That's correct.

Okay. And were you under the impression, at the
time, that you would be making a determination as to whether Mr. Milgaard had been unjustly convicted?

A
$Q$

Well, $I$ think that was implied, but that was not the request. My, the request was as stated in the letter, to review the evidence and see if $I$ had an opinion either supporting or perhaps not supporting.

Okay. And if we go back to the full article, please, if we move down to this portion. Again, I'll read this to you.
"Markesteyn conducted the review at the request of Milgaard's lawyer, David Asper.

Markesteyn, who declined to comment on his findings until his report is complete, said he is intrigued by both the case and Ferris's report.
'It is a very interesting case
indeed. I find it fascinating.'"

And was this accurate as far as your position and comments at that time?

Yes.

And why were you declining to comment on your findings at this point?

A It's -- I do not comment on findings to the press ever, umm --

Okay. So that was a policy, then, of yours? Oh yes.

And had you been expecting to hear from the press about your involvement?

Well the press, at that time when $I$ was in office, was very often in contact with me, there's hardly a day didn't go by that they didn't contact me about something or another, so that did not surprise me at all. In fact, I recall getting in -- a statement or a question from the Toronto newspaper in which the journalist asked "have you been asked to find Milgaard innocent?", and I recall saying to him "they have no courts here, you know, in Manitoba, they just phone me and I'll say", he said "I get your point", and I said "that's not what I do."

Okay. I'm going to continue reading from the point that we left off:
"Key to Ferris's report is the conclusion that semen samples found at the scene were incorrectly interpreted as tying Milgaard to the crime." Of course $I$ believe there we're talking about the
frozen substance that was found at the scene and we'll talk more about that. The article continues quoting Ferris' report:
"On the basis of the evidence that $I$ have examined," the report stated, "I have no reasonable doubt that serological evidence presented at the trial failed to link David Milgaard with the offence and that in fact, could be reasonably considered to exclude him from being the perpetrator of the murder."

And I assume by this point in time, Dr.
Markesteyn, that you would have been aware of Dr. Ferris' conclusions in this respect? Oh, yes.

And did you understand that they were twofold in a sense, (a), that the serological evidence failed to link David Milgaard to the murder, and secondly, that the serological evidence could be reasonably considered as excluding David Milgaard as the perpetrator?

A
2 I was aware of that conclusion, yes. Okay. Out to the full article again, a short portion here, the paragraph here states:
"Asper said he requested Markesteyn
review the evidence because it appears
the Justice Department has little
interest in challenging Ferris's
findings."
And were you aware or do you recall whether you were aware at the time of Mr. Asper's feelings in this regard?

Well, he did not share that to that extent with me in the sense that $I$ 'm sure that Mr. Asper felt that this was the case, but that's not what he asked me to do.
$Q$
And was Federal Justice involved at all in the retention of your services?

No, they were not.

I turn you to another article, a similar article from the same date, 004726 , and this is from the Toronto star, and perhaps it's the one that, or related to what you were referring to earlier, "Pathologist re-examining evidence from murder trial." The date is actually May 13th, 1990 on this article $I$ believe, and just the first paragraph states:
"Manitoba's chief medical examiner has
reviewed forensic evidence and will soon
give his opinion on whether David Milgaard is innocent of a 1969 murder for which he was convicted."

And were you under the --
COMMISSIONER MaCCALLUM: Mr. Hardy, it says January doesn't it?

MR. HARDY: Actually, if we go to the full, it is May.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.

MR. HARDY: But you are right, the -- I
think it got cut off. If we could just blow up the date there for a moment, please.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh, okay, thank
you. May 13th, 1990 ?
MR. HARDY: That's how I read it, yes.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: All right. Thank you.

BY MR. HARDY:

Again, the first paragraph states:
"Manitoba's chief medical examiner has
reviewed forensic evidence and will soon give his opinion on whether David

Milgaard is innocent of a 1969 murder for which he was convicted."

And perhaps you've covered this, but were you

A
Q
under the assumption at any time that you would be reaching a conclusion on Mr. Milgaard's guilt or innocence?

I do not reach that conclusion.
One more article that I'll just refer to, I don't think we need to review any portions from it, but it's from the same time period and it's generally of the same approach, it's from the StarPhoenix, and the document is 004730 , and again I'll just note that for reference, there are no specific portions that $I$ am going to refer you to, Dr. Markesteyn.

> We next come to a second letter
from Mr. Asper to yourself dated May 15th, 1990, if we could turn to 155507 , please, and again you'll see it's correspondence directed to yourself from Mr. Asper dated May 15th, 1990, and again I'll review this correspondence with you. It states:
"Further to our telephone
conversation of May 14, 1990 , this will
confirm my request that you offer an
opinion if possible on whether the
evidence tendered at the Milgaard
supports the Crown's theory of the case.

I trust that you are familiar with the scene immediately surrounding the body of the deceased. The body was located in a north/south portion of a T-shaped alley. There was an east/west portion of the alley located at the southern end of the portion in which the deceased's body was located. The most proximate street to the west of the alley was Avenue 0 South, and to the east was Avenue N South.

The Crown's theory is that Milgaard intercepted the deceased as she walked along Avenue $N$ near where it meets the east/west portion of the alley. Allegedly, a struggle occurred at that point, and then carried on into the lane and then northward into the north/south portion of the $T$.

I do not know whether you have the evidence of the identification officers, but the evidence at trial was clear that there was no evidence of a struggle having occurred at one point in the alley, and carrying on up to the
point where the body was found. I can appreciate that this area is highly speculative, but nevertheless, one would think that given the number of stab wounds, as well as the degree of violence used in the attack generally, there would be some evidence -- be it blood stains or a disturbance in the snow -- to show that the attack had begun at one point and concluded at another."

And do you recall this request, Dr. Markesteyn? Yes, I do.

And do you recall any discussions with Mr. Asper at the time relating to this request?

Yes, he did ask me, you know, about the opinion that had been expressed by Dr. Ferris on this matter and $I$ said $I$ would look at it and, as you know, I later declined.

Okay. And $I$ think we'll see that in your report as you mention. Now, it would appear that around the same time as the document we just looked at, that you were also in contact with Eugene Williams who was a lawyer from the Federal Department of Justice working on Mr. Milgaard's Section 690
application. Do you recall Mr. Williams?

A
$Q$

Q

A

Q

A

A
$Q$
A
$Q$
A
Q

A

And when you say all of this work, do you mean all of the --

All this forensic testing, retesting, non-testing and all that.

Okay. And do you recall whether the charge had any impact on your findings?

It had no impact on the findings, but $I$ do state in my report that the judge specifically stated that there was no evidence that the semen had been contaminated with blood.

And I think that perhaps that wasn't in the charge, but perhaps in the evidence, or during the evidence of Bruce Paynter, and would that fit with your recollection? In the charge itself for the most part there is no direction on the forensic evidence.

I may be incorrect.
That's a matter that sticks out in your mind?
That's correct.
As you recall in any event?
Yeah.
And other than that, though, I take it that the judge's charge, you don't recall it having any impact on your findings?

That does not have any impact on the scientific
evaluation of the findings, no.
And it could have, and $I$ know I'm speculating at this point, but could have related to some of the theories about how the crime occurred, and $I$ refer to the request that Mr . Asper had just made of you in terms of commenting on the Crown's theory. Yeah.

And $I$ don't know, as $I$ say, what discussions took place with Mr. Williams, but perhaps it could have related to that as well.

I'll turn you to another memo
relating to a discussion with Mr. Williams, the document is 002510 , and you'll see it's a memo to file by Mr. Williams dated May 29th, 1990
respecting conversations with Dr. Markesteyn and Murray Brown, and starting at the first paragraph I'll read to you:
"On May 29, 1990, I spoke with Dr.
Markesteyn ... to request a copy of his
completed report. Dr. Markesteyn
indicated that he was currently working on the report and expected to have it completed by June 1, 1990. Dr. Markesteyn indicated that a number of individuals and organizations had
expressed an interest in obtaining a
copy of his report."
And do you recall this request for the report
from Mr. Williams?

A
Q

A

Q

A
Q

A
Q .

not my station to exonerate anybody, that $I$ would review and $I$ would answer any questions that he had on the theory of the Crown if you like. Okay. And just moving to the next paragraph: "Dr. Markesteyn also had access to the psychiatric file of David Milgaard. Further he indicated that a professional source, (non-medical) had advised him that Albert Cadrain had been admitted to a psychiatric facility after the trial of David Milgaard."

And is that information that you would have provided to Mr. Williams at this time?

And do you recall who had provided you with this material?

A
No, I don't. I got it all, I would imagine,
from -- well, it may have been from Mr. Williams, but I got it, I got it all. It may even have been from Mr. Asper, I'm not sure. I don't remember where it came from.

And in terms of the information relating to Albert Cadrain, do you recall providing that information as well to Mr. Williams?

Yes, because $I$ had that information from what $I$ call a professional source non-medical, that's what -- that can only mean that's probably a legal source of some kind.

And are you able to tell us or do you recall who that information was received from?

No.
And did this type of information, I'm referring to the psychiatric file and the information relating to Albert Cadrain, was that relevant at all for purposes of your review?

No, not really, but it is important to know as much as possible if one can as a pathologist to address the circumstances of the death, to know as much as possible of the accused and habits of the accused and so on.

Do you recall specifically why you were mentioning this information to Mr. Williams?

A

Well, I think there was a, I had a discussion with another pathologist who gave me the impression that $I$ should have no doubt about the guilt of Mr. Milgaard because he had a psychiatric problem. And who was the pathologist that you are referring to?

Dr. Emson.
Okay. And I think we're going to touch upon that just shortly. Did you have your own view at the time, your own personal view at the time on Mr . Milgaard's guilt or innocence?

No, I do not, and may $I$ qualify that. Of course as a person, as a person $I$ have views, but if you are asking me whether $I$ had a professional opinion, that's a different matter.

Okay.
Of course I have views.
And maybe that's a better question. Would this information that $I$ 've been referring to, whether from the psychiatric file or the information relating to Albert Cadrain, have impacted your deliberations or your ultimate conclusions at all? No.

And is there anything else you can recall respecting your conversation with Mr. Williams at
this time?
No. I answered the questions he had as best as I could and that was the end of that.

Okay. Again, moving chronologically, we next come to a memo to file by David Asper dated May 30 th, 1990, and the document is 169913 . The memo mentions Dr. Colin Merry and Dr. Merry has already testified here at this Inquiry. How did you know Dr. Merry and how had he become involved in this case?

I, as you know, $I$ was not only the chief medical examiner, $I$ was also the professor of forensic pathology at the University of Manitoba and head of the forensic division, and the forensic division is more than pathology, that includes anatomy, serology, bacteriology, all sorts of stuff, which is the nice thing about being in a university setting, so $I$ knew Colin Merry, I knew he was a serologist, $I$ knew he does blood grouping, that was his task, and as he is a colleague, could call him and ask his opinion and that's what I did.
$Q$
And I'll review the body of the memo with you. It states, and this is again David Asper writing a memo to the file:
"I was contacted on Sunday, May 27, 1990 by a Dr. Merry, who is a Hematopathologist at the Health Sciences Centre, and connected with the University of Manitoba Medical School. He was consulted by Dr. Markesteyn as to the blood grouping issues because that is his specialty. He will be conducting a battery of tests which he believes will establish among other things:
a) That human semen is not yellow in the snow, but rather either clear or white, and not visible to the human eye. This likely means that what the police officer found in the snow was urine, and probably urine from some kind of an animal. He believes that certain enzymes present in urine will give rise to a positive test for human semen, as well as any testing for the presence of antigens.
b) Assuming that the samples were in fact human semen, there is no evidence whatever to establish the presence of blood, and in the absence of such, the

A
only conclusion was that the antigens were present in the semen by virtue of secretion, and therefore excludes Milgaard as the donor based on the evidence.

He expects that his testing will occur within the next week, and he will provide a report in due course." And do you have any recollection how it had come about, Dr. Markesteyn, that Dr. Merry was having direct contact with David Asper?

No, I did not know he had done that, nor is that any concern of me, of mine, nor is that anything that -- but $I$ didn't know he was doing this, that's fine.

And you had clearly consulted Dr. Merry by this point in time?

But you weren't aware though of this particular telephone call from Dr. Merry to David Asper, but knowing now about it, that doesn't cause you or concern or wouldn't have caused you concern at the time?

Not in the slightest, no.
And $I$ think this is the earliest mention we see of
the thought that the frozen lumps that were found at the scene by Lieutenant Penkala on February 4 th, 1969 may have been dog urine. Can you tell us who first considered this possibility and how that theory evolved?

I did, and I did that because of the, for two reasons. First of all, in my experience as a person, not as a pathologist, yellow stain or yellowish stains in snowbanks are urine unless or until proven otherwise, and -- now -- then one says to one's self, okay, if this is urine, could it possibly have sperm in it and could it possibly have A antigen in it, because of course if that was not possible, then it could not be urine, and I had done research in Newfoundland at the time on kidneys of dogs and $I$ remember talking to the professor involved in that and saying to him sort of during a conversation, you know, it's amazing that -- his research was about urinary tract infections in dogs, that dogs can pee all the time, you know, and this is one of those conversations that one has during coffee and all that, and he says, "What makes you think that's urine?" I said, "Well, isn't it?" He says, "No. Dogs, male dogs, they excrete their semen, they
don't recycle. Humans do, dogs do not." So I knew that could be, and $I$ checked it out actually with the Department of Veterinary Affairs at the university who agreed that dogs do that.

Now, I had another issue, could there be A antigen. At least we knew it could be semen, they could have semen unless they were neutered, and number 2 , could that have A antigen. Well, low and behold, there was an article in the Scientific Press to find a link or to find a model for research to see if blood group A was related to cancer of the stomach, there seemed to be a lot of people who had cancer of the stomach who had blood group A and so we needed an animal model who had the same antigen, and low and behold, in nature -- there's a the journal, a very highly regarded journal stated dogs have A antigens, we can use dogs and that was the end of that, so $I$ knew that not only that dog urine could contain semen and could be a positive and therefore $I$ said okay, how do we know this is not urine, dog's urine.

And then we had another thought
and that is this, $I$ said, you know, to my experience, not as a pathologist, but as a person,
is semen, does that look yellowish in snow, so we decided to do an experiment, and Dr. Merry, as you know, is a very enthusiastic person and let's go for it. I said, "Now where are we going to get the semen from," and contrary to some suggestions, we decided that we'd get it from the fertility clinic where they had a pitcher full of it and which they do for, to test fertility of males, so -- and he said, "I've got a freezer at minus 40, that's where we keep our specimens," and he said, "There's snow attached or icy snow attached to the side of it, let's test it," so we did, and so we squirted that semen with a syringe against the side of that freezer and we did not find it, you could not see that, and in fact only with ultraviolet light, which is a well-known test by the police, and $I$ knew of that test, could you see that it was a fluorescent, so we then reached the conclusion, number 1 , semen, frozen semen does not look yellowish; number 2, it is possible, it is possible that dog's urine, being yellowish or yellow, contained $A$ antigen and contains sperm and therefore $I$ raised the issue how do we know in this unpreserved scene that this is not dog urine, I raised that.

Okay. And we'll come to some of this further in a moment. You had mentioned the test that was done with the freezer, and before $I$ forget, $I$ wanted to ask, do you recall whether you had let some time lapse in relation to that test determining whether frozen semen at minus 40 could be yellow, was that something that you looked at at the time or was there a time lapse afterwards?

No, that's -- that's not a very great scientific test. I'll tell you why not. First of all, the semen we tested was not so-called fresh, right, it had been ejaculated before; number 2 , it was at room temperature, not at body temperature because we had it from a pitcher, and we did not wait four days, of course we should have waited four days, kept that freezer and then look again. We did not do that.

Again, we'll look at some of that further in just a moment. Otherwise, does this memo, what I've read to you, sound accurate in terms of the conclusions you were considering at the time? Yes.

We'll move next to a memo to file by Eugene Williams dated May 31st, the document is 333433, you'll see it's a memo dated May 31st, 1990 to
file from Eugene Williams respecting telecom with Mr. Peter Markesteyn, and it states:
"Dr. Markesteyn called to advise me that his report would be completed today. He also indicated that he had spoken with David Asper concerning the distribution of the report. Mr. Asper requested Dr. Markesteyn to provide his report only to Asper, who would then distribute the report to those requesting it."

Does that fit with your recollection?
Yes.
Okay.
"I asked Dr. Markesteyn whether the forensic evidence exculpated David Milgaard. Dr. Markesteyn said: "I can't say the forensic evidence excludes him." He did note, as have the scientists consulted by the department, that the forensic evidence does not inculpate David Milgaard. Dr.

Markesteyn told me however, that his report was silent on the question quoted above.

I also spoke with David Asper

A
$Q$

A
2

A

Q
A

who assured me that as soon as he receives Dr. Markesteyn's report, he would provide me with a copy." Do you have a recollection of this conversation?

Well, to the extent thereof, yes, I would certainly have told Mr. Williams that I have no opinions on whether Mr. Milgaard is guilty or not. So no reason to dispute the accuracy then of the contents of this memo?

No.
And had you then concluded by this time that Mr. Milgaard could not be excluded on the forensic evidence?

He could not be excluded, no, but he could not be -- I could not include him, but I could not exclude him.

Okay. We'll move next --
I'm sorry, I could not include the semen as being, belonging to Mr. Milgaard, nor could I exclude that the semen was not Mr. Milgaard.

Okay. We'll move next to a report by Dr. Merry dated June 1st, 1990, 204511 , and this report would have just predated I guess your report which we'll see in a moment which was dated June 4 th, 1990. I'm going to review the letter with you

|  | 1 |  | that went from Dr. Merry to Mr. Asper. Dr. Merry |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 |  | states: |
|  | 3 |  | "I have examined the forensic |
|  | 4 |  | evidence presented at the trial. |
| 09:41 | 5 |  | From this I do not believe that |
|  | 6 |  | the possibility can be excluded that the |
|  | 7 |  | frozen yellowish substance found near |
|  | 8 |  | the body of the deceased was dog urine, |
|  | 9 |  | from a dog positive for a blood group |
| 09:41 | 10 |  | antigen cross reacting with the human |
|  | 11 |  | blood group A. |
|  | 12 |  | Approximately 50\% of dogs are |
|  | 13 |  | known to have the Tr antigen which cross |
|  | 14 |  | reacts in this manner." |
| 09:41 | 15 |  | I think this touches upon something that you've |
|  | 16 |  | described for us already, but, in effect, and |
|  | 17 |  | perhaps I'm stating it too simply, it had been |
|  | 18 |  | determined that the Tr antigen in dogs could |
|  | 19 |  | mimic the $A$ antigens that might be found in a |
| 09:42 | 20 |  | human sample. |
|  | 21 | A | That's correct, yes. |
|  | 22 | Q | It states as well: |
|  | 23 |  | "Such dog urine might well also contain |
|  | 24 |  | spermatozoa." |
| 09:42 | 25 |  | And those would be for the reasons that you've |
|  |  |  | rtified Professional Court Reporters serving P.A., Regina \& Saskatoon since 1980 Central Booking - Call Irene @ 1-800-667-6777 or go to www.compucourt.tv |

A

Q
already explained to us?
already explained to us?
That's correct.
It continues:
"The use of a test, "used by hospitals to test for blood in urine", to test for blood in seminal fluid is totally invalid. Normal human seminal fluid specimens will, on standing, test positive as the spermatozoa disintegrate and liberate cytochromes and enzymes which will catalyze the benzidine/peroxide reaction. This was known but was tested on some seminal fluid specimens submitted to this laboratory for analysis."

And we've covered this aspect with Dr. Merry, but I believe, and correct me if I'm wrong, what he's stating is that if you have uncontaminated semen which sits for a period of time, because of certain reactions that will take place within the cells of that semen, that if you were to apply the hemostix test later on, you may in fact get a positive reaction?

So I believe, yes.
Okay. And the hemostix test, as he explains, was
the one, and as we've heard from Staff Sergeant Paynter, was the test that was used to attempt to detect whether there was blood in the original frozen substance that was tested?

Yes.

Okay. And then the letter concludes:
"From the manner in which the test for secretor status was performed it is not possible to be certain if David Milgaard is a secretor or non-secretor of blood group A antigen."

Again, were you aware of these findings and that Dr. Merry was providing a separate report in this regard?

No, I was not aware of that.

Okay. And any concerns about that now that you are aware of it?

No. I think it actually helps the matter. We obviously did not discuss that we would both give reports and his report is no different from my conclusions.
$Q$
You would have agreed with these conclusions?

A Yeah, that's correct.

Based upon your considerations at the time? Yes.

And I think they are threefold, but one of them was that the frozen substance was possibly dog urine --

That's right.
-- was one of the conclusions. That the hemostix test was invalid, that, as $I$ said, could have been positive even where the semen was uncontaminated? He said that, and $I$ have no reason to disagree with that. That's his specialty though, that's not mine.

Okay.

A
Q

A
$Q$

A

A
Q

A
$Q$

A

2
A

.

Yes.
And that David Milgaard could be a secretor, that it couldn't be determined one way or the other from the tests that were done in 1969 ?

That $I$ was aware of.
And in relation to this very last point that I've just mentioned, do you recall what your thoughts were on that aspect?

Yes, I do, and $I$ had grave doubts that -- in fact, I had grave doubt indeed that that test was a valid test and --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: That's the hemostix test for the presence of blood?

No, the test whether he is a secretor or not.

BY MR. HARDY:

2

A
$Q$

A

2
A
$Q$

A
Q

A

And can you detail that further? You mentioned that you had grave doubt; what were your thoughts at the time?

Well my thoughts at the time was that he should be re-tested.

And do you recall any discussions with anyone, at that time, respecting that matter?

I do have a recollection of that, and it was my understanding, unless I stand corrected I've always acted under the principle that the services of a forensic pathologist is an extension of the client/solicitor privilege, and therefore $I$ do not, obviously, discuss what counsel discusses with me --

You do --
-- unless I am allowed to do so.
And you do recall certain discussions with counsel for Mr. Milgaard, then, respecting this particular matter?

Yes, I do.
But you are unwilling, at this point, to share your recollections of that discussion with us?

Unless I'm allowed to do so, --

Q
A
Q

Okay.
-- I believe I cannot.
Okay. And perhaps we can come back to that, then, and we can cover that at the break, perhaps, but $I$ can continue on.

> And we're going to look at the
contents of your report in a moment, Dr.
Markesteyn; would you have likely provided a summary of your findings to Mr. Asper prior to the release of your report?

Very likely, that's very common.
Okay.
Before I give a report I'm always asked, you know, "let's have a chat".

Okay.
So I'm sure that happened here.
And we have a clip, a video clip from
approximately the time period just prior to the release of the report, we don't have an exact date for it. I'm going to play that for you and then $I$ have some questions that follow. I believe the clip is JH1, and it begins at 9 minutes and continues to 10 minutes and 38 seconds, and it will show up on your screen.

INTERVIEWER: But what about the Ferris report?

MR. DAVID ASPER: Well --

INTERVIEWER: What does Ferris say that is so encouraging to David Milgaard?

MR. DAVID ASPER: All right. The background is the Crown alleged that there was a sexual assault, and they attempted to link David Milgaard to the scene of the crime because they said that they had found two spots of semen in the snow, which for a variety of technical reasons they say belonged to David Milgaard. And what Dr. Ferris says is that this doesn't link David Milgaard at all, and for a variety of technical reasons again, can reasonably interpreted to exclude him as the donor of the semen. And $I$ suspect that, by the time this show goes to air, it will be pretty clear from Dr. Markesteyn that what the doctors and the courtroom was dealing with was something that could very well have been something other than semen and totally unrelated to the crime.

INTERVIEWER: Perhaps even dog urine in the snow, something like that? MR. DAVID ASPER: Anything.

INTERVIEWER: Something like that?
MR. DAVID ASPER: Anything. I mean the -Dr. Markesteyn and his support group have so riddled the forensic evidence that it has no scientific value and yet, you know, it played a fairly -- it must have played a fairly important part in the trial because it's the only independent thing that really establishes David as being at the scene of the crime, or purported to, and the Court of Appeal, you know, in their decision, relied on it, in part, to support the conviction.

## (Clip JH1 ends)

BY MR. HARDY:
And Dr. Markesteyn, the clip seems to confirm -and $I$ think we've confirmed it already -- that you had likely advised Mr. Asper, then, about the dog urine --

Yes.
-- theory by this point in time? And we, of course, saw the letter from Dr. Merry as well.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Mr. Hardy, before you go on, do you have a -- is there a doc. ID for that?

MR. HARDY: Yeah, I can give you a doc. ID,

Mr. Commissioner, it's 230098 .
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Is that the transcription?

MR. HARDY: It isn't, I think that's just --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: The tape?
MR. HARDY: -- the video itself.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.
MR. HARDY: The video clip is identified as JH1.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes.
MR. HARDY: And do you have the time, running from 9 minutes to 10 minutes and 38 seconds?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.
BY MR. HARDY:
$Q$

A
And Dr. Markesteyn, if you would have expressed this theory in relation to the dog urine prior to the point of the release of your report, how would you have expressed that theory to Mr. Asper or otherwise?

Oh, $I$ probably would have told him exactly what $I$ said in the report, in the sense that, you know, "we can't be certain that this is not dog urine, all right, it was not tested, therefore it could
be, and therefore $I$ don't think it's got any value".
$Q$
Okay. And one more very short clip that I'll show to you, it's from the same tape, and it begins at 25 minutes and 11 seconds and, I believe, continues until 25 minutes and 30 seconds. If we could play that, please?
(Clip played)
INTERVIEWER: I guess the Ferris report just reinforces ...",
(Clip ends)
MR. HARDY: Sorry, can we start it over again?

MS. BOSWELL (Document Manager): We're trying to find the start.

MR. HARDY: Oh, I'm sorry, okay.
(Clip played)
MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Don't have Joyce Milgaard at their doorstep every day too.

MR. DAVID ASPER: Well --
INTERVIEWER: And the other thing, because we're talking about humanity, we're talking about human beings, there are major careers on the line?

MR. DAVID ASPER: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: There are, what, three people from the investigation and the trial, going back to 1969 and 1970 , who have responsible positions now in saskatchewan?

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Oh yes. The investigator is now the chief of police in Saskatoon.

MR. DAVID ASPER: And this is the guy, the investigator is the guy who found the samples in the snow --

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Right.

MR. DAVID ASPER: -- which, if all goes well, by the time this show airs will be ridiculed.

INTERVIEWER: So you have the investigator who is the police chief?

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Yeah. We have --
INTERVIEWER: You've got an attorney who is now on the Bench, Justice --

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Now on the Court of Appeal.

MR. DAVID ASPER: Court of Appeal of Saskatchewan.

INTERVIEWER: Of Saskatchewan, and we have one other person?
$Q$

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Oh yes, Mr. Caldwell, and he's --

## (Clip ends)

BY MR. HARDY:

Okay. One further pre-report document that I'll refer you to, there's another discussion that takes place, and we have the transcript of this discussion, and it apparently took place between -- or amongst Joyce Milgaard, David Asper, and an unknown female. And if we could turn, please, to document 336785, and it's page 12 of that document. It's not particularly easy to follow, Dr. Markesteyn, but I'll direct you to those portions that $I$ want your comment on. And just to give you some context, I believe there's some discussion here about Dr. Ferris' findings
and your findings, and Mr. Asper begins at this paragraph:
"MR. DAVID ASPER: Yeah. The problem is ideally, and you know, I talked about this with Hersh, what $I$ would ideally like is for the evidence to be sound, for the integrity to be sound."

And I believe he is talking about the integrity of the original forensic evidence at trial.
"UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Right.
MR. DAVID ASPER: And for it to exclude him.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Right.
MR. DAVID ASPER: What we've got now is Markesteyn saying "this evidence is junk, this is not even evidence" --

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Shouldn't have even been used (Inaudible) --

MR. DAVID ASPER: That's right, which I think is as good."
"UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: That's right, yeah.

MR. DAVID ASPER: And yet, you know, so now you've got to rethink the whole trial without that evidence, or having that
evidence but having it subject to proper cross-examination.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Uh-huh.
MR. DAVID ASPER: Does that affect the jury.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Oh, well, it's got to.

MR. DAVID ASPER: Well --
MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: I mean you have to.
MR. DAVID ASPER: Okay.
MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: So say you were in Kim Campbell's spot and this information comes to you; how are you gonna see it?

MR. DAVID ASPER: I'm gonna see it as just another problem with the forensic evidence. One says it excludes, the other says it shouldn't even have been in there, none of them are saying that it -- that it's properly there and, and culpable."

And if we can move to the next page, please, I'm going to skip ahead to the top left-hand corner of page 13. And this portion -- yeah, that's fine, beginning here. And it seems apparent that you haven't yet provided the report. Mr. Asper
says:
"MR. DAVID ASPER: I mean that's what Markesteyn is doin'.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: And I think we should wait and get the report."

And then it continues from there:
"MR. DAVID ASPER: Markesteyn, you see Markesteyn is a more of a Quincy type, you know.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Yeah.

MR. DAVID ASPER: Markesteyn wants to investigate, Markesteyn is like a real -- he's like a cop, almost.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Yeah.
MR. DAVID ASPER: And, umm, he'll dig --
MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: So has not -- yeah. What about the, does Markesteyn have access to the prelim?

MR. DAVID ASPER: He hasn't asked for it.
I said "if you want it", you know, it was, it was --

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Yeah, but I think maybe he should have it.

MR. DAVID ASPER: No, no, the prelim is not evidence at the trial.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: No.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: No? Okay.

MR. DAVID ASPER: I said to him "if you want it I've got a whole", I mean I got all this, this is the prelim right here, and I'm -- I got a list right here of what stuff from the prelim he could get, and I said "if you want it I'll send it", and he says "nah, nah, I mean I don't need anything more, this is junk, you know, this evidence is junk".

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: So you might as well wait and get this report from Markesteyn before even putting to Farris about the other --"

And in terms of the comments that are attributed to you, or the types of comments that are attributed to you, does this sound like the type of information that you might have been providing to Mr. Asper prior to the release of your report? That could very well be, yes.

And how would you express that in terms of, we see here it is expressed that the evidence was junk, what would you have been saying to Mr. Asper?

A Well, that's not a scientific term, $I$ probably
would have said "you know, I don't think this is valid", but $I$ could have said "this is junk", I'm not saying $I$ didn't, but, you know, $I$ could have. And we've probably covered this, but why would you be saying, or expressing the view that you didn't think the original forensic evidence was valid? That's because of all the reasons we've gone through, which was first of all an unprotected scene, then it was not. The test, the ultimate test in science, in forensic science, is this: We always have to ask two questions, the first question we ask -- and $I$ teach that to my students and to myself when $I$ need to be reminded -- "what is it", and then the second question, "what else could it be". And the "what else could it be" was not addressed and, therefore, it has no value.

I had no reason to believe, at that time, that that was not dog urine, $I$ still have no reason to believe that it was tested, therefore -- and it has never been excluded, and to me this entire scenario of the A grouping and the secretor status, and all that, meant this, we were going into no-man's land with it.

Okay. And it would appear that Mr. Asper was aware of the apparent fact that you were not
necessarily of the same opinion as Dr. Ferris insofar as you weren't ready to offer an opinion that the forensic evidence at trial probably excluded Mr. Milgaard as the perpetrator?

You see, I could not exclude him. Dr. Ferris could, based on the evidence he had at that time for him, which was Milgaard is a non-secretor, this is secretor stuff, excludes him. I could not do that. I could not exclude him, I could not tie him in, but $I$ could not exclude him.

And do you recall whether you appreciated that difference or --

Oh yeah.
-- you recognized that difference between your report and Dr. Ferris'?

Oh yes, oh yes.
Sorry, one other document before we get to the report, it's 025927 . This is another press article dated June 4th, 1990 from the StarPhoenix, Mother confident new review will support Milgaard's innocence. The article states:
"David Milgaard's mother is confident a new review of forensic evidence will support a 1988 one indicating her son is innocent of a 1969
murder.


#### Abstract

'There can only be one answer, and it's got to be that the new review will be supportive ...,' Joyce Milgaard said saturday about a study by Manitoba's chief medical examiner, Dr. Peter Markesteyn.


Markesteyn's review, a report
on which is to be delivered today to
Milgaard family lawyer David Asper,
follows the 1988 review of trial
evidence by Vancouver forensic
pathologist Dr. James Ferris.

The Ferris report said evidence
about semen, presented at Milgaard's
trial, failed to link Milgaard with the Saskatoon murder of nurse Gail Miller.

Joyce Milgaard says the
Markesteyn review can do nothing but confirm the Ferris report.
'Dr. Ferris is a world renowned
pathologist - he's not going to have made any dumb mistakes or anything,'

Milgaard said in a telephone interview from Winnipeg.

Markesteyn was mum about the contents of his review when contacted at his Winnipeg home on Saturday.
'If he (Asper) allows people to see it, fine, and if he doesn't that's not my problem,' said Markesteyn.
'I'm sure he will share it with
others.'"
And, again, that would be an accurate account of the position you would take on this sort of matter at that time?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
Q


Yes, at that time it was, yes.
We'll next turn to your report, the document is 026321 . And we've reviewed this together previously, Dr. Markesteyn, and $I$ understand that you have had a chance to refresh yourself in terms of the contents of this report?

Yes, sir.
And it's directed to Mr. Asper, and you begin by listing the various materials that you would have
reviewed in the course of your deliberations, and would that be an accurate list of the materials that you had considered?

Yes, sir.
And perhaps we will just look briefly at some of them. I note the decision of the saskatchewan Court of Appeal, the affidavit of Deborah Hall, Ferris' curriculum vitae, two reports of Dr. Ferris, trial transcript re blood, application pursuant to Section 617 of the Criminal code of Canada, and I'll pause there.

And if we add item $n$ ) below, just for our own reference sake, to those first six that $I$ have mentioned, $I$ believe they are all contained in document 000002. We don't need to turn to that document.

A couple of other items I'll
note, $I$ note $h$ ) judicial history; do you recall what that might have been, Dr. Markesteyn?

No, I don't, really.
Okay. And I missed the affidavit of David Edgar Milgaard, we have excerpted evidence of Staff Sergeant Paynter, and we'll see below in the list of transcripts it would appear that you have the complete trial evidence of staff Sergeant Paynter.

We then see various letters passing back and forth between counsel for Mr. Milgaard and the ministers of justice, both Joe Clark and Doug Lewis. We then see a list of the various transcripts of evidence that you apparently reviewed, and you have had a chance to look at that, I'll just briefly go through that. We have the evidence of Thor Kleiv, John Parker, George Reid, Joseph Penkala, Keith Mackie, Helen Gerse, Eddie Karst, Ray Mackie, John Oleksyn, Shane Kirby, Thomas Edmondson, Gary McLeod, Lloyd McDonald, Bruce Paynter, Victor Molchanko, Dr. Emson, Mr. Molchanko on recall, Lewis Brand, and Thor Kleiv and Giles Beauchamp on recall; and does that look like an accurate list of the testimony that you would have reviewed from the original trial?

A It does.

And would you have read the complete evidence of each of these witnesses in your preparations?

I would, yes.

And, moving down the page, it states:
"In addition, I had the opportunity to review:
the autopsy report prepared by
Dr. ... Emson;
some slide photographs from the
scene and autopsy, and, laboratory
findings; and,
the charge of the Judge to the
members of the jury."
Just as far as laboratory findings, do you recall
what you may have had in that respect?

Probably what $I$ meant, the drug reports, there usually is alcohol and drugs on the deceased, and which $I$ believe was negative. And the histology also, which is a laboratory, that's part of the autopsy report is a test done in the pathology department after the autopsy, that's probably what I meant by that.

So these, from your best recollection, would have been original lab reports, then, from the lab work that was was being done at the time of the investigation?

A
$Q$
A
Q

A
2

Well, it may be copies thereof.
Yeah, right.
Yes.
Okay. But no specific recollection other than that?

No, that's correct.
Okay. And we have learned that you did receive

A
the charge to the jury from Mr. Williams; am I correct that you did not have the closing arguments of counsel from the original trial?

No, I didn't ask for that, no.
And did you have an opportunity to examine any of the original exhibits during the course of your review?

No, I did not.
And I think we've confirmed as well, through the discussion with Mr. Asper, but you did not have the transcripts from the preliminary hearing?

I did not.
And, in the course of your preparations, did you conduct any interviews with any of the original witnesses or other parties of interest, and if so can you share your recollection?

No, I did not. I did a discussion with
Mrs. Milgaard, but she is not a party of this type of work, yeah.

Okay.
No, I did not interview any person, no.
And we'll see in a moment, and $I$ think maybe you made reference to this earlier on, that there may have been discussion with Dr. Emson?

Yes, I did, yes.

Q Okay. And what do you recall of your discussions with Dr. Emson during your, during your work on this matter?

Well it's very common, of course, for a pathologist -- and $I$ know Dr. Emson well -- to discuss their findings with the original source, and so I discussed with him. And I also discussed a matter which was of some concern to me, and $I$ think, in fairness, $I$ should relate to that somewhat.

Dr. Ferris -- sorry -- Dr. Emson
had come to Winnipeg some years prior to this review and given a talk in which he mentioned that he had been in a case where he took the stand, as he called it, with -- in fear and trepidation because, in a sperm sample, he had not determined the human origin. And he said -- but, you know, in the context of an after-dinner speech and, you know, we doctors, we do like lawyer jokes you know -- and he said "these guys, you know, they don't understand, because $I$ escaped", he said, "because they asked me: Did you make sure, doctor, that the sperm was male? And everybody laughed and that was the end of that". And then $I$ reviewed his testimony years later and there it
was.
Q
And help us follow through, perhaps it's clear, but help us follow through with the connection, then, that you made?

And then $I$ said "Harry, there are some concerns here about this because, you know, it could be that this is not human at all", and all that. And I also had some other concerns, concerns perhaps, or I needed a clarification, and that was his conclusion that he had drawn about the motility and mobility of the sperm, and I said "you know, you reached the conclusion in, certainly valid in living persons, that they lose their motility, certainly in the vagina they lose their motility, not in the uterus", of course not. Otherwise, after four hours, none of us would have been born. Some of them, those that don't make it up the uterus lose their mobility, motility, and he had a time frame there, but $I$ said, "you know, that doesn't, that doesn't hold in frozen sperm". And he says "well how do you know the sperm was, how do you know the sperm was frozen", I said "well, you know, your report somewhere states that her womb was frozen, and so I assume, if the womb was frozen, then certainly the vagina would be frozen,
and that, so that doesn't hold". And I recall saying that "frozen sperm is sent all over the world, from Manitoba I may add, bull sperms to fertilize cows all over the world, and when they thaw out, they get happy, and they start moving again". So I said "that doesn't hold, you cannot say that", and I said to him "have you considered, also, the fact that at the time the only sperm found in her", that he examined, and he told, he told me he had, was in his report as well as in his evidence, "was in the crotch of the panties that contained sperm and the vagina", and as well as the test -- as the snow stuff, and with the -I said "with regards to the crotch and the vagina, you know", I said, "that's not valid. I mean, ladies who are sexually active have sperm in their panties, that's, we know that, and what about a boyfriend, could this not be sperm from sexual intercourse she had that night before" because, as I said -- not because $I$ believed that to be the case, but we have to take what are all the possibilities -- well I've been going there. And then so that's fine, and so therefore $I$ think $I$ mentioned in my report "you've got to be very careful here about this conclusion that it has to
be -- I'm not saying it's correct, incorrect -you have to be certain that the evidence that you give is based on, and you have to say what the strength or weakness of that evidence is, and then" -- and so on.

Anyway, so that was, to my
recollection, what $I$ discussed with Dr. Emson on this matter, and that's basically it. I did not discuss, $I$ had no reason to discuss the cause of death with him because we have no, no, no qualms about that, and the manner of death. But I did have a discussion, as $I$ said before, about he volunteered his opinions which, which are fine for what they are, but about guilt and innocence, which is not a theater in which $I$ play a role. I'm sorry, and were you saying Dr. Emson did express a view on that aspect to you?

Yes, he did.
And what did he say?
He said there he thought, it was his opinion, a personal opinion, that Mr. Milgaard was guilty.

Okay. And in terms of the discussion, the points of discussion, $I$ think we'll -- we will be able to get a bit of a clearer picture of it as we go through your report, but $I$ don't think $I$ heard you
recall that portion of the discussion where you were inquiring about the origin of the sperm. Was that something that you spoke to Dr. Emson about, in terms of whether he considered it was of human origin or not?

A

A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A
BY MR. HARDY:
Okay.
I wasn't going to get into an argument.
And were you connecting it to the after-dinner speech that you had heard him say earlier?

That made me think. That made me think. And there was another reason why $I$ was concerned about this, and that was that, you know, Dr. Emson does not normally do that human test, you don't do
that, pathologists don't do that, so why have fear and trepidation that it wasn't done? All he had to say is "I don't do that, crime lab does that", that was the end of that.

But as $I$ say, in fairness to him, it was an after-dinner speech and sometimes we do embellish them and make them more interesting, so it's not, it's not, as I say, evidence in the sense that -- under oath that he would repeat, or he didn't even perhaps mean that, but $I$ became concerned about, in general terms I became concerned of the way this thing had been handled from a forensic point of view.

And so he did not confirm with you at any point that what he was speaking about at that after-dinner speech was his work on the Gail Miller investigation?

No, he did not, but $I$ recognized it.
And again on that other aspect, we'll come back to, you are referring to sperm on the panties and also the question of the survivability of sperm, and $I$ think probably -- and $I$ know I'm over-simplifying that -- am $I$ correct that what you were getting at in that respect was that Dr. Emson had perhaps provided an opinion at trial
that the sexual attack would have taken place perhaps in a range of 12 , or less than 12 hours prior to the time of examination on the afternoon of January --

Yes.
-- or, I'm sorry, February 1st, 1970?
Yes.
Or I'm getting that wrong, January 31st of 1969.
Now I'm confusing things more. In any event, again to simplify it, you were saying that, because of the intervention of the possibility of freezing, that it was not possible to say whether or not the sexual intercourse or the deposit of the semen had perhaps taken place as far back as the evening prior?

That is correct, could not exclude that.
And $I$ didn't do a good job of simplifying that, but we'll look at the paragraph where you refer to this in your report in a moment, to cover that in a little more detail.

Just continuing on this page:
"This report ...",?
you state:
"This report is forwarded to
you in response to your request, dated

May 1, 1990, to offer an opinion on the report prepared by Dr. Ferris*. This report addresses Dr. Ferris' report but is not limited to his report."

And, just in terms of that last comment, do you recall what you were signaling by that comment?

A
Actually, it's a term that $I$ learned from lawyers, and $I$ put it in there. I don't recall anything specific. It just means that if anything else, you know, $I$ probably incorporated that.

Okay. And $I$ jumped ahead a little too quickly, I think, from my previous chain of inquiry. You've confirmed that you did have a previous discussion with Dr. Emson; do you recall any other discussions with any other of the original witnesses during the course of your review? Well I recalled, $I$ certainly asked Sergeant Paynter whether he had done the human test, because obviously that was important, and more importantly how he had done, done that. And what I, what $I$ heard from him was "I don't recall", and that concerned me somewhat because it was -- it's a routine test, $I$ mean everybody does that, from all sperms you do that, and he said "I don't recall whether $I$ did that", and that concerned me
some -- somewhat. And I think I -- I've addressed
that in the report, so $I$ had a discussion about that, yes.

Okay. And we'll see that in a moment. Any other interviews with any of the other original witnesses?

No.

Just before $I$ leave that point, in terms of the materials that were listed that you reviewed, there are a number of materials that $I$ guess were of a non-forensic nature, affidavits of Deborah Hall, David Milgaard and other materials which we know to be the submissions on behalf of David Milgaard. Did you need this sort of material for purposes of your review?

I need it, $I$ always ask, whenever $I$ do a case for anybody $I$ ask for all, "all they've got", because I have been in cases where I've only got bits and later there was confusion, that $I$ should have had all. Now $I$ just ask for everything, and in this particular case $I$ would have asked for a review also of the autopsy slides, which I did not do in this particular case, but $I$ do that normally as well, that's an extra -- I review whatever is there if $I$ can myself, give me the works, and then

I'll see what that means or not means.
And did you have any concern or would you have had any concern at the time that your review of the non-forensic material might compromise your objectivity?

It does not compromise my objectivity in that I'm fully aware that opinions given are given in context and for reasons other than of a forensic nature and I'm certainly able to separate those. Okay. Sorry, we'll pick up on the second page where $I$ left off a moment ago, beginning there, it states:
"On May 15, 1990, you asked me to
comment on the Crown's theory is that Milgaard intercepted the deceased as she walked along Avenue $N$ where it meets the east/west portion of the alley.

Allegedly, a struggle occurred at that point, and then carried on into the lane and then northward into the north/south portion of the $T$.

Due to a restriction on my
time, compounded by the lack of scale drawings, photographs, and, scaled maps of the scene and surrounding areas, it
would lead me into a situation where $I$ would offer an opinion based on insufficient personally reviewed evidence. I, therefore, must decline your request to respond."

And I take it you were obviously uncomfortable commenting on this particular aspect then, Dr. Markesteyn?

That is correct. As a forensic pathologist, as you know, we do take into consideration the scene as it relates to the body found. As a forensic pathologist and as coroners and medical examiners, we do go to scenes, so we have expertise with regard to the body and the scene, the body in its surroundings. I'm not an expert on how long it takes to run or walk or stroll or limp in darkness and lightness from $A$ to $B$, that's not my station, I'm not going there.

And just the last paragraph in this section states:
"I have read the evidence several times. As it could be helpful for me to prepare this report under similar headings as Dr. Ferris, I will do so."

And then you begin your discussion under the
heading "Pathology Evidence - Dr. Emson". The first sentence states:
"I concur with Dr. Ferris' opinion that the cause of death and the mechanism of death, including the suggested survivability of the stab wounds." And perhaps for reference we'll turn to that portion of Dr. Ferris' report, the document is 000002 , and if we could turn to page 56 of that document, please, and, I'm sorry, if we could turn to the next page beginning at the bottom, same subheading, Dr. Ferris states:
"I think there is absolutely no doubt that Gail Miller died as a direct result of stab wounds inflicted on January 31, 1969 at or around 0700 hours. It may be important, however, to note that none of the stab wounds penetrated any of the major blood vessels or the heart and that Dr. Emson in his evidence states that the cause of death was the actual
loss of blood into the chest cavity, the
"shock intendant upon this and the
embarrassment of breathing". While
there is no question that these injuries
are fatal, the speed with which an
individual becomes immobilized as a result of injuries such as this is relatively slow. Since death is as a result of bleeding from the lung tissue into the chest cavities, the speed with which unconsciousness will occur is also relatively slow. It would be my opinion that the stab wounds as described by Dr. Emson were neither immediately fatal nor even immobilizing. In my experience individuals with this type of injury may live for several minutes following the injuries. It is possible that in fact she could have survived for at least 15 minutes following the injuries."

And back to your report, page 2, so you were stating general agreement with that assessment -I am.
-- by Dr. Ferris?

Yeah, complete agreement there, yes.
And just at the bottom of the page, again I'll continue on, you state:
"The time of death is not known. I have assumed that, where the autopsy report
was silent on co-existing blunt force injuries to neck organs, forearms, thighs, knees and legs, that these injuries were not present. This also holds for the lack of documentation of any signs of asphyxia in neck organs, eyes, heart, and lungs.

I find if necessary to comment on this in view of the lack of internal bleeding described around some of the stab wounds (liver) and the, in my opinion, incredible absence of blood on the coat of the deceased as evidenced by the testimony given. Were some (or all) of the stab wounds postmortem?"

And can you explain to us what your thought process here was, Dr. Markesteyn?

A
Well, my thought -- this certainly looked like a sexual assault and -- now, those can be co-existing of other attacks, it need not be one. Very often there's blunt force in injury, there's very often strangulation or strangulation attempts or things like that, so $I$ had to be -- I agreed it was only stab wounds because all this other was absent, there was no evidence of strangulation
here. If she had been strangled and was dead or dying, then some of these wounds would not bleed any more or very little and $I$ was somewhat concerned about, or $I$ could not really explain why some of these wounds did not bleed as much as others which made me think what other possibilities are there, and strangulation signs are visible in the eyes, which was absent, I'm sure he would have mentioned that, and in the heart and lungs you see signs thereof, so $I$ don't think there was any attempt here to strangle her. I do recall there was one mention of a lip injury on the autopsy report which $I$ thought was, could be significant in that there may have been an attempt to silence her, but she certainly was not strangled or smothered, there's no evidence of that, and I totally agree with the evidence that, or the opinion, rather, that it would have taken some time for her to die. And you seem to be focusing on your observations in relation to the absence of blood and you tie that to the question of whether it was possible that it was a postmortem stabbing. Why would there be less blood in a postmortem stabbing? Well, that's how we diagnose them. The heart does
no longer pump and therefore there's no active bleeding, so the wounds are there and there's no blood escaping from them, and that was the case of the liver which made me think was she already dead and when that wound was inflicted.

And so in fairness, this was just a matter of speculation, or you were asking the question? I'm asking the question, right.

Okay. And $I$ think you are correct that Dr. Emson noted either in his testimony or in the autopsy report that the liver did bleed very little, as did one of the puncture wounds, I believe to the left lung, the right lung did bleed, and $I$ believe the evidence was that there was approximately a thousand millilitres of blood from that wound.

You mentioned the incredible absence of blood on the coat and we know that there was blood, or know now that there was blood on the coat, and in fairness to you, I reviewed the evidence of the various people involved and I think what had happened was no one commented on the presence of blood or the quantity of blood, but I don't know if any of those observations I've just mentioned to you would have changed what you speculated about in this particular paragraph?

A

Oh, yes, there was no stab wounds through her clothing, inner clothing, only the coat.

And in terms of Dr. Ferris' comment about the victim being not necessarily immobilized given the
wounds, did you have a view on that in terms of whether she could have moved or otherwise?

Well, there was absolutely no sign of any bruising, there was no sign of any fight of any kind on her at all, and $I$ don't think she moved much.

And moving to the next section then, window of Opportunity, you state:
"Dr. Ferris was of the opinion that the time frame suggested by the evidence of the trial at which the assault, undressing, alleged rape, partial redressing, (at - 40 F) could not have occurred as suggested by the evidence at the trial.

I wish to limit my comments on this matter to say that there are three elements in the time required to perpetrate this alleged crime:

1) the time it took for the accused to get from the car to the person;
2) the time it took to commit the offence at or near the place where the body was found; and,
3) the time, following the commitment of
the crime, to return to the car.
With regard to 1) and 3, there
is no corroborating evidence to indicate the distance between where the car allegedly was stuck and the place where the body was found. Obviously, therefore, $I$ cannot tell you how much time these took.

With regard to 2), it is my understanding that clothes can be ripped off a person in a matter of seconds certainly in less than a minute.

Infliction of stab wounds, even on both sides of the body, also can be accomplished within seconds and certainly within less than a minute. Ejaculation in or outside the vagina against consent or without consent can be achieved also within a very short period of time."

And again, am $I$ correct that you were generally unwilling to comment on this particular aspect?

A That is correct. In fact, I did discuss this with the -- Dr. Ferris seemed to have the impression, you know, you cannot do this in this time frame
and he really was a bit strong on that. I felt that minus 40 stuff, and, well, we know that this can be, certainly you can do anything at minus 40, that's why $I$ commented on that, that doesn't take long at all, $I$ do know that. I don't know how long it takes to get to the body, but I do know once you get there how long it takes or can take to kill a person, rape them and stop it.

And so the temperature caused you no concern in concluding that the rape may have occurred outside?

A No, because $I$ had a short, a very short discussion with the crime lab and with the CID and the crime people all take -- I, in fact, was involved in a case of a person who was performing a sexual act at minus 40. That's certainly not impossible to do that.
$Q \quad$ And --
A
Q

A
Minus 30 . Sorry, minus 30 .
And were you referring a moment ago indirectly to a discussion with Dr. Ferris about this aspect?

I don't recall whether $I$ actually did that, but $I$ certainly -- not at that time, but $I$ may have done that later.

And in terms of point 2, though, you did seem to
be of the view that the attack itself could have happened in a short amount of time?

A

MR. HARDY: This is probably a good place to break, Mr. Commissioner.
(Adjourned at 10:29 a.m.) (Reconvened at 10:51 a.m.)

BY MR. HARDY:
If we could return to page 3 of Dr. Markesteyn's report, and we left off at the bottom of the page under the subheading Semen from Vagina. You are speaking here of the vaginal aspirate that was taken at the autopsy of Gail Miller, and perhaps for context, again we'll refer first to Dr. Ferris' comments on this point which again is document 000002 , and if we could turn to page, I believe, 58 of that document, please, and if we look at -- I'm sorry, I lost my place. If you could go down a little bit, please. I'm sorry, can you go back one page, this paragraph here, and I'll read that to you, it states:

> "I note from Dr. Emson's evidence that some issue was made as to the apparent presence of blood mixed with semen in the vagina. It was suggested by

Dr. Emson that the most likely cause of this would have been staining with menstrual blood, however, he failed to find any evidence of menstruation at postmortem examination. It is not unusual to find discolouration of fluids and secretions within the vaginal tract at postmortem examination simply on the basis of sluffing and decomposition of the vaginal mucosa following death. Unless there was clear proven evidence of frank blood in the vagina, I would not consider the presence of apparent bloodstain secretions in the vaginal cavity of any significance."

If we can return to your report, the bottom of page 3, you state:
"The apparent mixture of blood and semen in the vagina of the deceased is open to many interpretations. The blood could either have originated from the deceased, the assailant, or, from both. The blood, according to the evidence, was of insufficient quantity to type as to its blood group."

And that was confirmed by Dr. Emson on cross-examination at trial.

Moving to the next page, you set out the alternatives, firstly noting blood from the deceased, and you state:
"Bleeding could have been the
result of:
injury to the genito-urinary tract;
inflammation of the genital tract; menstruation; or,
postmortem freezing and thawing of the vagina, cervix, and, endometrium.

Dr. Emson stated that chronic
cervicitis was present and that this
indeed could have been the origin of the
blood."
And that relates to the second option that had been noted above, inflammation of the genital tract, and $I$ take it that you thought this was a viable option?

A
$Q$
That could have been, yes.
Okay. And continuing on, you go on to talk about the third option, menstruation, you state:
"Dr. Emson in his testimony stated that
"there was no evidence to menstruation".

The autopsy report under the
'Microscopic Description', however, refers to changes in the endometrium consistent with imminent or commencing menstruation. Dr. Emson, in his
testimony, stated that the microscopic findings of endometrium although consistent with imminent or commencing menstruation could have been wrongly interpreted as the microscopic examination was made somewhat difficult as a result of the freezing of these tissues prior to the autopsy." I'm going to skip down to this paragraph:
"Any indirect evidence of menstruation was not evident to my satisfaction. No sanitary pads or tampons were found. The panties were blood-stained. The evidence with regard to the crotch of the panties is silent as to whether the crotch was blood-stained. The presence of blood-staining of the other articles of clothing around the panties (which were found around the ankle), makes the blood-staining of the panties, in my
opinion, more likely the result of the
assault than the result of
menstruation."
And so with respect to that third option that you
had noted above, menstruation, $I$ take it that
your view was that that was not likely --

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
And if we go back to the one sentence that $I$ left out:
"There was no evidence of injury to the genito-urinary tract."

That, of course, relates to the first option you had mentioned. And then the last sentence under this heading:
"The autopsy report is silent on the presence of blood in the urine."

And do you recall what the significance of this
comment was from this perspective?
Well, you can have blood in the urine due to a cystitis and inflammation of the bladder and that could also therefore find its way into the vagina.

I see. And did you consider option, I guess (d), or the fourth option you had set out:
"Postmortem freezing and thawing of the vagina, cervix, and, endometrium."

That is the only one that $I$ think is indeed quite probably the case here.

And that wasn't stated in your report, but that would have been your view at the time, that that was the likely source of the blood?

Yes.
And move on, the second alternative you note is Blood from the Accused and you state:
"The other source of blood, from the accused's genitals, could be the result of injury or inflammation of the genito-urinary tract. However, no evidence was produced to indicate that Mr. Milgaard at the time of the assault had any injury or inflammation to his internal or external genitalia or urinary tract.

I have addressed this matter with some detail in that it is my impression, for what it is worth, that some inference could well have been drawn that the blood and semen mixture in the vagina and the so-called blood and semen mixture retrieved from a snowbank several days later were somehow linked together."

And we'll come back to this, Dr. Markesteyn, but what was the concern that you were expressing here?

A The concern was that in order to tie Mr. Milgaard in, you had to have blood in the semen, otherwise -- because he was a non-secretor, right, so therefore if you try to say, ah, we've got blood in the vagina as well, that explains why, that there's A antigen in it, so there was an inference drawn here. We can't go on the semen alone, we have to have blood with it, and so I thought, well, you know, $I$ don't think this is blood of the accused, it had to be -- in order for it to be $B$ at -- yeah, at a time, or $A$ rather, it had to have blood in it, so I thought there was a suggestion here that $I$, you know, you've got two,
you've got both blood and semen in the snowbank, you've got blood and semen in the vagina and that explains why this person, although he's A, could be Milgaard.

Okay. And so this was just an observation you were making about a potential inference that you were concerned about?

Concerned about, that's right.
And in fairness, again you would not have been in possession at this point in time of the closing arguments of counsel for the Crown or for the defence?

No, I did not, no.
Okay. But you would have reviewed the cross-examinations, for example, conducted by Mr. Tallis in relation to this issue where he dealt with these possibilities of the blood being there as a result of menstruation and also of the cervicitis and matters of that nature?

I probably did, yes.
You state:
"In any event, there was insufficient
blood there to be typed."
And then ultimately you say:
"I concur with Dr. Ferris' opinion that
the presence of apparent blood-stained secretions in the vaginal cavity was not of any forensic significance."

And this was your conclusion on this particular aspect then?

A

Q
Okay. And then continuing on you say:
"I disagree with Dr. Emson's testimony
that shedding blood in semen is a quite
"common occurrence" as the result of
inflammation to penis, urethra,
prostate, and/or bladder. I disagree with Dr. Emson's thought expressed at that time that it was "accepted medical knowledge that small amounts of blood commonly find their way into seminal fluid of males of any age beyond puberty". I have been informed that the Forensic Laboratory in Winnipeg has never seen such a case. Other
investigators also have failed to
confirm this impression of Dr. Emson's." Would that be an accurate account of your opinion
on this point at that time?
A
Q

A

Q

A
That's a very difficult question to answer, counsel, what people ought to know and should know.

And again, you can only speak from your experience. I assume that you were practicing pathology at that time and perhaps -- you weren't a serologist, so you may not be able to answer the question, but do you know from your own personal experience and knowledge whether this -- would you have known in 1970 that this conclusion was wrong that Dr. Emson put forward?

A

Q

A
$Q$
A
Q

A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A

Q
Yes.
The next subheading, Sperm in Vagina of Deceased, and this is a continued discussion of the vaginal aspirate that was taken at the autopsy, and you state:
"Dr. Emson detected non-motile, intact
sperm in a specimen taken from the vagina of the deceased. He testified that sperm would start to lose their motility within the vagina within four hours and that probably all sperm retrieved from the vagina are non-motile in six hours following intercourse."

And was he correct on this point?

Yes, that's fairly commonly the case, yes. Okay.

The vagina is a hostile environment for sperm.
You go on to say:
"Non-motile, intact sperm was found. We do not know for certain, but, it is medically reasonable to assume that this was human sperm even though no evidence to this effect was given. Evidence was also given that sperm would lose its integrity and, therefore, would no
longer be intact, some twelve hours following the last intercourse. Whereas this, with a certain range of time, may be the case in living females this
certainly does not apply when the sperm
is frozen. Evidence was given that the
body showed "signs of extreme freezing" and that the lining of the uterus had been frozen. Therefore, no time can be given in this case to estimate the outer limit that sexual intercourse could have taken place. In any event, the sperm was not typed as to the presence of antigens and was later discarded. Therefore, in my opinion, not only the blood but also the sperm in the vagina failed to link the accused with vaginal intercourse with the deceased." And we've touched upon this earlier, but I don't know if you can simplify this further, what are you stating, in effect, in this paragraph, Dr. Markesteyn?

A
What I'm stating is that whereas certain research has been done on the presence and survivability of sperm in vaginas of living people, that does not necessarily apply, $I$ know it doesn't apply when the samples are frozen, then you have to be very careful in interpreting something that happens during life with something that happens after death in a frozen sample. We know that sperm that is frozen remains intact for a long period of
time.
And again, this ties back to Dr. Emson's evidence, I believe, that the sperm would have been deposited within the previous 12 hours from the point that he was examining the body on the afternoon of January 31st?

That's what he said, yes.
And some suggestion being made that that might be consistent then with the time of the attack?

That's an inference drawn, that's right.
Right. And what you are saying is that at the point that freezing intervened, sort of everything went on hold at that point? Exactly.

In other words, you would count back, your 12 hour window would count back from the point of freezing?

That's right.
And so that your opinion, if you were reviewing this, assuming that what you've assumed is correct, is that this evidence would simply indicate that intercourse may have taken place within the previous 12 hours to freezing? That's right.

The freezing of Gail Miller's body on the morning
in question?
A
Q Dr. Emson and he said to me "well how do you know it was frozen", I said "well you told me the uterus, or in this report that the uterus had been frozen, if the uterus is frozen then certainly the vagina would be frozen, and therefore the sperm is frozen in the vagina. That's, I think, a reasonable conclusion to draw."

Okay. And it's not mentioned, actually, in the autopsy report; is it possible that you would have gathered that information from somewhere else? From his testimony, that he could not be certain whether menstruation was imminent because of freezing and thawing of the uterus.

Yes, okay. And there is mention of that in Dr. Emson's testimony, and it's in that context, he is being asked about the question of menstruation being the reason for the presence of blood, and I
think he indicates some reservation in being able to determine that because of the freezing and thawing --

A
Q
A
Q
That's right.
-- of the tissue that was ongoing?
That's right.
Okay. If we move to the next section, the Knife Wounds, it states:
"The individual knife wounds were not described in the autopsy report as to size, direction, external and internal appearance. They were, to my knowledge, not approximated. I have reviewed some photographs which were submitted to me by Dr. Emson. They hold no rulers. It is my understanding that photographs taken by the Identification officer at the time of autopsy may show consistency of the knife used in the attack. As you know, more photographs are taken at autopsy than are used in evidence. If still available, all the photographs taken by the Identification officer should be made available for review.

It is unlikely that all the knife wounds would be the same five-eights of an inch in width. I am sure the estimated depth of penetration of the knife blade took into account the thickness of the coat (not stated) as to the possible length of the knife blade. In passing, $I$ find it difficult to explain why the knife blade was broken in view of the fact no bones were struck."

I don't know that $I$ need to spend much time on this section, but that would be an accurate account of your opinion at the time --

And was there any forensic evidence -- I'm sorry -- was there any forensic significance to your last observation where you note you found: "... it difficult to explain why the knife blade was broken in view of the fact no bones were struck."?

A
Yes. You see, one has to explain how come the knife breaks, all right. And as you know in, or
could know, in autopsies where the death is due or the assault is due to a knife we always x-ray the bodies, because we very often find that the tip of the knife breaks when it hits bone, and certainly when the knife is applied with great strength and pressure. In this case it was broken but there was no mentioning in the autopsy report at all that the bone had been hit, and $I$ couldn't understand why that happened. I just raised that, I don't understand why that is, did it break after the assault, $I$ don't know that.

Okay. So it didn't necessarily lead to any forensic significance for you?

No. I still think this is, without a doubt, a death as a result of knife wounds inflicted.

And do you recall considering, in terms of the knife wounds -- and it looks like maybe you were under the impression that you didn't have enough information to do so -- do you recall considering any question about whether there could have been different knives involved in the attack, or matters like that?

A
Well that is, that's why I mentioned the fact that when you do knife wounds, you do approximate the wounds. What $I$ mean by that, if you hit skin with
a knife it starts to gape, so when you put those edges together, so instead of an oval when you put it together you find that the wound is much longer than it looks like when it's gaping, that's why you have to approximate.

Now what does that mean? A
knife does not only cut, it can also cut -- or stab, it can also cut. That means it can be longer, longer than the width of the blade, but not narrower, right, unless it's a pointed knife and only the tip goes in. So there are certain tests that we do at autopsy to determine the consistency. Of course nowadays there are many more and better tests to do that, but this is what a pathologist does. He -- and then he estimates or determines, rather, if he can, the length of the blade as it relates to the depth of the wounds, and when you do that you have to take into consideration the clothing, how thick is that, because obviously -- right, and the compressibility of that clothing, and the compressibility of the tissue. So this is not easy science but we try and see if, at least from a pathology point of view, that particular weapon could have been used, whether it is -- whether a
knife could be used with certain characteristics.
Now to determine if that's
indeed that particular knife, there are better tests than that, like serology and all that.

Okay. Then am I correct then, though, that you didn't feel you had sufficient information to make determinations of that nature?

I could not say that that particular knife was used, that $I$ would not do, I just made the observation that certain tests could have been done, but the ultimate test would be the serology on the blade.

Okay.
On an -- in an uncontaminated knife. All right?
Okay.
If there was blood on it, in an uncontaminated knife it is reasonable to conclude that that's the knife that entered the body, but if there is blood anywhere -- everywhere, and there is a knife, you cannot draw that conclusion.

Okay. Turning to the next page, please. And this
is, the sub-heading is Seminal Stains at Scene (Yellowish Stains in the Snowbank), and of course this is the discussion, again, relating to the frozen substance that is found at the scene by

Lieutenant Penkala on February 4th, 1969. And I think probably for context, again, I should -- we should review Dr. Ferris' report in terms of what he says on this aspect, it's a little bit longer, but if we could turn, please, to 000002 . And at page 58 of that document -- got it wrong again, I did, I got it wrong again. Next page, please. Starting here, Dr. Ferris states:
"Seminal Stains At Scene
I have real concerns as to integrity and continuity of the samples of alleged semen that were recovered on February 4 th at the scene.

It is apparent from reading all of the statements of the witnesses and the police that by the time the body was examined by police and pathologists, the scene was extensively trampled. There is nothing to indicate whether this trampling was as a result of movements by the victim during the dying process or whether or not the trampling was as a result of the assailant or perhaps other people who may have found the body earlier. A very large number of people
attended that scene including those examining the body.

The descriptions of the scene are in general reasonably precise. It is clear that there was considerable blood and bloodstaining of the snow around and underneath the body. The police, however, clearly describe a detailed search of the area immediately around the body both before and after the body was removed. There is evidence that the snow was shovelled to one side while he were searching for other evidence. In view of the porosity of snow particularly deeply frozen snow, mixing of evidence and soiling with blood from the area around the body would be almost bound to happen. There is also evidence that the area was melted during the searching process although I have been unable to determine the extent of this melting."

Down the page:
"In view of the extensive disturbance of the scene and the obvious
potential for contamination of the scene, $I$ find it quite remarkable that two small pools of semen were identified four days after the initial examination. On the basis of the forensic testing that was done $I$ have no doubt that semen was recovered as described. However, it would be most unusual for this semen not to have been contaminated by all of the tampering which had gone on with the evidence around the scene. I am surprised that with this clear inability to prove either the continuity or integrity of these seminal samples, they were considered admissible evidence.

The fact that when this frozen semen was melted down in a tube and appeared to be slightly bloodstained is not a surprise. I would find it hard to believe that any object that had been recovered four days after the murder from the area immediately adjacent to where the body had lain would not have been stained by blood derived from the area adjacent to the body."

And if we return to your report, please. It states at the top, first paragraph:
"I share Dr. Ferris' concerns about the integrity and continuity of the samples of the alleged semen which were recovered on February 4, 1969, at the scene. The scene, according to the evidence, had been extensively searched, trampled, and, the snow had been melted - in and around the body. There was heavy staining with blood from the deceased. The evidence seems to indicate that two yellowish stains were discovered some four days after the assault took place."

And we read Dr. Ferris' words in terms of concerns about contamination and integrity; you shared all of those same concerns, then, Dr. Markesteyn?

Very much, yes.
Okay. And what was your initial conclusion, then, as to the potential value that this evidence should have had at trial?

I think it should have been, if entered at trial at all, it should have been testified to as to its
strength or weaknesses thereof.
We'll continue on to the next paragraph?
"Yellowish stains in
snowbanks most commonly find their origin, not in human ejaculates, but in urine, most commonly of canine origin.

I have been informed that male dog urine often contains semen. 'Unused' semen in dogs is not reabsorbed but is secreted in the urine. Dogs urinate over other dogs' semen and/or urine to establish territory. Dogs have antigens which serologically cross-react with human A-antigen. One of the two yellowish stains contained semen, perhaps intermingled with urine. The other one did not contain semen and perhaps contained urine only. We will never know."

And am $I$ correct that this, effectively, was the expression of your opinion that this substance may have been dog urine?

A
Yes, because both looked alike, and one contained semen and the other one didn't, and they had the same appearance.


Q

A
Q

A

And you've explained to us how that theory evolved. Am I correct, again, that the yellowish coloration was the key indicator for you in terms of proceeding with that consideration?

Yes, sir.
Okay. And we'll continue to look at this a little bit further. Just moving down to the next paragraph:
"Human semen does not freeze
into a yellowish stain at - 40 degrees Fahrenheit. In fact, it is white and difficult to spot in snow other than through special techniques such as ultraviolet light exposure, etc."

And, again, this is referring to the tests that you conducted at the time of your review? That's correct.

Including in the freezer that was at minus 40 ? Yes, sir.

And $I$ think, just for the sake of completeness, there were a couple of photos taken, and I'll refer those to you, the first one being 338030 . And do you recognize that photo as being one that was taken in the course of your testing? Yes, I do.

And, again, the purpose, $I$ take it, of the colour chip chart beside the petri dish was to compare the colour of the frozen substance to --

Yes, sir.
-- the colours noted?
Yes, sir.
Okay. And, again, there was one other document, I think it's much the same, $I$ don't know if we have to turn to it, but 338031 . Yes, again same thing, I see there $I$ think the difference is that the substance is frozen, now, in the petri dish, and again, it was for purposes of doing a colour comparison; is that correct?

Yes, sir, that's correct.
And under the circumstances that you previously described for us?

Yes, sir.
So back to your report. Continuing on from where we were in that paragraph, and you state:
"One of the two yellowish lumps was found to contain semen; the other one, although it looked the same, did not contain semen or any other human material in that it did not contain, we are informed, blood, sweat, tears or
saliva. Dr. Emson examined the material
prior to having it sent to the Crime Laboratory in Regina. He has informed me that he was sure it was semen, but, that he could not say from what species it originated."

And is this the conversation that you were referring to earlier?

A

Q

A
Q

A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A
$Q$
Yes.
And is that an accurate account of what Dr. Emson advised you during that conversation?

Yes.
And does that refresh your memory any further in terms of the -- that portion of your discussion with Dr. Emson?

Yes, and $I$ raised, $I$ must have raised and $I$ did raise, you know "are you sure that this wasn't dog urine or dog semen".

And your recollection --
Yeah.
-- is that Dr. Emson responded in the manner noted?

That's right.
And continuing from there:
"The Serology Section determined it to
be not only semen but of human origin." And, again, that, $I$ take it you confirmed that through the evidence of Staff Sergeant Paynter -That's correct.
-- as provided at the trial?
Yes, sir.
"In order to reach a firm scientific conclusion whether the semen retrieved
from the snowbank four days after the assault was indeed human one needs to review the methodology used by the serologist at that time and thus one needs to review the notes that were made at that time."

And I'll just pause there. Notwithstanding the fact, then, that Staff Sergeant Paynter
identified the semen as human at the trial, upon your review of the evidence you still had concerns or questions about that aspect? Yes, I did.

And in what form were your concerns still existing?

A
Well the concerns were this; did the test to determine its human origin, what was that test? All right. Not that it was done, it was done, and
he told me so. Was there any possibility of any -- in that test, that particular test, if there were contamination with the specimen with human blood, was it possible that he would determine the human origin by a cross-contamination of other tissue or other fluids in that sample. In other words, $I$ wanted to know is that test that he did at that time very specific for the presence of a human origin fluid, not only in the sperm, but in the surrounding material. As you know, sperm, or semen contains sperm and fluid, and was it possible, if he did it -- and I don't know what he did -- if he did it on the fluid, and it had contained blood, then it would be human, it would -- would it? Would it be so specific that it would detect the human origin of the contaminated product rather than the sperm. Now I wanted to know what is the methodology, how did you use it, what did you use, what are the controls, what are your concerns, what did you do, do you do -- I remember doing this myself when I was a pathologist because this was part of our training -- although I'm not a serologist but we do do this stuff as part of our training -- we had -- when $I$ did that in Glasgow we had samples
of origin of many animals that we were using at the time. In fact, we went to the Glasgow Zoo where we had apes and monkeys and zebras and the whole bit, just to make sure that there was no chance of cross-contamination of serology which is, as you know it occurs, because in dogs there is cross-contamination with humans; what did you do, how sure are you that this is a pure sample and not a contaminated sample with other human tissue, which gives you the conclusion it's human, but how sure of it are you thereof? That was my question.

Okay. And continuing to the next paragraph:
"I have been informed that the original notes on which this evidence by Staff Sgt. Paynter was based are no longer available. Staff Sgt. Paynter informed me that he does not remember (some twenty years after the event) whether or not he performed specific tests to determine the human origin of these specimens."

And in terms of the first portion of that paragraph, do you recall who had informed you that the original notes were no longer available?

A

I don't recall who informed me. I don't recall that. I may have discussed that with Mr. Asper, that's quite possible, $I$ may have discussed it with the staff sergeant himself, but I don't recall doing that. But I did call, I do remember calling him asking him whether he had actually done the human test on this, and what test was performed, specific tests, all right, to determine the human origin. This was my question. I knew, because it says it in the -- that he had done the human test, but what specific -- how specific is that, meaning if there's any contamination would it detect that. That was my question.

And in terms of your discussion, or your recollection of your discussion with Staff Sergeant Paynter, is your recollection as stated here, that he did not remember whether or not he performed specific tests to determine human origin?

That is correct, yes.
And as you are aware, we have heard from Staff Sergeant Paynter, and he has testified that he doesn't recall this conversation with you, but you have a clear recollection of speaking with him on this matter?

A
$Q$
A
Q

A
Q

Well I wouldn't say that $I$ have a clear recollection, but $I$ probably did talk to him, because I did talk to the crime lab people quite commonly, and $I$ don't -- in fairness to him, $I$ don't recall, clearly, having that conversation, but my reports says $I$ did, and -Okay.
-- I don't doubt my report.
Okay. And, as you're also aware, that the Commission has received Staff Sergeant Paynter's original lab notes, or what he has identified as his original lab notes, and we'll review those in a moment. But you were clearly under the impression, at this time, that those original notes were not available?

That's correct.
Just to the next paragraph. It states:
"The fact that the semen contained an $A$-antigen does not make it human nor, $I$ am informed, does the enzyme test for phosphatase used at that time make it human. The human antibody test doesn't make it human if there was any contamination with human blood. The only way of excluding this semen from
being of non-human origin would have been the morphology and/or species specific antigen-antibody reaction tests."

And what were these tests that you are referring to here and how might they have assisted? Well they -- $I$ just testified to that.

To the anti-human --
That's right.
-- protein test?
Yes, and then you set it up, you -- first of all is it possible if you mixed, if you were to mix, for instance if you were to mix dog sperm with human blood, or a bit thereof, would it then test human? A very simple test to do. And not only dogs, but they use other animals as well, right, to make sure that the human origin is specific and sensitive and specific. This is what $I$ was after. Are you, have you actually excluded contamination which allegedly took place here, or we were told there was blood in it; does that interfere with your test? And I -- I don't know the answer.

And what was the morphological test that you were --

A Well that is --

Q -- referring to?
A
-- that is when you look under the microscope, and under the microscope, and if you are a serologist, and if you have looked at dog sperms, you might recognize them. I, as a quasi-amateur, tried to do this myself, and $I$ cannot see the difference, but I'm not a serologist.

But you are reporting that that would be a manner in which you could --

Could be.
-- identify human sperm?
Could be.
Okay.
And certainly at that time, as you know, morphology, looking under the microscope, is not as good as other tests that we know as hairs and fibres and so on.

But am $I$ correct that you were setting out those two tests as, your words were, "the only way of excluding this semen from being of non-human origin"?

A
Q Okay. And it goes on to say:
"I assume the slides made of
this semen have not been preserved."

And that concludes your discussion on this aspect. But when -- in summary then, when we consider the theory relating to dog urine, what -- what were you effectively saying in your report?

I'm saying that this could be, and show me that $I$ am wrong.

Okay. And $I$ have been mentioning to you, we've -we have the benefit, now, of some information that you weren't privy to at the time of your review, and there is some other information as well that $I$ want to bring to your attention to see how your opinion may have been affected, and the first observation $I$ had -- and it, and it perhaps isn't the most relevant one or most important one -but, again, you've confirmed for us that the key indicator for you in terms of reaching this theory initially was the yellowish colour, as had been described by Lieutenant Penkala, of the substance found in the snow?

And the fact there were two of the same colour. Okay. And how's that relevant, what, how -Because one contained nothing, so that was not containing any semen, yet it had the same colour. Okay. But if $I$ just follow you through on that,
and we follow through what your theory became, the fact that one of them didn't contain semen might be seen to exclude the dog theory that you were mentioning, at least in relation to that particular spot?

Not necessarily, because as you know, many dogs pee, not all of them contain semen.

So you mean it would be different dogs depositing one, the one stain, a different dog --

Why not?
-- depositing together?
After four days? Why not.
Okay. And were you aware that Staff Sergeant Paynter described the substance, in his testimony, as pale yellowish or clearish?

Yes.
And would those descriptors -- and I guess 'clearish' is the most obvious one -- but I take it if the descriptor of that substance had come to you as clearish, that that wouldn't necessarily have set you off on the same theory relating to dog urine?

A
No, because by the time he got it that was intermingled with snow and is diluted, -Okay.

A
-- so the colour would be less yellow.
And so you were going from the description of the officer who found the --

That's right.
-- substance initially? And also, Dr. Markesteyn,
we know from the trial testimony of Victor
Molchanko, who was the hair and fibre specialist at the lab, that seven human pubic hairs were retrieved from one of the vials, and if we go back to his original notes they tell us that it was the vial that we're speaking of, or that contained the substance that we're speaking of that had sperm in it as well. Do you recall reviewing that information during your review of the transcripts? I don't particularly recall. I probably was aware of it, I could have been aware of it, $I$ don't really recall that. I do recall thinking about it later, at some time, and $I$ became aware of it and I reached some conclusions on what that meant. And how would that have impacted your theory if you were aware of it at the time that you were considering these matters? If it had been an uncontaminated specimen, meaning it was a specimen which had not been, shall we say, interfered with, if you find semen in an
uncontaminated specimen with human pubic hair it is entirely reasonable to conclude that they belong together and, therefore, would be human. In a contaminated specimen -the presence of pubic hair at that scene doesn't surprise me at all, this lady was viciously attacked, her panties were removed with, we have reason to believe with force, the fact there are pubic hairs at that scene doesn't surprise me at all.

And bringing it to what it actually was, if the seven pubic hairs were actually taken from the stain that we have been referring to, is that different from what you have been -- does that cause you different considerations from what you have just been referring?

Well if they were together, if they were, let's assume that this is correct and it is relatively uncontaminated, then $I$ think we have to put great credibility on that. And, also, it means how does it get there? If these sperm were together with the pubic hair, $I$ think an inference can be drawn, which we have already drawn, and that is this; if that is the case, then first of all that sperm must have been found on the surface, because that
meant that an -- a pure ejaculate does not contain, as you know -- we all know that -- does not contain pubic hairs, they don't go with the ejaculate. It could be, therefore, that she moved, she did not move, that it leaked from the vagina with the pubic hair and stayed together, and if that is the case it was post-mortem excretion of semen and pubic hair, which meant that she was not moving much following the sexual assault.

And with that information that you have mentioned,
I suppose with the qualifications that you have mentioned, would it have changed the report as presented on this aspect?

Well, as $I$ said, $I$ had so little confidence in whatever was found that $I$ did not consider it of any significance at all in the sense that, from a scientific point of view, $I$ found it very difficult to believe that, with all that blood there, it had to be on the surface. If my theory is correct, that to have it together, sticking together, all right, semen and hair sticking together, it meant that they both, they were both together undisturbed, that must have been at the surface. If it was not on the surface, if it was
found in the bottom or half-way down the pile, well then the intermingling, that made no sense at all, that could have been -- occurred from the shovelling alone. It had to be on the surface. But I'm told that the surface was covered with blood.

Now is -- am I now to understand
that it was found at the surface not as the result of shovelling, in spite of the blood there, or was it the result of intermingling with shovels of semen and hairs. And, therefore, $I$ think from a scientific point of view, if unadulterated as I said, if it had not been contaminated, you have to say "look, these are, this is it".

This is it?
This is not, you have to say -- it can still be, certainly, but you have to say "we're not 100 percent certain of this because we -- there is intermingling going on".

We're not 100 percent certain of what, I'm sorry? That they do belong together.

Okay.
A
Because the specimens are churned up.
Okay. Well let's follow through with this, and do you recall talking with this -- talking with a

A
Q
A
Q

professor Neil Boyd on this issue, who is a professor from UBC -Yes, right. -- involved in conducting a review -Right.
-- in about 1991? Do you have a recollection of him bringing this very issue to your attention at that point?

Not really, but he certainly could have. And $I$ haven't -- if we could turn, please, to the document, I believe it's 003688 , and I believe it's page 003704, and perhaps, I may be reading more than we need to, but just for context, Professor Boyd writes:
"It is also not impossible that
contamination by other organic
substances could have caused a positive reading for the 'A' antigen. This could have occurred, for example, through contact between the sample and dirt on a shovel or through contact between the sample and a leather glove. In June of 1990 the Chief Medical Examiner for the Province of Manitoba, Dr. Peter Markesteyn, suggested that the semen
found at the scene might be dog semen from dog urine. He noted that dog urine is the most common yellowish substance found in the snow, and that dog urine contains traces of dog semen, which test positive for the presence of the 'A' antigen. In his report on the Milgaard case he noted that, "The only way of excluding this semen from being of non-human origin would have been the morphology and/or species specific antigen-antibody reaction tests. What Dr. Markesteyn did not consider is the trial evidence from hair and fibre specialist Victor Malchanko of the RCMP Crime Detention Laboratory; Malchanko told the court that he found seven pubic hairs in the semen stain. Dr. Markesteyn now agrees that it is more probable that this was a human semen stain."

And I guess I'll pause there. Do you recall a discussion with Professor Boyd where you confirmed as it's indicated in this report?

A
I don't specifically recall it, but $I$ certainly
agree with his conclusion. I could have said that, yes.

So you agree with the conclusion that at this point you agreed that it was more probable that this was a human semen stain based upon that information?

More probable, yes.
Okay. And if we turn back to the report, please -- I'm sorry, your report. And as I mentioned, we also -- I'm sorry, the page prior, continuing our discussion on this aspect. As I mentioned, we also have Staff Sergeant Paynter's original lab notes and his Inquiry testimony and he has testified that the notes, and we reviewed those together, that he kept at the time, confirmed that an anti-human protein test was done on the substance, first of all, and secondly, that he did conduct a microscopic examination of the substance and identified human spermatozoa. Now, this would be something that you weren't aware of at the time of your review. If you had had that information that $I$ 've just mentioned to you, and it was accurate information, how would that have impacted your opinion?

A
It would have -- I would have been less likely to
pursue this matter of it being of canine origin.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Where were you getting that?

MR. HARDY: I'm sorry, which part?
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Where were you getting that information?

MR. HARDY: The lab notes that we referred to during --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh, I see, you referred him to your report, so you are reading this from the lab notes, and -- all right, I understand.

MR. HARDY: Yeah, lab notes in
combination -- I'm sorry, I probably didn't present that clearly, Mr. Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: That's all right.

MR. HARDY: The lab notes in combination with what Staff Sergeant Paynter testified to at the Inquiry.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: All right.

BY MR. HARDY:
Q And, I'm sorry, Dr. Markesteyn, accepting that information as accurate, you've indicated that it would have had an impact then on your opinion?

A It would have, yes.

Q And how so?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A

Q any great inference from it.

Okay. So I think I'm hearing you say that you may have still actually mentioned in your report that the possibility existed that this substance could have been dog urine?

A
Q

A

Q

A
Q
A

Yes, or contaminated with it.
And what about the confirmation that a microscopic examination was done and that Staff Sergeant Paynter indicated that he identified, in terms of morphology, that the sperm were human sperm? If $I$ had known that, then $I$ would not have raised the issue of it being of canine origin, I would not.

Okay. So that particular aspect is more relevant or more important for purposes of what you are indicating now than some of the others that we've mentioned?

Yes.
Or more indicative I guess?
That's right.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Just put that question again, please?

MR. HARDY: I had asked him if he was aware of, and we accept Staff Sergeant Paynter's information as fact for a moment, if he was aware that a microscopic examination of the frozen substance had been conducted by Staff Sergeant Paynter in 1969 and that from that microscopic examination Staff Sergeant Paynter identified human spermatozoa on the basis of viewing the
morphology of the spermatozoa, whether or not he would have still had the opinion that this was possibly dog urine.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well, but I understood him to answer to that question, which was put to him before, that it would have impacted his opinion, that he would have thought it was less likely that the substance was of canine origin, but he still would have raised the question in his report.

MR. HARDY: Yes, and perhaps it was my mistake, $I$ combined two factors $I$ think in the question that $I$ initially put to Dr. Markesteyn, those factors being the anti-human test along with the microscopic examination.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: No, no, that was your first question. I mean, it's now apparent, as it was not apparent to him when he did his report, that Paynter had done the desired tests and you asked him then had you known that at the time would it have impacted your opinion, and he said it would have been, to a degree, impacted, because I wouldn't be quite so confident in the possibility of non-canine origin.

```
MR. HARDY: Right.
```

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: But I still would have mentioned it because there was certain things that $I$ still didn't know, i.e., the quantity of spermatozoa observed under microscopic examination. Now, which is it? BY MR. HARDY:

Well, perhaps we can -- Dr. Markesteyn, let's cover it again. What we now know that Staff Sergeant Paynter did is a couple of things, apparently, and again assuming this to be the case, (a), that he did conduct what he described as an anti-human protein test on this particular frozen substance in 1969 and that he confirmed from that test that this substance was of human origin, and if $I$ pause there, I'll ask the question, if you had known that information during the time of your deliberations on this matter, how would that have affected your opinion in relation to the possibility that this substance was dog urine?

I did know that information at the time of my report and that did not influence me because $I$ needed to know how specific that anti-human test was and --

Okay. And then -- I'm sorry?

A
Q

A

Q

A
$Q$
A
Q
A

And now the morphology is different.
Okay. So -- and then the second question or the second part of that is if you had known that a microscopic examination was done of the spermatozoa by Staff Sergeant Paynter in 1969 and that he had identified the spermatozoa morphologically as being of human origin, how would that have affected your opinion?

Then $I$ would have said, in all $I$ would have said it is human sperm, $I$ would not have thought that, or I had no reason to adduce that, so it's human sperm perhaps contaminated with dog urine because human sperm doesn't look yellowish.

Okay. So ultimately at the end of that then you still would have offered the opinion that it was possibly dog urine?

Contaminated.
Contaminated with dog urine?
That's right.
Okay. And why would you have still added that? Because if the other stain was identical, which I'm sure is, was dog urine, and it's quite possible that -- it's rather irrelevant, but it is an indication of the contamination that can take place at scenes when dogs have access to that,
that they can contaminate, but $I$ would certainly not have put forward in this report that this is, in all probability, not human, because I would have no reason to do that, $I$ would have said human it is, sperm it is, he says it is, $I$ go with that, right, and $I$ still think it's possible that it's just a contaminated specimen. I don't think it would have affected anything because it would not affect the humanity of the morphology.

Okay. And I hope we're clear on that. So I think what you are saying is in terms of the sperm, the semen at the scene, you would have been confident that it was of human origin?

I would not have any reason to doubt that.
And that the only issue that might still have been raised in your deliberations, and perhaps reported on, is the possibility that that human semen had been contaminated with urine, perhaps dog urine? Whatever.

And is that correct?
That's correct.
Okay. Is that clear, Mr. Commissioner, or can I assist any further in terms of that particular area?
have to wait for the report.

BY MR. HARDY:
Okay. I'll turn you now to the next page of your report under the heading Blood in Semen from Snowbank, and of course this talks about the question of whether or not there was blood in the frozen substance found at the scene, and you state at the top of the page:
"The evidence suggested that an attempt was made to determine if the seminal fluid specimen retrieved from the snowbank contained blood. Evidence was given that a method used in hospitals at that time was used for the determination of blood in urine. This in all probability was the Hemostix test and, if so, would have been used contrary to manufacturer's instructions which specifically limits the use to a screening test for blood in urine. The evidence given at the trial made it very clear that this test is not specific for blood. Not only do vegetables and leather give a positive reaction but so do also a range of bacteria and
contaminated material such as soil (from
shovels) as well as the cytocrome
enzymes of spermatozoa themselves. The
evidence stated that confirmatory tests
(presumably hemochromogen) failed to
confirm that this was blood."

And would that be an accurate account then of your thoughts at this time on this particular aspect?

A
Yes, sir.
And was this, would $I$ be correct in guessing that this was largely Dr. Merry's work then that you had consulted on?

That is correct, yes.
And $I$ don't know if much turns on it. Mr. Paynter confirmed at the original trial, and again here at the Inquiry, that the confirmatory test was not actually done or was not attempted because there wasn't a sufficient sample. Now, I assume, though, given the wording of your report, that wouldn't have had an impact though on your ultimate conclusion on that point?

A
Not really, no.
Okay. Turn to the next section, subheading A-Antigens in the Semen from Snowbank, and you
state:
"If this was uncontaminated semen, then this semen cannot possibly be from Mr. Milgaard as he was stated to be an "A, non-secretor". A-antigens can find their origin in non-human material such as animal blood and secretions, bacteria, and, again, soil."

And again, would that be an accurate account of your view at the time?

A
Yes, sir.

And what was -- $I$ think you probably already answered this, but what was your view on the possibility of non-contamination of that substance?

A
Well, actually it was very little possibility of non-contamination.

Okay. Moving to the next paragraph:
"I agree with the opinion expressed by
Mr. Brian Jay that if blood
contamination of type $A$ had taken place, but that the amount of blood was so
little that it would be Hemostix
positive and hemochromogen negative, the amount of blood would also be too small 25
to show the presence of A-antigen."
And we went through this with Dr. Merry, but I assume that in other words, accepting this to be the case, the A antigens that were found in the frozen substance originally could not be accounted for by the presence of blood?

A
Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
$Q$ That is correct.

And again, do you know personally whether this information should have been known -- or would you have been aware of this information in 1970?

Yes, I think that was known at the time, yes. From your experience and your dealings in matters of that nature?

That's right.
The next paragraph states:
"The Judge, however, made it quite clear to the jury that, in his opinion, there was no evidence to show that contamination of the semen with blood had occurred."

And you were satisfied with this direction from your review of the trial transcript?

How do you mean satisfied with that direction? Perhaps not a good question, but you had clearly concluded from your review of the trial
transcript, or you had clearly observed that the judge had given this direction?

That was my impression, yes.
Okay. And then the last paragraph under that subheading:
"I agree with Dr. Ferris' conclusions on page five of his letter that assuming the fact Mr. Milgaard is blood A, non-secretor and the semen revealed the presence of type $A$-antigens, a limited number of interpretations can be based on this evidence. He listed them under '1', '2', '3', and '4'. I am in
agreement with this opinion. I will not repeat these interpretations as you have them available to you in Dr. Ferris' report."

And we've covered these conclusions with Dr. Ferris, and I'll touch upon them indirectly in your conclusion, Dr. Markesteyn.
"I must stress, however, my assumption
that Mr. Milgaard is an $A$, non-secretor
is based on the evidence submitted at
the trial. This assumption could be subject to challenge. The determination
of the non-secretor status of Mr.
Milgaard, although perhaps acceptable at
that time, would now no longer serve as
proof of his non-secretor status."
And again, that would be an accurate account of
your views on that particular aspect at this
time, Dr. Markesteyn?
Yes, sir.
And $I$ think you expressed for $u s$ earlier that you
had grave doubts about the validity of the test
that was originally done which suggested that Mr.
Milgaard was a non-secretor?
A That's correct.
Move to the next section, Hair and Fibre Material
Recovered from the Nurse's Badge:
"I understand from the evidence given
that the hair and fibre material
recovered from the nurse's badge did not
originate from the nurse's clothing
itself. Obviously, badges from nurses'
uniforms have lots of fibres sticking to
them in their natural exchange of trace
material as the result of normal course
of events and obviously does not
necessarily mean that these originated
from the assailant. These badges are not washed; they are taken from uniforms and put on again whenever a clean uniform is put on."

Next page:
"The presence of hairs and fibres on the badge may have given the impression that there must have been close bodily contact between the assailant and the deceased. This is perhaps what Dr. Ferris meant when he said: "As present in court $I$ believe it could even have been misleading to the jury."

And do you recall whether you shared Dr. Ferris' concern in this regard?

Well, yes, $I$-- it didn't make much sense, it didn't mean much to me at all, the presence of these hairs and fibres, unless they were linked to the accused, but they were there. I didn't see much significance there at the time. And do you recall being aware from a review of the transcript that there was no link drawn between those fibres or proven between the fibres? No, I don't remember that $I$ was aware of that. I probably wasn't.

Q

A
$Q$

Okay. You didn't think, though, on an observation of this point, that that observation would have had any significance?

Any significance at all, no.
And then the last paragraph:
"I understand a suggestion was made that close contact of the assailant with the body of the deceased would result in a lot of blood-staining of the assailant's clothes. If sexual intercourse took place prior to the stabbing this would not necessarily be so. Also, the stabbing alone would not necessarily leave much, if any, blood-stains on the clothes of the assailant."

And again, that was an accurate account of your opinion on those particular matters?

It is not unreasonable, but you can actually, or you need not, you need not. It depends on the amount of bleeding and the direction of the blood

A

A
and all that, and the way the knife is withdrawn, is blood-stained, and it's reinserted in between, that's called off-cast splattering. Wounds themselves, stab wounds themselves need not bleed much to the outside of the body, they very often lead to bleeding to the inside of the body. They need not bleed to the outside. In fact, it is well known in emergency medicine that one can miss stab wounds that can indeed be very serious because they don't bleed because the skin is elastic, so it's fairly variable the amount of blood that is present on a person. I'll refer to your conclusion --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Just a second, before you leave that point. You don't mention anything about the slash wounds on the throat, Doctor.

No. If there was a slash wound -- now, if they hit the carotid --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: It did not.
Well, then they need not bleed much.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: But there were multiple.

There were multiple, but they need not, and they were not very deep if $I$ remember, they certainly
did not hit the jugular which is the vein or the artery --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I believe so, yes.
A
$Q$ BY MR. HARDY:

Moving to your conclusion, you state in the first paragraph:
"In conclusion, I have, contrary to Dr.
Ferris, no opinion whether the window of opportunity was insufficient for Mr.

Milgaard to have committed this crime.
I have insufficient data to reach an
opinion."
And we've covered that, that was an accurate account then of your position on this matter?

A Yes, sir.

And then the paragraph:
"I agree with Dr. Ferris that the
serological evidence presented at the
trial failed to link David Milgaard with
the semen retrieved from vagina,
snowbank, and crotch of panties."
And this was your conclusion at the time?

5

A Yes, sir.
Q

I believed that he was a non-secretor, I would have, like him, I would have said this is not Mr. Milgaard's, $I$ can exclude him, being the source of that semen, but $I$ did not have that degree of confidence that it wasn't.

And, I'm sorry, you had referred -- is it just to the secretor aspect?

That's correct, the A stuff, the blood group stuff.

But is it also -- your conclusion in that respect also relied upon the semen being human and uncontaminated?

Yes, that's right.
And then the next paragraph:
"In my opinion, the serological evidence presented at the trial was on very shaky scientific grounds to a degree that it may very well have been erroneous. I do not know what effect, if any, this evidence had on the jury in order to reach a verdict in Mr. Milgaard's trial. Unless another trial were held, we will never know if another jury, properly instructed on the scientific merits of these forensic tests, would draw another
inference."

And have we covered the concerns that you had about the value and presentation of the forensic evidence?

Yes, you have.
And you are ultimately saying that if this evidence had been accurately presented, or perhaps not presented at all, is your point that we don't know how a jury in those circumstances may have reacted?

I would not know, no.
Right, okay. And again, fair to say that you weren't aware at this point again of the closing arguments of counsel for the defence or for the Crown?

No, I was not.
MR. HARDY: This is likely a good spot to break for lunch, Mr. Commissioner.
(Adjourned at 11:58 a.m.)
(Reconvened at 1:32 p.m.)

BY MR. HARDY:
Q
Good afternoon, Dr. Markesteyn. We'll pick up where we left off before the lunch break. We had completed a review of your report and $I$ wanted to ask you, next, what your recollection was in terms
of what was done with the report?
As far as $I$ recall, that report was then submitted to Mr. Williams, and I believe he was on behalf of the Section 690, to the Minister of Justice, and I'm sure that is where it went, in fact $I$ know it went there.

Okay, and you would have initially forwarded it to Mr. Asper?

That's correct, yes.
And so your understanding was that it may be involved, somehow, in the ongoing Section 690 application on behalf of David Milgaard, that your report may have a part to play in that ongoing application?

I would think so, yes. I think that was the purpose of it, yes.

And there was a letter that we have from Mr. Asper to Mr. Williams enclosing the report, the document is 157075, and you'll see it's a letter dated June 5th, 1990 directed to Mr. Williams from Mr. Asper. And I will just refer you to the first paragraph, it states:
"Please find enclosed a copy of the report of Dr. Peter Markesteyn, who as you know is the Chief Medical

Examiner for the Province of Manitoba.

You will note that the report confirms
the original report of Dr. James Ferris
which was sulomitted with our
application. However, it goes further to suggest that the samples used to link David Milgaard to the scene of the crime could well have been dog urine, which could have caused the results suggesting the presence of sperm and/or blood.

Assuming that these samples were in fact semen, Dr. Markesteyn confirms that they could not have come from David

Milgaard."
And would you have agreed with this
characterization of your findings that was provided by Mr. Asper?

Yes, in essence, yes.
Okay. And just on a couple of points, he notes first:

> "You will note that the report confirms the original report of Dr. James Ferris ...",

A Yes.

And I think you advised us earlier that perhaps you went so far as to agree that the serological evidence did not link David Milgaard to the crime, or the forensic evidence, but that you couldn't go so far as Dr. Ferris went in terms of saying that it probably excluded?

I couldn't go, that's right, I could not link him, but $I$ couldn't say it definitely is not. okay.

I wasn't going to go that far.
So your report, then, wouldn't be confirming that aspect of Dr. Ferris' report?

That's correct, yes.
And then the last sentence in that paragraph, it states:
"Assuming that these samples were in
fact semen, Dr. Markesteyn confirms that
they could not have come from David
Milgaard."
And would you have agreed with that comment?
Well in as far, yes, in as far as that they had -they were A positive and, you know, they
certainly -- if it was $A$ positive semen it could not have come from Mr. Milgaard, that's correct. And - -
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A

Q

A
Q

A
Q
A
$Q$

A

But $I$ have my doubts whether -- that a -- of the positivity of the secretor status was correct. But I think he went a little bit further, it implies a little bit here that $I$ have indeed excluded David Milgaard, and I did not.

Okay. And is the answer, in terms of this last sentence, $I$ think in your conclusions in your report what you indicated was that if it was, in fact, uncontaminated, unadulterated human semen, --

Right.
-- on that basis Mr. Milgaard could be eliminated?
And I assume, perhaps, that this sentence might have been inaccurate to the extent that it did not include those adjectives?

That's correct, --
Okay.
-- yes.
Okay. I'll refer you, moving again chronologically, to a press article which followed the release of your report, 048870 . And, just as a general question, were you expecting some interest from the press, Dr. Markesteyn, following the release of your report?

Oh yes, I did, yes. Oh yes, and I got it, yeah.

And I'll just refer you to a couple of pieces. This is from the StarPhoenix, a little bit difficult to read, but it's June 6th, 1990, heading Key evidence in conviction called flawed, and I'll just refer you beginning there, please. It states:
"A key piece of evidence used to convict David Milgaard of murder was likely worthless, according to a new forensic review.

Alleged semen found in the snow at the scene four days after the murder, which was linked to Milgaard, could have been contaminated by dog urine.

The revelation is contained in
a review of forensic evidence by
Manitoba's chief medical examiner, to be released today."

Just skipping down one paragraph:
"In the report, Dr. Peter
Markesteyn says investigators failed to eliminate the possibility that the two yellowish frozen lumps were dog urine.

They were found by then lieutenant Joe
Penkala - now Saskatoon's police chief.
'The evidence doesn't exclude it (as dog urine),' Markesteyn said from Winnipeg. 'There are various sources of yellow stains in a snowbank."

And would this have been an accurate account of your views at least at this point of time, Dr. Markesteyn?

Yes, that's fairly accurate, yes.
And when $I$ see the last sentence you've noted, it appears that you have stated:
"'There are various sources of yellow stains in a snowbank.'"; --

Right.
-- is that something you would have said at the time?

Well, possibly. Various sources, I mean various sources, I mean there's more than one animal, right, there are many sources of yellow stains, yes.

Okay, and $I$ was going to ask you that, what you were using in your use of the phrase "various sources", so can you answer that again?

A Could be dogs, could be cats, could be raccoons, could be anything, animals. "Various sources" could be, as $I$ say, human as well, of course,
urine as well.
Okay.
Could be anything.
But you are referring, then, to urine, it's just various sources of urine --

Yes.
-- in this quote?
That's what $I$ meant, yes.
Okay. If we move to the next column, please, just at the top. That's good. It states, beginning at the top:
"In an interview, Markesteyn said dog urine contains also both the A antigen and semen, leading him to question the value of such evidence.
'I said it was on very shaky scientific grounds, if indeed not erroneous.'

But Markesteyn makes no pronouncement on Milgaard's guilt or innocence.
'That's hardly my station, is it?'

He does, however, support a main conclusion of Dr. James Ferris,
head of pathology at Vancouver General Hospital, whose 1988 report strongly questioned the value of linking the semen sample to Milgaard.

Like about 15 percent of the population, Milgaard is a
'non-secretor,' meaning his body doesn't secrete antigens from the blood into other bodily fluids. Although Milgaard's blood is Type $A$, a semen sample from him wouldn't contain the A antigen, as the substance in the snow did.
'He cannot be linked to the semen found in the snowbank,' Markesteyn said."

And, again, would this be accurate in terms of the information you would have provided to the press at this time?

Yes.
Okay. I refer you to just a couple of other articles that are similar in nature and ask for your comments. The next one is from the Winnipeg Sun, the document is 159851. You will note it's an article from June 6th, 1990, again from the

Winnipeg Sun, Report gives con new hope:
"A report by Manitoba's Chief Medical Examiner is more ammunition for David Milgaard, who maintains he was wrongly convicted of murder and imprisoned 21 years ago, Milgaard's lawyer said yesterday.

Lawyer David Asper, who planned
to release the report by Dr. Peter
Markesteyn today, said it supports the findings of a Vancouver pathologist who examined forensic evidence in the case.

Dr. James Ferris, head of forensic pathology at Vancouver General Hospital, concluded in September 1988 that evidence presented at Milgaard's 1969 trial was interpreted improperly by the court.
'It's consistent with Ferris,' Asper said yesterday of Markesteyn's findings.
'They have different
approaches, but it certainly forces the Department of Justice to do something.'" And this is similar to the question $I$ had
relating to the other article, and $I$ think we've clarified it; am $I$ correct that your report, and your view and your evidence or evidence today, would be that your report was consistent only to the extent of the conclusion that the forensic evidence failed to link David Milgaard to the crime?

That is entirely correct, yes.
And, again, you weren't offering a conclusion or an opinion, though, on whether it excluded him -No.
-- or probably excluded him?
No.

Okay. Refer next to 025929. I believe this is an article from the StarPhoenix June 7th, 1990, Doctor in charge of autopsy stays mum, and just a short paragraph $I$ wanted to refer you to, Dr. Markesteyn. It states:
"In an interview, Markesteyn said he was concerned that people would try to read between the lines of his report and conclude that he is assigning blame.
'There is no blame here at all,' he said."

Do you recall giving a comment of this nature?

A
I don't really recall, but $I$ could have said that because, as you know, in my work $I$ do not do that, and $I$ certainly do not wish, ever, to imply that, and if anybody -- if $I$ was in response of a question about who, so to speak, screwed this up, or anything like that, I would not go there, because that's laying blame, and $I$ would not do that.

And do you recall, though, what motivated you to make this particular comment?

I don't recall, but it's probably under question, you know, who is sort of -- who is to blame here. Okay.

In all probability, that's the case.

I'm going to refer you to a short video clip that similarly comes from the time period following the release of your report, $I$ think this one's a little bit later, and it was contained in a program entitled $A$ Current $A f f a i r, ~ a n d ~ I ~ t h i n k ~ t h e ~$ clip is identified as -- and I may be wrong here -- but the doc. ID is 230173, and I have it as JH2, and it's -- begins at 1925 and continues to 2013. So we'll just take a moment to find that starting point.
(Clip JH2 played)
"NARRATOR: ... semen samples were taken from the victim, semen samples were taken from David Milgaard, investigators never tried to match the two. But then something amazing happened.

MR. DAVID ASPER: The forensic evidence at the trial, the only physical evidence that purported to link Milgaard to the scene, were two yellowish clumps of frozen material found in the snow four days after the girl's body had been found.

DR. PETER MARKESTEYN: What is the most common source of yellow, yellowish, yellow stains in snowbanks? Well that, in Canada at least, is dog urine.

MR. DAVID ASPER: What they tendered as Milgaard's semen was, in fact, fido's urine.

NARRATOR: But there is more from this woman, Linda Fisher ..."
(Clip JH2 ends)

BY MR. HARDY:
$Q$
And do you recall giving interviews of that nature
following the release of your report, Dr.
Markesteyn?

A
Q
No, that is -- I just raised that, it was not in
fact, no.
Okay.

We don't know that, we still don't know that.
And I'll turn you next to 220863, one further press article. Again, you'll see it's an article Justice official to meet with forensic pathologist from the Saskatoon StarPhoenix June 7th, 1990. I refer you to a couple of paragraphs. The report is speaking about -- I'm sorry, it's the next column, actually, is speaking about Dr. Ferris' report and your work, and it notes in the middle of that column:
"His report is supported . . " ",
his being Dr. Ferris:
"His report is supported by one written by Dr. Peter Markesteyn, Manitoba's chief medical examiner, which was made public Wednesday by Milgaard's lawyer.

Like Ferris, Markesteyn says
emphatically that semen found at the scene could not have been Milgaard's."

And $I$ realize that we're covering this in various different respects, different forms, Dr.

Markesteyn, but would $I$ be correct in concluding that you would not agree with the accuracy of
that comment?
A
$Q$

Q
I'll read this letter to you beginning in the first paragraph:
"I have attached a copy of a report from Dr. Peter Markesteyn, Chief Medical Examiner, Manitoba. He has reviewed Dr. Ferris' report and all the other information as provided to Dr. Ferris.

Dr. Markesteyn has come to the same conclusions as Dr. Ferris in many areas and introduced a new twist to the semen in the snow, by suggesting that it may have been of canine origin. The comments he makes in this area are interesting. From personal experience, I have noted that some canine blood will carry A-like antigens. I cannot make any comments regarding canine urine or semen. The morphological differences of human spermatozoa and canine spermatozoa are several. The experienced examiner would not have any problems in distinguishing between human and canine spermatozoa.

Both Dr. Markesteyn and Dr.

Ferris have taken the absolute interpretation of the absence of $A$ and/or $B$ antigens in Milgaard's saliva sample, i.e. that the absence of antigens is proof positive of a non-secretor. This statement is not an absolute one based on the technology available twenty years ago as compared to that of today."

And would you have any reason to dispute the accuracy of any of Ms. Alain's comments in this letter?

No, I would not.
Were you aware that she was involved in reviewing your work at the time?

No, sir.
We'll move forward next to a memo to file by Mr. Williams, the document is 002507 . You'll see it's a memo dated June 16 th, 1990 respecting an interview with Dr. Peter Markesteyn and Dr. Colin Terry, and I'll read some of this to you, beginning in the first paragraph:
"On June 12, 1990 I spoke with Drs. Markesteyn and Terry ... The main objective was to obtain
clarification on certain items contained
in Dr. Markesteyn's report, and to
obtain Dr. Markesteyn's reaction to
public announcements that his report confirmed the findings of Dr. Ferris' report.

At the outset, Dr. Markesteyn expressed his concern that there was an inferential tie between the blood this the victim's vagina, and the semen on the victim's panties and in the snowbank, which could have unfairly influenced the jury. I drew his attention to pages 20-22 of the Crown's closing address which contained the trial counsel's submissions to the jury concerning the serological evidence, and to the judge's charge. I invited Dr. Markesteyn's comments."

And do you have a recollection of being shown the -- or a portion of the closing address of Crown counsel?

A
$Q$
A

I vaguely do, yes, yes. Okay.

I'm sure that $I$-- it was shown to me.

Q Okay. The next paragraph notes:
"Dr. Markesteyn noted that it was fair for the Crown to tell the jury that the evidence neither tied Milgaard to the crime, nor did it exclude him. Notwithstanding the Crown's position, Dr. Markesteyn felt that the serological evidence was poor, if not erroneous. He noted that the Crown failed to prove that the sperm in the vagina, on the panties and in the snowbank had anything to do with each other. From a serological point of view no link had been established to his satisfaction."

And would that be an accurate account of comments you would have made to Mr. Williams during this discussion?

A

Q

A
Q
A
$Q$
Yes, sir.
And do you have a recollection of this meeting with Mr. Williams?

Well, $I$ do remember meeting with him, yes. Okay. And Dr. Merry being present as well? Yes.

I'll continue forward:
"I drew Dr. Markesteyn's
attention to paragraph 3 of David
Asper's letter to me dated June 6, 1990, and asked whether the following quote accurately summed up the conclusions contained in his report:

On June 5, 1990, we forwarded to you a co[p]y of the report of Dr. Peter Markesteyn, which confirms the findings of Dr. Ferris.

Dr. Markesteyn stated that although he agrees with the assumptions contained on page 5 of the Ferris report, he:

1. disagrees with the conclusion that

Milgaard could not have done it
because there was insufficient
time."
And:
"2. disagrees with the conclusion that
the serological evidence exonerates
Milgaard."
And I think we've covered those in some detail;
that would be accurate --

A
Yes, sir.
-- in terms of information that you were providing
to Mr. Williams at the time?
A
Q point?

Yes, that's correct.
And the next paragraph:
"After showing Dr. Markesteyn photos of the scene, I asked him whether had any comments concerning Dr. Ferris' theory that the body was dumped at that location. While noting that it was unusual to find the knife underneath the body, and noting the absence of blood around the wounds, Dr. Markesteyn concluded that the widespread location of the blood spots around the body
coupled with the trampling and signs of struggle in the area, suggested that the assault had occurred where the body was found."

And do you recall this particular discussion with Mr. Williams?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

Yes.
And is this a fair representation of your conclusions --

It is.
-- on this issue?
Yes, it is.
You are generally of the view that the assault would have taken place at the scene noted in the photographs that you had viewed?

Yes.
And then just moving down the page to:
"Findings and Conclusions
Although Dr. Markesteyn
criticized several aspects of the serological evidence, it was his opinion that the serological evidence did not exonerate David Milgaard as Gail Miller's killer.

Further, he did not share Dr.

A
$Q$

A

Ferris' conclusions that Milgaard did not have enough time to commit the acts which accompanied death. Thirdly, he did not share Dr. Ferris view that the crime had occurred elsewhere, and the body was then dumped in the alley." And are you comfortable with the accuracy of that summary as provided by Mr. Williams?

I am comfortable with that, yes.
In terms of what you would have advised him at that time?

No, not that $I$ recall, no.
And what was your assessment of Mr. Williams' approach in his discussions with you?

Well Mr. Williams was not, he has not been the only counsel for the Department of Justice that interviewed me on 690 cases, I have been involved in others. He was firm, and they don't fool around, it's -- it is like an interrogation, but he was professional and he didn't, you know, bang his fist on my desk or point fingers or anything
like that, but he certainly was to the point, and they certainly weigh what everyone has to say and challenges, if necessary, what one says and why one says it. This is an interview which $I$ thought was professional, courteous, but it wasn't a friendly chat, no, nor is it intended to be. So you didn't have any concerns, then, with his approach?

None whatsoever.
Okay. If we move forward to a letter dated June 27th, 1990, the document is 333472 . This is from Mr. Williams to yourself regarding David Milgaard, and just in the first paragraph $I$ note he states:
"Thank you for your recent
letter which enclosed the photographs by Dr. Terry and the article authored by Sheila M. Keating entitled 'Information From Penile Swabs in Sexual Assault Cases'."

And do you have a recollection of providing this information to Mr. Williams, -Yes.
-- the photographs and this article?
Yes, I do, because $I$ often do that. I, whenever $I$ receive or review scientific articles, I very
often send them on to counsel in case they ever needed that for future cases or whatever.

And would the photographs referred to be the photographs that we took a look at earlier in relation to the colour comparison -Yes.
-- with the frozen semen and the colour chip chart?

I believe so, yes.
Okay. And do you recall this particular article by Ms. Keating and why, in particular, you had forwarded it to -- forwarded it to Mr. Williams? Well the reason was because there was a case of a sexual assault, and these are the sort of things that one can do, and in case he ever had another case like that. And $I$ often do that, and I still do with counsel, $I$ often send them cases for their files.

And $I$ won't turn to the article, we do have a document reference, it's 002539 .

Moving forward, we come to
another press article, and the document on this one, Dr. Markesteyn, is 026530. You'll see it's from the Western Report dated August 13th, 1990, and if we could move to the next page, please.

Just a short portion near the bottom that $I$ was going to refer you to. It states:
"Dr. Markesteyn, 59, is the chief medical examiner of Manitoba. He has concluded that the Crown sample was not semen at all, but dog urine. Dogs normally secrete blood and semen into their urine. Certain canine antigens will register in tests as type $A$ human antigens. The frozen samples police found were yellow. Dr. Markesteyn froze human sperm samples. In all cases, it remained white. 'I'm not saying

Milgaard is innocent,' says the
pathologist, 'But unless there's a new jury, we'll never know what really happened.'"

And then just briefly on the next page, I believe that's a picture of yourself, with a caption just underneath it:
"... The Crown's sperm samples were dog urine."

And I assume you would have the same clarification that you had for us with respect to other articles that had attributed this
conclusion to you?
A
Q

Oh yes, I was, indeed. The press arrived, at -in from New York on this, and they wanted an interview with me, and as you know I always give interviews when asked, and they wanted to get a -my opinion on the matter. That is to say they started the interview, they flew all the way in with their own cameramen, their own technicians, and after the usual introductory flattery they started to ask me information about the case and $I$ was waiting. When I -- I knew where they were going, and on several occasions they asked me "doctor, don't you think that Ms. Campbell, you know, erred here, and should have ordered this,
and don't you think he is innocent", and all that stuff, and $I$ said to them "as you know, or you could know, $I$ have no opinion on that, $I$ am just a guy who cuts up people, I have no comment on the activities or non-activities on the Minister of Justice, this would be highly inappropriate in Canada to do that". They went again and again to, went back to the evidence again, and then they came again, and they tried and tried for about 20 minutes, they really wanted me to say that, somehow or another, Ms. Campbell should get her act together, and I declined, for obvious reasons, to do give such an interview, and I didn't.

And $I$ would assume that your position with those reporters or otherwise would have been, I mean on the forensic evidence, would have been as you've already expressed to us and was expressed in your report?

That's right.
I'm going to refer you to another article that followed the initial dismissal of Mr. Milgaard's first application. The document reference is 012250 . We've looked at this article several times in the course of this hearing. It's from the Toronto Star dated, I believe, August 11th,

1991, and it's an article by Peter Edwards, and if we turn to the next page, please, just a single paragraph in the middle column, it states in that single paragraph:
"What was presented in court as possibly Milgaard's semen near the crime scene was actually dog urine, concluded Dr. Peter Markesteyn, chief medical examiner of Manitoba in a June, 1990, statement."

And for the same reasons we've covered, I assume you take issue with that --

A
$Q$
A
Q

A
Q

A
$Q$ I do.
-- characterization?
Yes.
And were these -- were these, was this type of reporting that attributed these types of comments to you or these conclusions to you, did that come to your attention at the time? Were you aware of that?

I was not, no.
Okay. And if you had been aware of it, would you have done anything about it?

No.
And can you give us -- why not?

A
Well, it's been my policy for many years that $I$ let the press do what the press does and $I$ do not contact the press and if they give the wrong information, $I$ do not get into an argument with the press. In fact, $I$ was taught that in my learning as a forensic pathologist in the topics of how to deal with the media, to be very careful of this, don't go there because you get into arguments with the press and you get absolutely nowhere with this, and $I$ have never ever written a letter to the editor in my life.

Okay. I'll move forward to another article, the document is 008469. It's a little bit out of sequence, this one should have come before the last one we referred to, $I$ don't think it matters though. The date at the top, although difficult to say, is dated May 15th, 1991, "The Milgaard case: Was justice served?" And this was from the Christian Science Monitor, and there's just a short portion dealing with your assessment of Mr. Williams that $I$ wanted to refer you to. The page, if we could turn to page 3, please, at the bottom of the middle column, please. You'll see it states:
"Dr. Ferris, the Vancouver
forensic pathologist, says the minister's decision was a foregone conclusion when he was interviewed by the investigator. "Mr. Williams was here to defend the decision that was going to be made" confirming Milgaard's guilt, he says.

The Monitor questioned five people Williams interviewed, but only one found him objective and open-minded. "My impression," says Manitoba chief medical examiner Peter Markesteyn, "is that without putting any pressure on me, he wanted to hear what $I$ had to say and why I said it."

And would that have been accurate in terms of what you would have indicated about your meeting with Mr. Williams at that time?

Yes, exactly.
And we'll move forward to a second report by Dr. Merry. If we could turn to 155549 , please, you'll see it's a report by Dr. Merry sent to Mr. Asper dated March 6th, 1992, and I won't review it, you and $I$ have had a chance to look at this together briefly. Did you have any role in the preparation

A
Q
A
$Q$
A
$Q$
$Q$
A
$Q$
A
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or provision of this report in 1992?

And were you involved through the ' 90 s in the course of the DNA testing and matters of that
nature that we know were ongoing, were you
involved in those matters at all?
Not at all.
Okay. And what about the Larry Fisher criminal

proceedings in the later 1990s, did you have any involvement in those proceedings?

None whatsoever.
Were you approached by any of the parties interested?

No, sir.
I'm just about done. There's one further short passage from Joyce Milgaard's book, A Mother's Story, that $I$ wanted to refer you to. The document is 269317 and if we could turn, please, to page 269482. You'll see the chapter is entitled Scent of Victory and there's a short mention of your involvement in the first couple of pages of this chapter. First of all, would you have read this book previously or were you aware of this book, Dr. Markesteyn?

A
$Q$
I got a copy, but I have -- I'm sorry to say, I have not read the entire copy, no.

And just in terms of, just under the title $I$ see a portion is quoted there:
"This semen cannot possibly be from Mr.
Milgaard."
And would you have ever stated this comment, unqualified as it's set out here, at any point following the release of your report or at any
time $I$ guess?
A
No, sir.
And I think probably what happened, if we go to your report, and maybe just for the sake of completeness we can see where this comes from, if we can go to your report just for a moment, O26321, and, I'm sorry, if we can move forward to the last page -- I'm sorry, it's the page prior I think, and you'll see at the beginning of this paragraph under the heading $A-A n t i g e n s$ in the Semen from Snowbank, it states:
"If this was uncontaminated semen, then this semen cannot possibly be from Mr. Milgaard..."

And it looks like that's perhaps where the quote was taken from, and $I$ take it that that information would only be accurate with the words that begin that sentence in your report?

That's right, sir.
Okay. And if we can go back to the portion of the chapter that we were referring to of Mrs.

Milgaard's book, I'm sorry, 269482, and $I$ just noted in the first paragraph there's mention that you had been trained years ago by Dr. Emson? No.

Q
Q
A

Q

A
$Q$

A

That wasn't the case?
No, sir.
Okay.
Not at all.
You had just known of Dr. Emson?
Dr. Emson, I knew about Dr. Emson, he was a professor of breast pathology in Saskatoon and I knew him -- and also where Mrs. Milgaard may have gotten this from, Dr. Emson at one time was the chair of the Canadian Association of Forensic Pathologists or Forensic Scientists and I knew him in that capacity, but he certainly never taught me, no.

Okay. If we could turn to the next page, please, just one further portion $I$ was going to refer you to, it's on the second page, or on the right-hand side, the paragraph that I've noted, and it states:
"There were other interesting things in
Markesteyn's report besides his dog
urine findings. His conclusions about
the murder were horrifying. Markesteyn
wrote that the killer stayed at the
murder scene for at least fifteen
minutes. Gail Miller had died over
several minutes, and the killer continued to stab her even as she lay dead. We could only shudder at the thought of his extreme hatred towards women. Markesteyn could find no explanation why the knife blade had snapped, since no bones were struck by it."

And was this, or is this an accurate account of what you had stated at any point in time?

A
$Q$
I think this is a literary license. That is not at all what I said.

Okay. And there's just one last bit of information $I$ had wanted to bring to your attention, Dr. Markesteyn. A witness who recently testified, Dr. Kim Rossmo, provided the Commission office with a document from the Encyclopedia of Forensic Science by Susan Bell, 2004 , and the document ID is 337736 . If we could turn to page 3 of that document, please, this portion here, there's a reference to semen or seminal fluid, and closer to the bottom of that reference it states: "Semen is a thick milky liquid that dries as a crusty, somewhat shiny material that acquires a slight
yellowish tinge as it ages."
And were you ever, or were you aware at any point of this information, not stating whether you agreed with it or not, but were you aware at any point of the possibility that semen on aging could acquire a yellowish tinge?

In frozen state?
I don't -- at any point were you aware of that possibility?

I was not aware of this article and $I$ dare say that this may or may not be the case in some cases under normal circumstances, but $I$ am not aware that it changes colour in a frozen state.

MR. HARDY: Okay. Dr. Markesteyn, those are all of the questions that $I$ have for you. My friends may have some questions.

BY MR. GIBSON:
Dr. Markesteyn, for the record, my name is Bruce Gibson, we chatted at the break a couple of times. I represent the RCMP. I've just a couple of questions for you. Mr. Hardy has been his usual thorough self, so I don't think you'll be up there much longer.

In your testimony you mention that there were some bits of information that you
were not provided with. I think you indicated you did not have the closing arguments at trial?

That's correct.
You never had any original exhibits from trial for testing?

No, sir.
And I think you indicated you also never had the preliminary evidence from the original trial?

That's correct, sir.
And $I$ want to just look at a document, if $I$ could just call up 025562 , please, and this is a report from a Victor Molchanko. I don't know if you remember Victor Molchanko with the RCMP lab?

Yes. I know him well, yeah.
And the date of that is March 27 th, 1969 , and it deals with some of the materials that we've talked a little bit about, certainly this is dealing with the hair sample. If we can go to the next page, please, and just at the bottom here, number 4, if we could call that up, it indicates:
"The hair from Exhibit "I" (vials) was examined and compared microscopically with the hair samples, Exhibits "J" and "K"."

Do you remember seeing this document at all?

A No, I do not.
Q
Okay. And if we could just go to the next page of that document, please, and call up part 4 again, and in it it indicates:
"Six human pubic hairs were removed from one of the vials from Exhibit 'I'.

These hairs had characteristics which were similar to those found in the human hair sample, Exhibit "J". (Control sample of pubic hair from the victim).

A common origin is possible."
And again, is that the kind of information that may have assisted you when you were first contacted, would have been some good background as far as trying to make a determination of what those samples may have been?

Yes, sir.
And if we could go to another document, 008311 , and this is the evidence from the preliminary inquiry for Victor Molchanko, or his evidence, rather, at Mr. Milgaard's preliminary inquiry, and if we can go to page 008323 , please, 323, just call the top portion $u p$ there, and again Mr. Molchanko is talking about his report and his findings with respect to the hairs, he says:
"A Yes, I did, I differentiated between the two vials, $I$ numbered the first one "I 1", and the other one "I 2", the vial marked "I 1", $I$ found seven hairs in it, seven human pubic hairs.

Q And did you...
A ...and these were compared with the hair sample, which is Exhibit P. 10 , allegedly a controlled sample of pubic hair from the victim. The characteristics on the seven hairs that $I$ found, were similar to the characteristics found in the human pubic hair in $P .10$, and because of this similarity, I concluded that the seven hairs originated from the same source as the hair from Exhibit P. 10 . Pardon me, could have originated from the same source."

And again, $I$ take it that information would have been of assistance to you when you prepared your original views on this subject?

A
Yes. Am I correct in understanding that those hairs were put in the vial, in the same vial where the sperm was, in the same vial?

Q

A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

They were found in the frozen sample and that was put into the vial and then it thawed.

So in one vial both --
In one vial, yes.
Both the pubic hair and the hairs?
The vial -- you are talking about when it was
gathered at the scene?
Yeah.
That's my understanding, correct, and I'm sure someone will correct me if $I$ 'm wrong here. Frozen into a lump, put into a vial, then thawed. Okay, together. Okay. The Penkala report is 006262 , that may be of assistance. Thank you, Mr. Loran, hopefully that will come up here. And I haven't looked at this, but if we call that up, it may be of some assistance. It says he:
"...researched the snow in the area where the body of Gail Miller was found. The snow was searched and during the search, two frozen lumps about one inch in diameter, yellowish in color, with hair frozen into the lumps, were found and retained in a frozen state..."

So hopefully that clarifies it for you.
A
$Q$

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
would have tried to sort of replicate during that experiment, there was no mixture of any kind of blood or anything into the sample?

No, we did not do that.
One thing $I$ was wondering about, do you think it's possible that there could have been, the seminal fluid could have drained from the body of Gail Miller and because she had expired at that point in time, that there could have been a discharge of urine from the body as well and that's possible how some urine could have ended up into that sample?
 Exactly, sure, that's possible. So that may be a good explanation as to why the seminal fluid that was eventually identified by Mr. Paynter as being human seminal fluid could have had a yellowish tinge to it because of urine that had perhaps drained into it?

Yes, it's a possibility, yes. Bodies often, as you know, excrete urine at the time of death. Thank you. If I could go to document 026321, and that of course is your report, Doctor, and $I$ want to go to page 6 of that report if $I$ may. I just want to call that portion up there, and you gave evidence earlier, and $I$ just want to try and
clarify a little bit about your contact with Staff Sergeant Paynter. You indicate:
"I have been informed that the original notes on which this evidence by staff Sgt. Paynter was based are no longer available."

And judging by the manner in which you phrase that, and $I$ think you were again fair this morning when you said you think that that perhaps could have been passed on to you by someone, perhaps Mrs. Milgaard, and possible, but you are not sure, that you may have gathered that information from Mr. Paynter?

Yeah, it's possible that $I$ was informed of that. Whether that was from, by Mrs. Milgaard, that I don't recall, but it may have been by others, it may have been by Mr. Asper who gave me all the other stuff, and $I$ may have asked him to get that. Yes. Just the way it's phrased there, it doesn't appear that Mr. Paynter told you that because in the next line you say, "Staff Sgt. Paynter informed me..." I think a person sitting down to draft something would likely say, well, Staff Sergeant Paynter informed me that he couldn't remember the tests and didn't have his notes, just
the manner in which that's phrased, so unlikely, if $I$ may say to you, that staff sergeant paynter would have informed you he didn't have his notes considering the fact that they surfaced relatively shortly after that for the 1992 investigation or '93 investigation by the RCMP?

Well, or whatever, $I$ was left with the impression, whatever the source, that they were not available.

Yes.

And $I$ wanted them and $I$ couldn't get them.

Absolutely, and I'm assuming that when you spoke with Staff Sergeant Paynter, did you ask him then if he still had his notes? Like, do you remember asking him that question?

I probably did. I wouldn't be surprised because that's what $I$ was after.

Okay.
But $I$ was more after, as $I$ said before, what the exact test was that he did.

And again, it appears that we have his notes now, obviously we do, and Staff Sergeant Paynter has testified with respect to that. I just wanted to make sure that it appeared to you that someone informed you initially that Staff Sergeant Pearson's notes -- or sorry, Staff Sergeant

A

Q

Paynter's notes weren't available and that's the information you went on?

That's correct.
And I take it you never contacted Staff Sergeant Paynter again asking for the notes at any point in time or trying to get ahold of him to get ahold of those notes? His evidence is that he doesn't recall you contacting him for that, but he would have made those available to you?

Well, I'm sure he would have if he had them, but $I$ didn't ask him, I was specifically, and I was surprised and $I$ remember that, and I expressed concerns because it's a routine test, and he said I don't remember doing that, and $I$ couldn't -- he must have misunderstood because why would he not remember what is done all the time.

And the circumstances of your contacting him, was that, did you run into him, was that by telephone? Probably by telephone. My recollection is -- what I was after is not the fact that he did or did not do the human origin, because $I$ knew he had done that according to the evidence. As I said before this morning, my quest was how sensitive, how specific is the human test in this specimen if there were contamination and $I$ referred to that
before and I will -- I have now repeated it.
And $I$ believe you indicate in your report here as well that -- if we can just go to the previous page of this report, page 6 -- sorry, let me just find that. Page 6 of the report. My apologies. Go back to page 6. I guess that's where we were. Call this portion up at the bottom here, and in your report you say:
"The only way of excluding the semen
from being non-human origin would have
been the morphology and/or species
specific antigen-antibody reaction
tests."

And those are the tests you are talking about, the manner in which you phrase that is you can either do morphology testing and you could do the specific antigen-antibody reaction tests, or the specific antigen-antibody reaction tests. In essence, if $I$ read you correctly, Doctor, you are saying that morphology testing in itself could also clarify that?

Could, depending on the expertise of the serologist.

All right. Now if we could go to document 185365, that was a report that was put to you earlier,

A
Q

A
call the middle paragraph up there, and you indicated that you knew the chief serologist for the RCMP, Patricia Alain? what?

MR. GIBSON: It was 185365, it's a one page document, Mr. Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.
BY MR. GIBSON:
I think one of the concerns that you had, and you wouldn't be the first forensic witness to comment on the contamination that could have occurred at the crime scene, and $I$ take it that that was a concern because of the blood staining and the

|  | 1 |  | trampling in the area to get, $I$ guess, proper, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 |  | pristine samples, if $I$ may put it that way? |
|  | 3 | A | Yes. |
|  | 4 | $Q$ | And would you agree with me, Doctor, that likely |
| 02:27 | 5 |  | it would have been better evidence if the |
|  | 6 |  | original, $I$ guess the vaginal aspirate had been |
|  | 7 |  | saved as opposed to trying to go and analyse |
|  | 8 |  | samples later on that were found? |
|  | 9 | A | Most certainly, yes. |
| 02:27 | 10 | Q | And is that something that a forensic pathologist |
|  | 11 |  | would routinely save in this type of a case? |
|  | 12 | A | Yes, sir. |
|  | 13 | $Q$ | And in your discussions with Dr. Emson, did you |
|  | 14 |  | ever have any opportunity to discuss that aspect |
| 02:27 | 15 |  | of this case with him, as to why that might not |
|  | 16 |  | have been saved? |
|  | 17 | A | No, I did not. I think I implied that I was |
|  | 18 |  | surprised, but things can happen. |
|  | 19 | Q | And I take it now, Doctor, with us trying to make |
| 02:28 | 20 |  | determinations with respect to serological |
|  | 21 |  | testing, A-secretor, non-secretor, morphology |
|  | 22 |  | testing and that, it's a lot easier now with the |
|  | 23 |  | advent of DNA to do more specific testing and |
|  | 24 |  | those other tests have kind of fallen by the way |
| 02:28 | 25 |  | side? |
|  |  |  | $\qquad$ Meyer CompuCourt Reporting rtified Professional Court Reporters serving P.A., Regina \& Saskatoon since 1980 Central Booking - Call Irene @ 1-800-667-6777 or go to www.compucourt.tv |

A
They are, and of course now with DNA you can indeed exonerate what you couldn't before.

MR. GIBSON: Thank you very much, Doctor. Those are my questions.

## BY MR. HOPKINS:

Dr. Markesteyn, my name is Marshall Hopkins, I'm counsel for the former justice Calvin Tallis. As I understand your evidence, sir, the bottom line on the dog urine/human semen issue today is that you think it's likely or more likely that the material found, the yellowish material found was human semen; is that fair? It's fair in that if $I$ were to assume -- that's an assumption. If I were to assume that the specimens were not mixed up all together, then -and if it is correct, if it's not adulterated, if it is correct that the semen and the pubic hair are all together, it's more likely, of course, that it is human, yes.

And at the time of trial -- you reviewed some of the trial transcripts $I$ presume?

Yes, sir.
At the time of trial is it your understanding that the uncontroverted evidence at that time was that at least one of the samples of this yellowish
material was human semen, that that was the evidence at the time?

A
Q

A
$Q$
That it was human semen, and that this human semen contained type A antigens?

Yes, sir.
Now, in your report, if we could bring up Dr.
Markesteyn's report, doc. ID number 026321 at page 026328, and if we could go to the third paragraph of the conclusion, and if you could bring out the third paragraph of the conclusion. There you say:
"If, to everyone's
satisfaction, it was established that
the origin of the yellowish patch was unadulterated, uncontaminated human semen, then the presence of the A-antigen in this specimen clearly, from a serological point of view, could not be Mr. Milgaard's."

Now the uncontroverted evidence at trial was that the yellowish patch was human semen, so the conclusion -- and you've underscored the phrase:
"... could not be Mr. Milgaard's.",
the conclusion that it could not come from Mr.
Milgaard would be properly drawn if -- this is a

A
$Q$
A
Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
complex question -- if, one, it was unadulterated
and uncontaminated, and two, Mr. Milgaard was a
non-secretor; is that fair?
complex question -- if, one, it was unadulterated and uncontaminated, and two, Mr. Milgaard was a non-secretor; is that fair?

That's fair.

And you underscore the phrase:
"... could not be Mr. Milgaard's."
to give emphasis to that point?
Yes.

And so if the evidence at trial was that the sample was uncontaminated, and Mr. Milgaard was a non-secretor, --

Right.
-- then that evidence, at trial, would have excluded Mr. Milgaard as the donor of the sample; is that fair?

Exactly.
Okay. Now this conclusion on page 8 of your report, I'm going to call it a conditional
conclusion, it has an if/then form, and correct me if I'm wrong, but if the antecedents, the ifs of the conclusion you describe were met, that
conclusion would be a very strong conclusion; is
that --
Yes, sir, at that time.
Now those antecedents, as $I$ think we've just seen,
are if the yellowish patch was unadulterated, uncontaminated semen, and the second one is if David Milgaard is a non-secretor, taken together, excludes him?

That's right.
And is that an absolute?
Yes.
Now the uncontroverted evidence at trial was that David Milgaard was a non-secretor?

Yes, sir.
So the only other antecedent which would need to be met in order to get to the absolute conclusion that he is excluded as the donor of that sample is the antecedent if the sample was unadulterated and uncontaminated?

A
$Q$
Now earlier in your evidence today $I$ heard you draw a distinction between -- and, again, correct me if this isn't fair -- between evidence which should not be admitted and evidence which, and I believe you said if entered at trial should have been testified to, its strengths and weaknesses?

A
$Q$ Yes, sir.

So you distinguish between two types of evidence, one which is inadmissible and one which is
evidence which, if it comes into trial, we have to comment on?

A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A
$Q$

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

A
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A
Q
$Q$
A
$Q$
A
Yes, sir.
And if there was some evidence of contamination,
could this still be evidence which tended to
exclude David Milgaard as the donor?
No, not -- no, I -- to be definitely excluded it
had to be pure sperm with $A$ antigen in it --
Yes.
Yes, I didn't say it was contaminated with
something that could be A.
Well --
If it was contaminated with type 0 blood, for
example?
I don't -- that would have made no difference.
But that would still be contamination, --
Yes.
-- but contamination that wouldn't make a
difference?
That is correct.
So if we had contamination by type o blood, and

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
that's the only source of contamination, then the evidence would still very strongly militate in favour of excluding David Milgaard?

Yes, sir.
Similarly, if the only evidence of contamination, as My Friend Mr. Gibson brought up, was perhaps urine from the victim, that as well wouldn't be contamination which would impact adversely on the question whether it excludes Mr. Milgaard? No, sir.

So we actually have to get into considering the particular evidence of contamination in order to fairly consider the impact of contamination on the question of whether or not it excludes, or doesn't exclude, Mr. Milgaard?

Yes, sir.
Now is it fair to say that the possible contaminants of relevance in this case were blood, - But possible contaminants of relevance; blood, dog urine, perhaps human urine, perhaps a leafy vegetable material, we've heard that mentioned as
a possible source of contamination, possibly leather materials, and you have heard of --

Yes, oh yes, I have.
-- contamination by leather, and $I$ know at least
one paper that $I$ reviewed suggested that things like household dust could be a contaminant? Yes, sir.

I think you mentioned in your report soil as a possible contaminant.

Yes, sir.
So there is a range of possible contaminants. And don't we need to look at each of those separately and ask ourselves the question "how does that particular contaminant impact or relate to the question of whether or not this yellowish material tends to exclude Mr. Milgaard?" We have to look at each one of those possible contaminants; don't we?

Yes. The only contaminants that play a forensic role with regard to inclusion or exclusion is that contaminant which contains A antigen. All the others are not relevant to that issue, to this issue.

I think that's -- that's my understanding as well, doctor, is that the only contaminants that would
tend to, let us say, undermine the conclusion that
Mr. Milgaard is excluded would be contaminants
which could contain type $A$ antigens and,
therefore, explain the presence of type A antigens in this semen sample?

That's correct.

Is that fair?

Yes, sir.

Now, in this case, those contaminants could have been -- and correct me again if I'm wrong -- leafy vegetable material?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
Yes, sir.
Was there any evidence of the presence of leafy vegetable material?

Not to my knowledge, but in order to find that you would have to con -- to examine the shovel.

So, if there is no evidence of it, is it
appropriate to speculate that maybe there was leafy vegetable material?

Speculation is never appropriate in this setting. What one would bring to the attention of the triers of the fact is that it is possible that a non -- never-used, or that a used shovel contains such material and that the soil contained vegetable material. Whether that was indeed the
case had to be weighed.
Was there any evidence that there was soil that had contact with this sample?

I believe that there was a shovel used --
Uh-huh?
-- to dig it up.
Uh-huh?
And not only about the sample --
Was it a soiled shovel? I'm just, I just want to be clear?

Well I did not get the impression, but it's subject to correction, $I$ didn't think it was a shovel purchased that day at Canadian Tire and one never used before. That, I may be mistaken on that.

Right. But I'm just wondering, I mean do we want to assume that soil is present, or is that something which --

A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A
I think --
-- there has to be evidence of?
Well, it's reasonable to raise the possibility thereof and then exclude it.

Okay. And that, the same thing, would go with
blood, as well, that had type A antigens?
And dog urine. You can raise the possibility and
then exclude it, if you don't, --
And if you --
-- you still have it.
Now if you don't exclude dog urine, if you are not able to rule it out altogether, does that mean that this evidence has no probative value now? I'm just saying that -- no -- probative value, with respect sir, is a legal term.

No, let me move away from that term, let me go back. We have a number of possible contaminants? Yes, sir.

Your evidence is that we need to exclude or rule out possible contaminants?

Okay. We have to rule them out, and if we can't rule them out, does that evidence then lose all scientific value?

A
$Q$

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Prior to you doing your report? You didn't see it before you did your report?

A No, $I$ don't think so.

BY MR. HOPKINS:
If we could go to doc. ID 212178, and at page number 212218 , and right at the bottom of the page --

A
Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
A
Q   Now if we could look at the bottom of the page. Now we're at something of a disadvantage here, and I'll explain to you why.

It turns out that, at the time of the appeal in this matter, the jury address here was not transcribed for the purposes of the appeal, and in fact it wasn't transcribed until I believe 1991 or 1992, and it was transcribed from the notes of the original court reporter who used a shorthand system which was somewhat unique, and so the transcription itself then was done by someone who wasn't sure of every word. And where we see these ellipses, that means that there are words missing, as many as a few words missing, and so we have to read this keeping that in mind, that the ellipses are not halting conversation or halting -- halting speech, what the ellipses reflect is just the absence of words that the transcriber was unable to discern.

Yes, sir.

And we get to the bottom of this page, and we see: "Now this may be, and $I$ suggest is something that you should consider pretty carefully, and as you see, if in fact the donor of that seminal fluid was an "A" group secretor, and there was no blood, as such, in the seminal fluid from that person with that "A" grouping, Central Booking - Call Irene @ 1-800-667-6777 or go to www.compucourt.tv
it cannot have been, the man could not have been the ..."

And then --

Right.
We've heard from Mr. Tallis that the word that followed "the" would probably have been "the accused" or perhaps "the defendant". Now this looks very much like the if/then statement that you have on page 8 -That's correct. -- of your report?

Yes, sir.
And so it would appear that Mr. Tallis was certainly alive to the issue that you have examined in your report?

Yes, sir.
And that, according to what he is telling the jury, if there was no blood in that semen, no contaminant which would have created type A antigens --

Uh-huh.
-- then it could not have come from the accused? Yes, sir.

Now he goes on, and $I$ don't know if you have had an opportunity to review any more of this address,
but he goes on to discuss the evidence which suggested contamination of blood, contamination by blood, and argues that the most likely blood, if it was contaminated by blood, would have been the type O blood of the victim. He, it seems, is mentioning, but again because we have this problem with the transcription it appears to be not complete, mentions perhaps other sources. And we did see in the evidence of Mr. Paynter that he had considered other sources of contamination, i.e. the leafy material, leather, that kind of thing, and it appears as though he was arguing that the jury had to consider the evidence of contamination, weigh it, and draw an inference, and in his -- and in this case he suggested the inference would be that the evidence tended to exclude the accused.

Now when $I$ said "tended to exclude the accused", earlier you seemed to have a problem with that, and can we have a middle ground between 'doesn't tell us anything', 'definitely excludes', and 'tends to exclude', is evidence which suggests that perhaps we have an exclusion here without knowing for sure?

Well $I$ think that is proper, depending on the
circumstances, that you can have a variation. Right?

And $I$ agree with you, and if $I$ understand it correctly, with the inference drawn and suggested to the jury. If this is a sample that is, does not contain blood, it cannot be David Milgaard. That's a very firm conclusion at that time, and reasonable to conclude at that time, ignoring the fact whether he was or was not a secretor.

But let's assume it is established he is not a secretor, and if you've got semen with $A$ in it, he ain't the person who produced that semen. That's not possible, period, so I have no problem with that.

Thank you. Those are my questions.
Thank you.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Dr. Markesteyn, I
just have a question for you before $I$ forget.
I think at various times, and
from other witnesses, we've heard of the presence of contaminants such as we've mentioned, leafy vegetables and leather being two of them, yielding a false positive, and I understood that to mean that there wasn't really A antigens in
leather or leafy vegetables, but rather something that reacted in the test like A antigens. What is the case? A antigens is a peculiar -- it's a blood component, is it not?

A

A

A

A

A

A

A
Cross-contamination. It need not be the same substance, but it reacts to the reagent you used as if it were the same substance.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes. So we shouldn't be talking about leather, or these exist in leafy vegetables in the same form?

No. That's called, in science, the specificity of the test.

COMMISSIONER MaCCALLUM: Is it? Canal

A

A

A
various contaminants, containing A antigens?

## BY MS. KNOX:

Doctor, for the record my name is Catherine Knox, and I'm counsel for the prosecutor in the original trial, Mr. T.D.R. Caldwell, whose name I'm sure you are familiar with as a result of these proceedings?

Yes, ma'am.
You, in your report that you sent to Mr. Asper, documented a series of information that you had been provided with, including lab reports, excerpts from transcript, as $I$ recall you recorded them as we looked at it today?

Yes, ma'am.
Sir, do you still have the file of materials that

A
you were provided with?
I looked for it the day I arrived, and I could have sworn $I$ had it, it's a very thick one, and $I$ couldn't find it.

Oh yes.
I was looking for it because $I$ had in there, still, copies of the photographs and a whole lot of stuff, and $I$-- $I$ may still have it, but $I$ was not able to find it before $I$ arrived here.

Doctor, there was a, you made reference to the fact that you had the transcript of the evidence of Victor Molchanko, who you knew, at the trial? Probably, yes.

Okay. Doctor -- and perhaps Commissioner, if we could, it's five to $3: 00$, $I$ would like -- there is a number of pages $I$ would like the witness to look at, I'd like to give it to him over the break, have him go through it, and then ask him a question when he comes back. It will save us all time if we do it that way, with the permission of the Commissioner, please?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Sure. I just want to make another note on something before we go.

MS. KNOX: Sir, for the record, the pages
I'm about to give Dr. Markesteyn are from the
transcript page numbers 1074 to 1114 , so taking the numbers of the transcript itself, it would be that portion of the trial transcript.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.

MS. KNOX: Thank you.
(Adjourned at 2:55 p.m.)
(Reconvened at 3:16 p.m.)

BY MS. KNOX:
$Q$

A
$Q$
And, Mr. Commissioner, the document ID for the commencement of Victor Molchanko's evidence is 176606 which corresponds to page 1074 of the original transcript.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.

By MS. KNOX:
And the portion $I$ gave concluded through to page 1114, and, Doctor, $I$ drew your attention to a portion of that piece of transcript that started at page 176626 in the Commission document, but page 1094 of the actual trial transcript. Do you recall that?

A Yes, ma'am.

Q

And that discussion in the voir dire continued through for a number of pages to page 1104. If we can go to that page, please. Again, as you will see on the screen, and you saw in the documents I gave you, a natural break in the transcription where the jury is recalled, and Corporal Molchanko was called back into the room you will agree? Yes, ma'am.

And, sir, my request of you was to tell me whether, to the best of your recollection, you had
been sent those pages of transcript by Mr. Asper or his office when they sent you the materials to review in this case, and what is your response to that question, sir?

To the best of my recollection, I never saw this before and $I$ wish to offer also the opinion that if $I$ had seen it, $I$ most certainly would have remembered it, because this is not an insignificant decision, and $I$ would have remembered it, so $I$ think it's fair to say $I$ never saw it.

Just as you never saw the lab report 025562 that Mr. Gibson showed you about the pubic hair being found in that sample?

That's correct.
And, sir, would it be fair to say that had you seen it, your theory as to the possibility of dog urine would have been seriously sidelined or might never have been advanced?

Well, it would have been weakened, yes.
Okay. Sir, you indicated this morning in response to a question to Mr. Hardy that as a person you were aware that the opinion that you were offering, if used perhaps inappropriately, could affect the reputations of people involved in this
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A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
case, but that that was a feeling you had as a person and not as a pathologist. Did I understand you correctly when you said that?

And as the chief medical examiner.
And, sir, when you became aware that your opinion or your speculation was being misrepresented in the media, you testified that as a matter of your training and practice you would not go to the media and try to correct their stories. Did I understand that correctly?

Okay. Sir, had you been aware of it, would it have been a prudent thing for you to do, to go to them and say "listen, you guys are misusing what I gave to you"?

I probably would have discussed that with them.
Not perhaps in those terms, but $I$ would have said
that $I$ never said that.
Sir, seeing the clips that you saw today, the TV clips, and seeing the newspaper stories, can you appreciate how significantly people like Mr. Caldwell were subjected to, I'm going to use the word ridicule, because they were perceived as having been quite ridiculously stupid not to have known that that particular exhibit was in fact dog urine as it was represented or, as you speculated, could have been dog urine?

Oh, I appreciate that, yes.
Sir, you said in your report, if $I$ can go to your report now for my final question, or my final area of questions, and the document number the

Commission is using is 026321 , you said at page 7 of your report that the assumption that, of Mr . Milgaard's secretor status could be subject to challenge as the testing of the day was very inadequate or inappropriate. Were you contacted by Mr. Asper or anybody on Mr. Milgaard's behalf and asked to conduct a test to determine his proper secretor status?

No, ma'am, I was not asked to do that.
MS. KNOX: I have no further questions.

## BY MR. LORAN:

Q

A
Q

Good afternoon, Dr. Markesteyn. My name is Pat
Loran and $I$ represent the Saskatoon Police
Service. I just wanted to follow up on something that Mr. Gibson took up with you before the break.

If $I$ understood your evidence previously, you based your June 4th, 1990
conclusions on the information which was supplied to you; is that correct?

Yes, sir.
And to the extent you were given limited
information, that may have affected the
conclusions you drew; would that be fair to say? Of course.

Can we agree you did not receive a transcript of the preliminary inquiry?

Yes, sir.
And I'm going to ask to have the preliminary inquiry called up. I've got page 008069. I don't have the doc. ID number, I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: What is it; do you know?

MR. LORAN: This is the evidence --
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: No, no, what is
the doc. ID?

MS. ELLERMAN: 008059 .

BY MR. LORAN:

Q
And this is the evidence of Mr. Penkala at the prelim and at line 72 it begins:
"Q And did you come across anything as you searched?

A Yes, in my search, I came across two frozen lumps of yellowish substance with hair that was frozen into these lumps and $I$ retained these and retained them in a frozen state."

I know you had expressed concern somewhat earlier about the hair having contaminated the samples. The impression $I$ got was that you had been concerned that the human pubic hair may have come from the surrounding snow. Did I understand your answers correctly in that regard?

That was one possibility. There was a vicious removal of clothing and to remove pubic hair that got torn at the same time would not be unheard of. In fact, almost expected.

Okay. And the -- perhaps I'm going to draw your attention to the trial transcript of Mr., the evidence of Mr. Penkala, at 087504.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Do you know the
doc. ID, Mr. Loran?
MR. LORAN: I apologize, Mr. Commissioner,
I do not.

MS . BOSWELL: 087460 .

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thank you.
BY MR. LORAN:
$Q$
dog urine?

A

Q

A
Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

Well, all that's left, sure, but yes, that is a more likely conclusion to draw, yes.

And it's speculative to suggest -- that there's dog urine in the sample is speculative because
what we've got is there's a yellowish tinge to it and that's really the basis upon which you speculate there might be dog urine; would you not agree?

It's remains speculative until proven or until disproven. It was not disproven and therefore it remains speculative, you are correct.

MR. LORAN: Thank you very much.

## BY MR. WOLCH :

Doctor, Hersh Wolch for David Milgaard. Good to see you again.

Good to see you, Hersh.
I only have one dog urine question. Am I correct that from David Milgaard's point of view, he would not want it to be dog urine?

I would assume that, yeah.
Okay, that's the one question on dog urine. Now I want to get to a different topic. You mentioned that you've had other involvement in Section 690 applications?

Yes, sir.
Can you just briefly give us an outline of what type of work you've done, other 690s?

I did two homicides, one was the Johnson case in Nova Scotia, of the lady who allegedly fell down
the stairs rather than murdered, and another one was Harper and Silliboy, two native persons who claimed they were innocently convicted.

So you had involvement in 690 s and you've also conducted investigations of your own and $I$ wonder if we can draw on your expertise. The Commission is going to be asked to make recommendations to hopefully guide us in not having the need for 690s, or whatever they are called now. Do you have any recommendations, based on all your expertise, that might be of use to the Commission? I do, indeed, and I'm very pleased that you asked me that question, because I'm, as you know, aware why some of these inquiries are held, to make recommendations to prevent similar occurrences from happening.

Some 30 years ago $I$ was asked by
a Mr. Hogan in Saskatchewan to assist the Department of Justice to establish in Saskatchewan a medical examiner system because Saskatchewan is one of the few provinces that does not have a forensic pathologist. Now, forensic pathologists are hard to come by, it requires extra years, an extra year of training, it requires an exam and all that. However, I would strongly recommend
that the Department of Justice were to consider, and I made a similar recommendation now in Newfoundland as well, for an academically-based forensic science service headed by a forensic pathologist, a trained, certified forensic pathologist.

## That person should have

independence from the Department of Justice, what I had in Manitoba. I was appointed at arm's length, $I$ was a university professor, $I$ was not an employee of the Department of Justice, which gives the forensic pathologist not only the appearance, but also the facts of being able to decide, regardless whether the prosecution or the defence or whoever, or the police, like it or not. A degree of independence is very important in this field.

The absence thereof, if such
recommendations were not to be followed, as you may know $I$ am now appearing more for the defence than in the past, and Saskatchewan to me now is an open field, it is actually quite sad, and $I$ have expressed those concerns to other lawyers who are now retired into the Department of Justice of Saskatchewan and told them, get yourself a
forensic pathologist, all right, get it, especially -- not only in the investigation of adult death, but also children's death.

Whether that means a medical
examiner system or a coroner system is not relevant in the sense that the medical examiner has certain functions, the fact is that this person should have some independence of decision and make the decision on the basis of science and not on the basis of pressures either implied or expressed by persons who have interest in the outcome of the findings.

Saskatchewan doesn't have this?
No.
You say Manitoba does?
Yes, and Alberta has, and Newfoundland has to a point, and Nova Scotia has.

Ontario?
A coroner system, a coroner system meaning they have forensic pathologists, and that's another issue that $I$ address, I'm not going into whether it should be a medical examiner system or coroner system. The chief medical examiner does not hold inquests, the chief coroner does, and it's not a function that $I$ would like to have full time more
or less, but all forensic pathologists, all chief medical examiners are forensic pathologists, but at least have a forensic pathologist, a person trained in this field, which is very difficult, and this is an example of a very difficult case, rape/murders are very difficult, and to have in this province the expertise to do that and the university, university based, why is that? You've heard examples of it. If $I$ need an opinion, $I$ didn't have to pay anybody, $I$ just go to my friend and $I$ said come on, come on down, come and look at this, which $I$ did in Manitoba as you may be aware. If it was a child abuse case, a child death, I ask the child abuse people, come and have a look.

This is the way to go. And, with respect, if $I$ am allowed to do so, $I$ would make such a recommendation.

What you are saying is the expert should not be beholden to police, defence or whoever, just the science?

That's right, and I have expressed that in somewhat funny form in my recommendations which $I$ can speak of perhaps and say that a forensic pathologist is not a police groupie and we should be independent from the prosecution or defence or
whoever else has an interest in the case and not lean towards one way or the other.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Can I clarify, Mr. Wolch --

MR. WOLCH: Please.

COMMISSIONER MaCCALLUM: -- whether the witness is speaking in general terms about the investigation of sudden death under a medical examiner system or whether he's addressing the specific issue that we face.

MR. WOLCH: I will, Mr. Commission.

COMMISSIONER MACCALLUM: Or a substitute for Section 690 .

MR. WOLCH: Yes, and also I would invite yourself to ask if you --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: You go ahead first.

MR. WOLCH: I think you heard the question. A With regards to the investigation of sudden death, the more -- the better scientifically based an investigation is of any sudden and unexplained death, the less likely we're going to have 696 now.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh, I see. So you do mean really that the whole coroner system in

Saskatchewan should be overhauled in some way as a move towards independence along the lines of a medical examiner system, but you are not really addressing the establishment of a separate Commission, for example, to do Section 690 applications?

A
Not at all, no.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Not at all, okay.
MR. WOLCH: Does that clarify?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thank you.
BY MR. WOLCH:

And, Doctor, I appreciate the importance of that recommendation. Are there any other recommendations or should we just -Oh, think -That's the one? That's where the meat is, that's where it's at.

MR. WOLCH: Thank you. Those are my questions, sir.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: In other words, Doctor, the hope would be that the frequency of wrongful convictions arising out of poor forensic science, the poor application of forensic science would diminish?

Exactly.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes, okay.
MR. HARDY: I have no questions on
re-examination and perhaps that last matter that was referred to, there will be some further follow-up on that. I know that there were many recommendations that came out of the Stonechild Inquiry and in terms of the implementation of those recommendations, I don't have the facts at this point in time, but it's something that we will pursue further.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thanks, Mr. Hardy. Doctor, thank you very much for coming and for testifying. You are excused.

A Thank you.
MR. HARDY: Mr. Commissioner, we are ready to proceed or continue with the video presentation that we began yesterday. I'm in your hands if you would like us to begin now or if you would prefer a short break at this point? COMMISSIONER MaCCALLUM: Oh, you can start right now unless the staff need some time to set it up.

MR. HARDY: Okay, it looks like we're ready to proceed.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.
(Clip VT3 played)
JOYCE MILGAARD: It isn't all of a sudden. I've been fighting for my son for all of that 21 years. The first few years we took the normal channels, you know, of appeals and things like that, but when none of them worked -- I don't know if you are aware, that in 1980 I came to Saskatoon and announced a $\$ 10,000$ reward for information leading to the real killer, and we did get a lot of information at that time which we followed up. We still need -- well, I really believe that what we have with the minister right now is more than enough to open the case. However, they've had it since December of 1988 and $I$ don't know if they are sitting on their hands or what they are doing, but we aren't knowing anything, and $I$ feel that it's long enough.
That's why I'm back in

Saskatoon, I'm asking the Saskatoon people for help now. Anybody that knows anything, don't contact the Saskatoon police, come and see me, call my lawyer David Asper in Winnipeg, collect, call him collect, he's waiting there for anybody that knows anything, even the smallest pieces.

It may be that we're going to have to find the real killer in order to proof David's innocence. That seems to be the only thing the Justice Department is going to accept.

INTERVIEWER: (Inaudible).
JOYCE MILGAARD: We have a forensic scientist, Dr. Ferris, world renowned, who says David Milgaard could not have committed the offence, period, just like that, and in fact the evidence shows that someone else did do it. We have a witness -- like, at the trial there were two major witnesses that came forward and claimed that David had reenacted the crime. Now, because our lawyer at that time is now a judge, we have not even been able to get -- we can't talk to him about it, we have not even been able to get the, you know, his file, we can't find out what information he had access to. There was a statement given at that time when those two boys' statements were taken of another girl in the room who said it didn't happen. We have found yet another girl that said that wasn't the truth, that they didn't see a reenactment, that they are, you know, embroidering the issue, and they were in on charges, which they walked on, so
there was obviously a deal struck.
All of these things, they are so -- I could spend hours on the inconsistencies that are there and I'm just absolutely utterly convinced, I'm not talking as a mother, I'm talking intellectually after having factually looked at the evidence, my son is innocent, and give me an hour of your time and have you sit down with the trial transcripts and let me walk you through it and I'll prove it to you too.

INTERVIEWER: How's David?

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: He has his bad days, it's been a -- but he's strong, he's doing well. He's a compassionate and caring man, he's helping others in his job, and believe it or not, what he's going to do when he gets out is help prisoners and, you know, he wants to go back and help others that are having hard times, because he believes that he's not alone, he believes that there are lots of other people in prison that are really innocent of the charges.

I don't think we've got a good system and $I$ guess that's why I'm here too, is because $I$ think our system has got to change. What's the good of having a remedy that says you
can go to the Justice Department on a 617 if they don't give you any money to go.

Our family money has just gone, you know, it's been so expensive. Legal Aid Saskatchewan, they won't give any money, Manitoba's won't give any money towards helping with this, we've been on our own, and $I$ just really feel that we just have to take these steps in order to get David out. I can't just sit back and let it -- it won't go away. You know what $I$ mean?

INTERVIEWER: What's the reasoning for letting (inaudible).

JOYCE MILGAARD: Well, they claim, Saskatchewan claims that he's in Manitoba, Manitoba claims that the offence took place in Saskatchewan, like, you know, so in the meantime I believe Manitoba Legal Aid has said they will go to Saskatchewan Legal Aid and make presentations or something, but whether that happens $I$ don't know. In the meantime, we're in the middle and my money has run out. David Asper, the lawyer, has been working on his own money for a long period of time now because he believes in David and he
believes in the evidence we've presented.
INTERVIEWER: The Donald Marshall case -MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Uh-huh.

INTERVIEWER: (Inaudible).
MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Oh, definitely. It's so similar in so many ways because at the first in the Donald Marshall case no one knew anything, you know, they all said that this was the case. It's the same in this one, none of the witnesses that were first interviewed knew any of these things. It wasn't until they had been through some pretty bad situations with the police and involved with the police that suddenly their stories started to change and then suddenly they saw blood on David's clothes, somebody else saw another thing, you know, all of it was just such manufactured evidence.

The credible witnesses at the case were not believed. Like, people that had nothing to hide, the Danchuks, they saw David, they saw no blood on his clothes. People like the man that saw him at seven o'clock in the morning, a normal young man, granted he walked into the motel without his boots on, but, you know, indicative that he had been in the car all
the time, to get a map, and he wasn't believed. He's really giving him an alibi for the time that Gail Miller was leaving her house. None of it makes sense.

INTERVIEWER: So the (inaudible) that Donald Marshall (inaudible)

JOYCE MILGAARD: I hope that it's going to make people aware that, okay, it happened there, it could be happening here, and in fact has happened here. If the Saskatoon police have nothing to hide, why did, in 1980, when $I$ was out visiting witnesses in Regina, not here in Saskatoon, in Regina, did they take the time and trouble to drive all the way down there and say to them don't talk to Mrs. Milgaard. Why? 10 years after the event they should have opened up the file and said "here you are, Mrs. Milgaard, we know he did it, go to it." They are hiding something. Someone is hiding something.

INTERVIEWER: Where do you go from here? JOYCE MILGAARD: I'm hoping --
(Clip VT3 paused)
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Sorry about this, but we've heard all this before. Was it on a different tape? This is VT3 and we were
listening to VT23 when we broke yesterday?
MR. HARDY: Am I correct that the document -- the girls might be able to correct me. I think we had skipped a couple because they weren't ready to be presented.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh.
MR. HARDY: In terms of the --
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: So we're going back?

MR. HARDY: Yeah.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: So we must have been listening to Mrs. Milgaard say the same thing to another interviewer? MR. HARDY: I'm assuming that.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh, is that right.
So can you give me a date? Would you just announce the date of these clips because $I$ don't have that guide that was passed around.

MR. HARDY: Okay.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: VT3 took place when?

MR. HARDY: VT3, $I$ have unknown but prior to May, 1990.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay. That's
fine, thank you, please continue. Oh, you've got

## (Clip VT3 restarted)

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: I will be here when I'm 90. I'm hoping not. I am optimistic that with the new -- Kim Campbell as the new Minister, I believe that when she sees all of the things that are there. Unfortunately, they can't go into all the things that $I$ can tell you, the inconsistency, because that's not new evidence. Like $I$ feel that it was strange that there were two knives found at the scene of the crime but one of them got lost. They had one person there, you know, what happen to that other knife?

I'm concerned that a sample
from inside the girl was discarded. They have David's seminal fluid, why couldn't they have had a direct comparison? If there was a direct comparison made that would link him why wasn't it at the trial? There -- it's pretty fishy.

INTERVIEWER: So where do you go from here?
MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: I just keep plodding along and hoping that anyone who knows anything will help us fit this puzzle together, and if it takes being out here, if $I$ have to come to

Saskatoon and live here and go door to door to find out what $I$ need to find out I'm going to find my son's -- the real killer that did this and get my son free. Okay?

INTERVIEWER: Thank you.
(Clip VT3 ends)
(Clip VT11A played)

INTERVIEWER: I guess the Ferris report just reinforced those?

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Oh, when $I$ got that report, when Dr. Ferris said to me he couldn't help me with the genetic testing, which is originally the reason $I$ went there, he said "Mrs. Milgaard, I can't understand why you need this genetic fingerprinting", and he said, "you have more than enough evidence here to prove that your son is innocent". And I said, "we do? Well will you talk to my lawyer about that, will you put it in writing", and he said, "of course I will". And, I mean, from that moment on it seemed that things were happening, and an application then went into progress with David.

INTERVIEWER: So what do you make of this what $I$ would call foot-dragging on the part of the Department of Justice? I mean it's been
what, about 16 months, David, Joyce, since the formal application was made to Justice to re-open the case?

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: It went in in December of 1988 and, you know, --

INTERVIEWER: And yet the report, --
MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Was --
INTERVIEWER: -- or the investigation for the department, nothing has reached the Minister's desk?

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Well this was the thing. We tried to be very, very patient, and David Asper kept telling us it's there, Joyce, you know they are going to be doing something, they are investigating, but $I$ couldn't see anything. And gradually $I$ started to think, well, nothing is happening, absolutely nothing was happening, we're going to have to get more evidence. And yet it doesn't seem right that we should have to prove that David is innocent by finding the real killer, but that seemed to have been almost the case.

And then, of course, we got
this anonymous phone call in David's office when he was on holidays saying that -- gives us the
name of someone that they said was the real killer, and $I$ recognized that name, $I$ knew I'd seen it on a police report and through our earlier investigation.

INTERVIEWER: When was that, by the way, Joyce?

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: That was in February of this year. So of course $I$ went hot-footing out to Saskatchewan, $I$ borrowed a car and $I$ got out there, and you would have had to be with me, talking to the people that $I$ talked to, to really know and believe that the information $I$ got was so sure. Like I'm never going to say that this man is the real killer, after what happened to my David you just wouldn't get me saying that, you know. I think that everyone, that has to be proved in a court of law, but certainly he has more --

MR. DAVID ASPER: It answers a lot of questions.

INTERVIEWER: It does, eh?
MR. DAVID ASPER: It answers a lot of questions, because it's a very unusual crime scene, and it's very difficult to explain a lot of the things that happened, bits and pieces of
evidence that were found strewn about the neighbourhood, in fact.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: And they, the Crown, kept saying, you know, the reason that David Milgaard did this was because the evidence led back to the Cadrain house. This suspect lived in the Cadrain house. Now, I mean, what --

INTERVIEWER: And Cadrain was a witness?
MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Was a witness.
MR. DAVID ASPER: David had gone to visit this fellow Cadrain in Saskatoon, and as I say, bits and pieces of the contents of $I$ believe the purse, some of the small things from the purse of the deceased were found, you know, in a direction going from where the body was found down towards Cadrain's house.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: And then the wallet was found just a few doors away from that, and the interesting part was the suspect's wallet was also found outside his house that morning and returned to him, so --

INTERVIEWER: So is that, you mean the person whose been interviewed two or three times --

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Yes, that's right,
that's part of the statement.
INTERVIEWER: -- by the investigator?

I want to ask you, David, on
what we call the foot-dragging on the part of the Department of Justice. Is there a rational explanation for that? I mean they have had enough time to at least give it to the Minister's desk for a decision; is there some sort of built-in inertia in that department, is there a situation?

MR. DAVID ASPER: I don't know, because -MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: They won't tell us. MR. DAVID ASPER: Well, I have -INTERVIEWER: Well there was foot-dragging in the Donald Marshall case?

MR. DAVID ASPER: I know, and I've been so naive about this whole thing, I don't have any great insight. I have some suspicions.

INTERVIEWER: Give my one suspicion?

MR. DAVID ASPER: Well, for example, what
is the Department of Justice but a large group of --

INTERVIEWER: Prosecutors.

MR. DAVID ASPER: -- bureaucrats and prosecutors.

INTERVIEWER: Not sympathetic to your material?

MR. DAVID ASPER: That's right.

INTERVIEWER: And I don't say that disparagingly --

MR. DAVID ASPER: No.

INTERVIEWER: -- but that's not their purpose.

MR. DAVID ASPER: No, that's right. And I don't ascribe anything evil or bad about having a Department of Justice full of prosecutors, except along comes somebody who now challenges what those people are ingrained to do, which is convict people, and again without any sort of evil motive they may intellectually and psychologically have a great deal of difficulty accepting that something like this could happen and so they will ponder and pore over the evidence, you know, the evidence and the transcripts and everything else without having the sense that $I$ have, which is that $I$ get a phone call daily from a guy in jail who wants, demands to know what's going on, and they don't have that pressure and they can have the luxury of this plodding sort of approach.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: And they don't have Joyce Milgaard at their doorstep every day too. MR. DAVID ASPER: Well --

INTERVIEWER: And the other thing, because we're talking about humanity, we're talking about human beings, there are major careers on the line?

MR. DAVID ASPER: Yes.
INTERVIEWER: There are, what, three people from the investigation and the trial, going back to 1969 and 1970, who have responsible positions now in Saskatchewan?

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Oh yes. The investigator is now the chief of police in Saskatoon.

MR. DAVID ASPER: And this is the guy, the investigator is the guy who found the samples in the snow --

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Right.
MR. DAVID ASPER: -- which, if all goes well, by the time this show airs will be ridiculed.

INTERVIEWER: So you have the investigator who is the police chief?

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Yeah. We have --

INTERVIEWER: You've got an attorney who is now on the Bench, Justice --

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: NOW on the Court of Appeal.

MR. DAVID ASPER: Court of Appeal of Saskatchewan.

INTERVIEWER: Of Saskatchewan, and we have one other person?

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Oh yes, Mr. Caldwell, he's in the Justice Department.

MR. DAVID ASPER: Works for the Department of Justice.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: That's right.

INTERVIEWER: So, I mean, you've got major careers at stake.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Uh-huh."
(Clip VT11A ends) (Clip VT11B played)

REPORTER: David Milgaard, he has spent 21
years in prison for a crime he insists he did not commit. Tonight Milgaard is sitting in Stony

Mountain Penitentiary while the Federal Justice Department examines new evidence to determine if he should get a new trial.

> A key element of that
investigation is focused on another suspect. The CBC has learned some revealing details about that suspect's background. Sharon Basaraba of 24 Hours reports now from Saskatoon.

MS. SHARON BASARABA: David Milgaard has been in prison for most of his 37 years. He's been denied parole, in part because he refuses to say he's guilty.

MR. DAVID MILGAARD: I don't want to have to report to somebody for the rest of my life for a crime that I didn't commit.

MS. SHARON BASARABA: His jury didn't believe him. Following his trial in Saskatoon in 1970, Milgaard was found guilty of the murder of Gail Miller, a 20-year-old nursing assistant. Miller's body was found lying in the snow on a cold January morning in 1969. The jury was told she had been raped and repeatedly stabbed with a paring knife. David Milgaard arrived in

Saskatoon around the same time that Gail Miller was killed. He was on his way here, to the home of one of his friends, Gail Miller's body was found about a block away, and the trail of evidence appeared to lead back to this house.

Her wallet was found two doors away and a blood-stained toque just next door. But Milgaard's friend wasn't the only one living here, there was someone else in the basement suite, someone who was never brought in for questioning.
His name is Larry Earl Fisher.

This is what his criminal record looks like
today, a history of brutal rapes, sexual assaults, and in one case attempted murder. His first three crimes took place in Saskatoon, before Gail Miller's murder. But Saskatoon police had no record of Fisher back in 1969. Those crimes didn't come to light until more than a year later when he was picked up in Winnipeg on yet another rape charge.
Lorne Huff is a private investigator and lie detector expert in Winnipeg. 20 years ago, he was the police detective who interrogated Larry Fisher after Fisher was caught in the act of raping a woman. Fisher ultimately confessed to two rapes.

MR. LORNE HUFF: The first rape, in particular, was rather brutal. He had a knife and he dragged this woman into a bush area in the

Fort Richmond area at the time, or King's Park I guess we called it then, but he dragged her into the bush and he brutally raped her. He, I can't recall what all the gory details were, but it was a very brutal rape and he tied her up with her own clothing.

MS. SHARON BASARABA: What did he have in his possession, what was --

MR. LORNE HUFF: He had a paring knife with
him, on both instances he had a paring knife. It wasn't a big knife, but it was a knife, and he would threaten the women with the knife.

MS. SHARON BASARABA: Fisher pleaded guilty to both Winnipeg rapes and was sentenced to 13 years. But Lorne Huff heard more than just those two confessions. Fisher confessed to four other previous sexual assaults in Saskatoon. One of those victims lived less than two blocks from where Gail Miller's body was found. At the time of those
confessions, police already had David Milgaard behind bars for the murder of Gail Miller. Three of Fisher's sexual assaults happened only a few months before Gail Miller's rape and murder, but that didn't prompt police to re-open their
investigation.
One person who thought they should have is Fisher's ex-wife, Linda. She refused our request for an on-camera interview, but in a signed statement given in March of this year Linda Fisher points an accusing finger at her ex-husband. She says "on the night before the morning of the Miller murder Larry again had failed to come home. I had discovered that my kitchen paring knife was missing."

Linda accused her husband of having committed the murder. She remembers his reaction. "My angry accusations stopped him cold. He look at me like a guilty person who had just been caught. The colour drained from his face and he looked shocked and scared. I will never forget his expression."

Linda Fisher says she went to Saskatoon police in January of 1980 and gave them a statement about her suspicions. She has heard nothing from them since.

Joe Penkala is now the chief of
police in Saskatoon. In 1969 he was involved in the investigation of Gail Miller's murder. He has consistently refused comment about the new
evidence in the Milgaard case.

MR. JOE PENKALA: There is no displayed compassion for the family of Gail Miller, and the media continues to promote the controversy, which doesn't require to be proven.

MR. LORNE HUFF: You can't overlook the fact that this man has now committed these number of rapes, and he lived nearby where this rape and murder had occurred, it's obvious you have to look into it.

MS. SHARON BASARABA: Larry Fisher served 8 1/2 years at the Saskatchewan Penitentiary in Prince Albert. He was paroled in 1980 . Less than three months later, he raped and tried to kill a 56-year-old North Battleford woman.

Fisher is now back in prison.
He refused our request for an interview, but the RCMP have interviewed him twice about Gail Miller's murder. Their investigation, part of the Justice Department's review, is continuing.

Larry Fisher is scheduled for release in 1994, the same year David Milgaard's sentence runs out.

For 24 Hours, I'm Sharon Basaraba.

REPORTER: More on this story tonight from our Saskatoon studios. Sharon Basaraba is standing by there.

Sharon, Larry Fisher, it would appear, is a natural suspect in this case; why didn't the police investigate him before now?

MS. SHARON BASARABA: Well, that's a good question. There does seem to be some compelling evidence leading back to Larry Fisher.

For example, we tracked the histories of some of his past victims, found they lived right in the same neighbourhood. If he had been -- if they had taken a bus to work, for example, they would have taken the same bus as Larry Fisher, as did Gail Miller.

INTERVIEWER: What happens now?

MS. SHARON BASARABA: Well Rick Pearson is the RCMP investigator looking into this case on behalf of the Justice Department. He says the questioning continues and, as far as we know, Larry Fisher is the only other suspect being investigated in the case.

INTERVIEWER: Anything else at all involved in that review you've just mentioned?

MS. SHARON BASARABA: Well it's, as you can
imagine, pretty hard to find new evidence in a murder that occurred more than 20 years ago, but there have been reports that came out that looked at that original evidence.

Dr. James Ferris of the University of British Columbia and Dr. Markesteyn the chief medical examiner of Manitoba, have -they are pathologists and they have both taken a new look, given a new interpretation to the original evidence, and in fact challenged the link between David Milgaard and the murder. INTERVIEWER: All right, Sharon, time for one more quick question. Any idea of how much longer David Milgaard is going to have to wait until -- not until he gets out of jail, but until there's some resolution of whether he gets a new trial?

MS. SHARON BASARABA: Well the lawyers working on his behalf, of course, have been waiting since December of 1988 when they first submitted their application to the Justice Department to have the case re-opened. Very few details of that investigation have been released. We spoke today to the chief investigator, that's Eugene Williams from the

Justice Department in Ottawa, and he says it's impossible to predict exactly how long it will be before this investigation is complete.

INTERVIEWER: Okay, Sharon, thanks for this.

MS. SHARON BASARABA: Thanks, Mike.

## (Clip VT11B ends)

MR. HARDY: And, Mr. Commissioner, we should be back, now, to where we left off yesterday.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.
(Clip VT24 played)

REPORTER: For 22 years, David Milgaard has been serving a life sentence for a murder that he claims he did not commit. Later this morning, an American-based Christian organization will present what it says is new evidence that will show reasonable doubt in the Milgaard case. Milgaard supporters will also ask the Justice Minister for the second time to re-open his case. Their first appeal, filed in 1988, was turned down earlier this year. Joining us this hour in Winnipeg is David Milgaard's mother, Joyce Milgaard, and his lawyer, David Asper. Good
morning to you both.
BOTH: Good morning.

REPORTER: Mrs. Milgaard, perhaps you could lead us off by telling us a little bit about the new evidence that has come to light?

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: The -- which new evidence, the --

INTERVIEWER: Well I understand that the ministry group in Toronto is presenting some new evidence today?

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Right. Because we had new evidence come forward in 1980 , and then of course we also had new evidence that went to the Minister in 1988, it's -- we have new evidence, all the time, that is going in.

What Jim McCloskey will be presenting in Toronto today is a report that -done by the Centurion Ministries organization. They are based, a non-profit organization based in Princeton, New Jersey, and that report will detail the findings of the interviews with the victims of a serial rapist who they believe was the real killer, not my son David.

INTERVIEWER: Uh-huh. So, above and beyond the material you already had in 1988 when you
first went to the Justice Minister, there is no other new material being presented today; is that correct?

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: There will be all -it will be the new material that he has collected during this last --

INTERVIEWER: These interviews?
MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Uh-huh.
INTERVIEWER: How did Centurion Ministries get involved in this case?

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Actually, my son David first heard about them from some news media paper that he had read, and $I$ was working on a course in New Jersey at the time, and he said "eh, mum, this guy is right down there, can you go and see him", and I did. But he wasn't -well he had 3, 000 cases a year coming to him asking for help, and there was just no way, he said, he could come to Canada. So I offered to help on my days off in the office, and that way $I$ thought, you know, I felt $I$ was really helping David, and did that for a number of months.

Then in February of 1990, when we got the anonymous phone call which indicated that Larry Fisher was the real killer, I phoned

Jim and I said "eh, I'm on my way out to Saskatoon". I really wasn't phoning for help, just to tell him what was happening. And he said "wait a minute, you can't do that, it's too dangerous", and he provided an investigator to come up with me. He said "I'll give you this guy for a week, and let's see what we can do, but you can't go on your own". And of course, once that investigator got involved and started giving the reports back to Jim about what was happening -INTERVIEWER: Then they jumped in? MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Oh yes, with both feet.

INTERVIEWER: Can we bring Mr. Asper in on this.

Mrs. Milgaard has mentioned a name of someone you suspect to be the person responsible for the murder in question. You are a lawyer; how can you broadcast a name like that?

MR. DAVID ASPER: Well, I want to clarify that, because independent of what anybody might say about Larry Fisher the value of Larry Fisher's evidence, in my opinion, is not to prove that Larry Fisher committed this crime, and it's not for me to do that, and Larry Fisher is
clothed with the presumption of innocence and all the other procedural and legal guarantees that he has.

What the effect of the evidence is, is to disprove that David Milgaard did it.

Now I appreciate that may seem
like a subtle difference, but it's an important difference, because at a trial of David Milgaard all he has to do is raise a reasonable doubt. If we were able to present to the jury the fact that this serial rapist was operating, and that the modus operandi of his crimes was virtually identical to that of Gail Miller, then the jury would have reasonable doubt as to whether David Milgaard did it.

> As to the guilt of Larry

Fisher, I -- I -- it's not my problem, frankly.
INTERVIEWER: I'm glad you clarified that
for us because it is a very important legal distinction.

MR. DAVID ASPER: Absolutely.
INTERVIEWER: Mr. Asper, the first application made to the Minister to review the case back in 1988 was finally turned down in 1991, you are going to go back to the Justice

Minister to ask for another appeal; is that correct?

MR. DAVID ASPER: Yeah. As a matter of fact, late yesterday afternoon a new application has been sent to the Minister of Justice, I hope that actually by this time it's arrived in Ottawa, and it presents in fairly comprehensive form the new evidence that we've developed, and hopefully the Minister will have a favourable look at it.

INTERVIEWER: Do you have any indication that it will take the Minister of Justice, this time, any less time to process this appeal than it did the first time around?

MR. DAVID ASPER: No, and that's -- and that's a very critical question. One would hope that the effect of this new evidence will cast a very different light on the evidence that the Minister earlier rejected, and to that extent one would hope that the process will be very, very much quicker.

I think that first of all a lot of the legwork has already been done, but secondly, I think that the Department, at the very least, owes some degree of compassion to

David Milgaard, who is having a very, very rough go of things at the present time and, you know, they owe him at least the courtesy of dealing with it quickly. I mean, his freedom is at stake.

INTERVIEWER: Mrs. Milgaard, tell us a little bit about your son at this point in time, 22 years into a sentence; how is he, how is his mental state?

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: I was up to see him yesterday, and he's very discouraged. He hasn't even wanted to become involved in what's going on right now because he just feels that the government is not listening. I know he was encouraged by the -- Gail Miller's family --

INTERVIEWER: This is the victim's family that's in question?

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Yes, uh-huh. Mr. McCloskey went out to see them and gave them the new information, and that was instrumental in them coming forward giving a statement to us to be given to the press, saying that they believed that there was more than enough evidence to show a reasonable doubt that David Milgaard was not the -- or not guilty. very powerful and important. And, you know, if they can see this from the evidence we've brought forward, surely the Minister of Justice will be able to see that too.

INTERVIEWER: Mr. Asper, if you can in the few moments we have, can you give us a quick precipe as to why the Minister of Justice turned down the application the first time round?

MR. DAVID ASPER: Well, there are three strands of evidence in the case, there is the evidence of Milgaard's companions, there's forensic evidence, and then there's evidence that a re-enactment by Milgaard occurred quite some time later.

One of the companions
ultimately totally recanted and admitted that he lied at the trial. The Minister now dismisses that recantation as not credible.

The Minister, even though the forensic evidence was totally discredited, says that the forensic evidence tendered by the Crown at the trial really wasn't that important.

And insofar as the re-enactment is concerned, we provided a witness who
contradicted very damning testimony, and the Department of Justice has claimed that it was really a matter of interpretation and that our witness, in fact, corroborates the Crown's evidence at the time of the trial, a ludicrous proposition. But that's it in a nutshell.

INTERVIEWER: Well, let me put it to you bluntly then, why would the Minister of Justice listen this time as opposed to last time?

MR. DAVID ASPER: Well, as I say, one would hope that the -- the new evidence that we're providing her is extraordinarily powerful, and one would hope that the Minister would see the old evidence in a fresh light, and that perhaps the judgements that she reached were perhaps a little bit premature.

INTERVIEWER: David --

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Can I make a point here?

INTERVIEWER: Yes, go ahead, Mrs. Milgaard? MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: I feel that, you know, a lot of people are condemning Kim Campbell, and they may be doing that rightly, but I think the main thing that Canadians folks have got to look at is that we don't know what Kim

Campbell has seen, we don't know what her department has given her, we don't know what she gave to the judge.

We don't have a system that provides openness, and that's what we need, we need the system to change so this secrecy, this closed-door policy, can't go on. Then you can say "well, she's doing wrong".

But, you know, I guess $I$ want this to be opened up so that everyone can see, and all we're asking for is our day in Court, and David's waited a really long time in light of everything we've put in.

INTERVIEWER: I want to thank you both for joining us this morning.

MR. DAVID ASPER: Our pleasure.
(Clip VT24 ends)
(Clip VT25 played)
REPORTER: David Milgaard has spent more than two decades ... lately he has been doing much of his time in the prison hospital.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: His mind, right now, is just ready to snap.

REPORTER: His mother has been working for years to try to have her son set free or at least
granted a new trial. Today, she and a group of supporters gathered in candle-light vigil hoping to bring the case to the Prime Minister's attention.

NARRATOR: Each one of the candles that has been lit represents one year out of the 22 years that David has been in prison.

REPORTER: Their bid succeeded. Mulroney stopped to chat with Milgaard on his way into a Iuncheon.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Anything you could do to help we would be so appreciative of.

THE HON. BRIAN MULRONEY: Well I, ah, Ms. Campbell is going to take a look at the new information.

REPORTER: Mulroney told Milgaard the Minister will look at information that's just surfaced in the case, including an allegation that crucial police documents have gone missing.

Milgaard urged speed in the
review, and asked that her son be transferred to a minimum security prison while he waits.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: It would be terrible for me to have justice for David in Canada and not have him able to know he's got it.

THE HON. BRIAN MULRONEY: IS -- is -- is he --

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: It's that desperate. THE HON. BRIAN MULRONEY: Is he that sick? MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: It is that desperate. THE HON. BRIAN MULRONEY: I didn't realize -- $I$ knew he was ill, but I didn't realize he was that sick.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: It is exactly. I would never be coming to you otherwise.

THE HON. BRIAN MULRONEY: I will look into it right away.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Thank you.

REPORTER: The two spoke for about five minutes. Milgaard says it's a source of new hope.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: He sounded sincere, he sounded -- it sounded encouraging to me that he even knew about the latest information, so it obviously means that he knows what's going on.

INTERVIEWER: Mulroney wished her good luck. Joyce Milgaard says she isn't counting on just luck in her quest to have her son's case re-opened.

News.
(Clip VT25 ends)
(Clip VT26 played)
NARRATOR: It's one of Canada's most notorious murder cases, and this man has spent 22 years proclaiming his innocence.

MR. DAVID MILGAARD: I demand an inquiry into the Justice Department. It's that simple.

REPORTER: But does he think Larry Fisher, a brutal rapist, killed Gail Miller?

MR. DAVID MILGAARD: I don't know that he committed the Miller murder, but $I$ hate the man, knowing what he is done for sure.

MR. LINDEN MCINTYRE: What's the worst part of being in?

REPORTER: From Manitoba, Linden MCIntyre has an exclusive interview with David Milgaard, a prisoner waiting for justice.

MR. DAVID MILGAARD: I am an innocent man, right, they have to come and say "we made a mistake, our department has made a mistake".

MR. LINDEN MCINTYRE: Last September, on our season premiere, The Fifth Estate laid out important new evidence in the David Milgaard case. Milgaard has been in prison for 22 years for a murder he insists he did not commit, and a lot of people believe in his innocence. You may remember that, last year, we told you about witnesses who have changed their testimony, how new witnesses have come forward, and how there may even be a new suspect in one of the most sensational murder cases in Canadian history.

Tonight we're going to revisit the Milgaard case by telling you what happened since we first broadcast our program and by talking to Milgaard himself. We had heard from his family and supporters that he was extremely depressed and isolated. Instead, we encountered a man waiting for freedom, convinced that he will be vindicated, but angry that it's taking so long.

MR. DAVID MILGAARD: There should be an inquiry into the Justice Department. I demand an inquiry into the Justice Department, it's that simple. Because people can say they demand an inquiry into something, why can't I? There should be an inquiry into the Justice Department. MR. LINDEN MCINTYRE: And what would you
hope the outcome of that would be, that inquiry? MR. DAVID MILGAARD: The truth. LINDEN MCINTYRE: The truth. Who really killed 20-year-old Gail Miller in Saskatoon early on January 31st, 1969.

Last year The 5th Estate reported that much of the evidence which originally led to David Milgaard's conviction is now in serious doubt. One witness, Milgaard's friend Ron Wilson, retracted testimony that was crucial in the Crown's case. He now says he lied when he said he saw Milgaard blood stained and with a knife.

And we identified this man,
Larry Earl Fisher, a serial rapist who has confessed to three rapes in Saskatoon at about the same time and in the same neighbourhood where Gail Miller was raped and murdered. Fisher denies any involvement in the Miller case.

MR. LARRY FISHER: The cops have already had my name for 21 years. Now, if they had some concrete evidence, why didn't they charge me 21 years ago?

MR. LINDEN MCINTYRE: The trouble with
Larry Fisher's logic is that by the time the

Saskatoon police learned about his confession, David Milgaard was already behind bars for the Miller murder. Since our broadcast, Federal Justice Minister Kim Campbell has refused to re-open the case.

THE HON. KIM CAMPBELL: ...if you want your son to have a fair hearing, don't approach me personally. I'm sorry.

MR. LINDEN MCINTYRE: However, this investigator, working for a U.S. advocacy group, has helped prepare a new submission to the Justice Department, this time focusing on the crimes of Larry Fisher. They contend that his methods, techniques and peculiarities amount to a signature, the signature of the man who killed Gail Miller.

In recent weeks the Saskatoon
Police Department, whose members built the case against David Milgaard, have admitted that key files concerning Larry Fisher have disappeared. In one of the most dramatic recent developments, Prime Minister Brian Mulroney raised the hopes of the Milgaard family in this encounter with Joyce Milgaard, who continues her long campaign to free her son from prison.
P.M. BRAIN MULRONEY: I'll look it right away.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Thank you.
MR. LINDEN MCINTYRE: Mulroney has since backed away from direct involvement in the case.

MR. DAVID MILGAARD: I want to see the Justice Department to come and see me and my family and say we made a mistake, it's that simple. I am an innocent man, they have to come and say we made a mistake, our department has made a mistake, and that's what $I$ want to see done.

MR. LINDEN MCINTYRE: Why is it so important to you, though, to hear those people say we made a mistake?

MR. DAVID MILGAARD: Because they're the ones that are sitting down right now, okay, outside of a prison, while $I$ sit in the cage, and people are telling them you've made a mistake and they're doing nothing about it.

MR. LINDEN MCINTYRE: But you can get out of the cage by saying, okay, I am the (unintelligible).

MR. DAVID MILGAARD: I can't get out of the cage by saying that to the National Parole Board
because I didn't do it. Would you admit to doing something as lousy as that if you didn't do it? MR. LINDEN MCINTYRE: I don't know what $I$ would admit to if $I$ sat where you sit for 23 years. I might admit that the world was flat, you know, after 23 years.

MR. DAVID MILGAARD: The person that sat down across from me and said that once, okay, a lady whose name $I$ won't mention, right, even though she was a National Parole Board person, okay, in her own kind of friendly way saying, "David, if you go in there and say you are not guilty, you are not going to get out for a long time. Even if you aren't or you are, it doesn't matter, go in there and say you are guilty and you'll get out quicker." I asked her the same thing that you just asked me, what would you do, you know, given the same situation. She said, "I would do anything to get out of prison." The same position you are taking. I said I won't. MR. LINDEN MCINTYRE: But my point is there, it reaches a certain point, you've been in here 23 years. It could take you 23 more years to get them to come around to admitting that they made a mistake, when you could probably get out
of here by just saying, okay, you didn't make a mistake. What's stopping you from --

MR. DAVID MILGAARD: When $I$ stand before the National Parole Board and they paint a picture of a person that is supposed to have raped and murdered a woman, I feel a sense of hostility towards that picture, it really bugs me. I hate people like that. I hate Larry Fisher, you know, just knowing what he's done for sure. I don't know that he committed the Miller murder, right, but $I$ hate the man knowing what he's done for sure.

MR. LINDEN MCINTYRE: To the other women? MR. DAVID MILGAARD: Yes, and people inside prison feel that way. A lot of people on the street think it's all fine inside prison and stuff, right. You know, we feel as strongly as men anywhere. Probably even stronger sometimes.

MR. LINDEN MCINTYRE: What about the other guys, you know, the guys that, the fellow you were travelling with, Wilson?

MR. DAVID MILGAARD: Ron Wilson? I'm glad he told the truth. It helped us.

MR. LINDEN MCINTYRE: But you forgive him
for having sold you out in the first place?

MR. DAVID MILGAARD: I don't hold anything against him. I remember his mother as being, and his family as being nice people.

MR. LINDEN MCINTYRE: Where do you get this compassion that you have for everybody? I mean

MR. DAVID MILGAARD: Truthfully?
MR. LINDEN MCINTYRE: Yeah.
MR. DAVID MILGAARD: Jesus Christ.
MR. LINDEN MCINTYRE: YOu are a religious $\operatorname{man} ?$

MR. DAVID MILGAARD: I consider myself a religious person, yes.

MR. LINDEN MCINTYRE: What's the worst part about being in?

MR. DAVID MILGAARD: I don't know, sometimes $I$ guess trying to find time $I$ guess for yourself away from the chatter of the day, you know, wanting to be able to just feel comfortable.

MR. LINDEN MCINTYRE: I sometimes imagine which would be the worst, with just the human creation and the confinement of prison, or is it the sense of injustice when you believe that you are wrongfully in there, which is worse?

MR. DAVID MILGAARD: Well, for me, the injustice, okay, is in fact being part of a picture, it's not just being locked down. I'm not $a$ big person in some country, $I^{\prime} m$ a man that's inside a prison and I've been here for 23 years and $I$ do feel a soreness and an anger at being left out and being screwed. I just put in my mind that eventually the facts as they stand, there's no reason for them to be ignored and that they will in fact get me free.

MR. LINDEN MCINTYRE: Do you get the feeling it's a little bit like digging your way out with a spoon, with a teaspoon, you know, sort of --

MR. DAVID MILGAARD: That's a nice way to put it, because basically there have been people inside penitentiaries with just a spoon, you know, they escape by scraping through a cement block over a period of two or three months and stuff like that. This has been very much like that for me.

MR. LINDEN MCINTYRE: You get depressed, I mean, not just like feeling blue, you get clinically depressed from time to time?

MR. DAVID MILGAARD: I really get down
there. I get to the point sometimes where I'm sitting still in the house kind of twiddling my thumbs like this and looking at the walls and saying, you know, when am I getting out of here and how, how, how, and, you know, who is going to get me out, and all that does for me sometimes is it gets me depressed.

MR. LINDEN MCINTYRE: Have you been damaged by this? I mean, like, are you going to take scars out of here?

MR. DAVID MILGAARD: Well, the whole picture is one of rather than seeing myself too much scarred, right, whether $I$ am or I'm not, right, it's the hold on my thinking, a picture of out, close, or it's forthcoming anyway, right, and to hold to the strength of looking to an optimistic picture.

MR. LINDEN MCINTYRE: Do you think of yourself as being healthy?

MR. DAVID MILGAARD: Yes, yes. Sore, but healthy.

MR. LINDEN MCINTYRE: And a survivor?
MR. DAVID MILGAARD: A week or two ago I wasn't doing, you know, all that good. I'm feeling better now. Sore, but healthy.

MR. LINDEN MCINTYRE: The big issue is whether or not David Milgaard is a threat to society $I$ guess. I mean, that's what --

MR. DAVID MILGAARD: Do I sound like a threat to you?

MR. LINDEN MCINTYRE: No.

MR. DAVID MILGAARD: Thank you. I like to think that I'm friendly, that people like me and that I like people. I like me.

MR. LINDEN MCINTYRE: You like you?

MR. DAVID MILGAARD: Yup, I do.
MR. LINDEN MCINTYRE: You would like to be David Milgaard's neighbour?

MR. DAVID MILGAARD: I wouldn't mind having just a neighbour, period.

## (Clip VT26 ends)

(Clip VT27 played)

REPORTER: ... story, Federal Justice Kim Campbell says she expects to make a decision on the fate of David Milgaard in the near future. Milgaard says he was wrongfully convicted of murder 23 years ago.

Now, in the last two years his mother has made a number of pleas to have the case re-opened, pleas that have been aimed at
both the justice minister and the prime minister. The latest now from Jacque Barbeau.

MR. JACQUE BARBEAU: David Milgaard has spent more than half his life in prison for a murder he says he didn't commitment. Now Milgaard is trying to get a second trial to prove his innocence.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: We're not asking anyone to say David is innocent at this point, we're simply asking that it be brought before -opened up.

MR. JACQUE BARBEAU: Milgaard's mother Joyce is also fighting for her son's freedom. Today she was on Parliament Hill meeting MPs, include Liberal leader Jean Chretien.
P.M. JEAN CHRETIEN: We're doing our best and wish you the best of luck.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Well, I thank you. Thank you for coming. MR. JACQUE BARBEAU: In the House of Commons, the opposition pressed the government to grant Milgaard a new trial.

MR. RUSSELL MacLELLAN: When is the Minister going to use her authority to do justice to David Milgaard, release the file to his lawyer
and re-open the case so this new evidence can be brought forward?

THE HON. KIM CAMPBELL: I will do that as quickly as $I$ can and consistent with my duty, and I have no apologies to make with the speed with which it's being done. I believe I owe it to the Canadian people to do this with great care and thoroughness.

MR. JACQUE BARBEAU: The government said it's ready to grant one of Milgaard's requests. He has been asking to be transferred from stony Mountain Penitentiary to a nearby prison. Today the solicitor general said Milgaard was offered a transfer, but he refused.

MR. DOUG LEWIS: Please be assured that the prison authorities remain open to consider the possibility of a transfer should your son wish to raise the request again.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: I don't know that my son understood what the warden was saying at that point. He has sent a request to the, to Saskatoon appealing the decision that they denied, so the request is in the works. I think there's a communication problem here.

JACQUE BARBEAU: David Milgaard --

```
(Clip VT27 ends)
```

MR. HARDY: That's likely a good spot to break for the day, Mr. Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: All right.
(Adjourned at 4:29 p.m.)
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