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## Transcript of Proceedings

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

## BRUCE IVAN PAYNTER, continued:

## BY MR. HARDY:

Q
A

Q
Morning, Mr. Paynter.
Morning.
We'll continue from where we left off yesterday. Just to recap, we discussed -- we were taking a look at your notes, and perhaps I'll bring that page of notes up on the screen again, please. And we have been talking about the entries and the abbreviations you were using, and perhaps just to summarize, we talked about some of your testing methods for the detection of seminal fluid, and correct me if I'm wrong, but $I$ understood it was essentially a three-step process; you would initially visually inspect an article, if you suspected a seminal stain you would move on to what is known as an acid phosphatase test?

That is correct.
And perhaps $I$ 'll pause there just for a moment, because $I$ don't know if this became clear yesterday, but that would involve actually cutting
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out a piece of the material where you suspected a stain?

A
Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

A

Q Okay. And we also touched briefly on the issue of detecting blood, and for the most part, as we made our way through your notes, it would appear that you did not test most of the items for the presence of blood. We had made our way to item $H$, which was the knife blade, and had been discussing that, and in particular the notation 'positive Hemo', and again correct me if I'm wrong, but I understood that to be the haemochromogen test? identify the stain as containing blood.

Okay. And is that positively indicating human

A

Q

A
Q
blood or, simply, positively indicating the presence of blood?

That would just indicate blood.
And, therefore, is that where the AH positive beside that entry comes into the picture? You had described that, I believe, to us as a test that was used for purposes of determining that a substance was of human origin?

That is correct, yes.
Okay. And just briefly, if we could go back to the first page of these notes, please, we had already talked about the pair of panties -- and we'll take a look at the entry which we discussed there yesterday -- and if we could go back to your original notes for a moment, and that would be document $I D$ 082386, and $I$ note item B, again the pair of pink panties, it's an identical entry, although $I$ note on your original notes that over on the right-hand margin here we see, again, the 'positive AH'?

Yes.
And would $I$ be correct, then, in concluding that, after you had received the positive acid phosphatase test and positive microscopic examination, that you also conducted the AH test
that you have described for us?
A
Yes, $I$ would run the same human determination test that $I$ ran on the blood samples, even though the microscopic examination wasn't sufficient for me to say that it was human seminal fluid, I still would run the other tests as a confirmation. Okay. And I think, then, you've already answered this question, but the AH test that you have been describing for us, then, could be conducted on a blood sample or on a semen sample; is that correct?

Yes, you used the same tests for both materials. Okay. And $I$ continue to say AH, I think you told us the name, what is that an abbreviation for? Well, we just referred to it as an antihuman test. Okay. And if we could go back, then, to the more legible version of the notes, doc 082377 , and again the second page please. I would like to talk to you now about the next two entries, Mr. Paynter, they are referred to as I1 and I2 and described as:
"Sample of liquid (received frozen in
plastic vial",
and we've heard in evidence already that these two items were items that were actually retrieved
by Lieutenant Penkala from the scene, from the scene of the crime, two frozen substances that he had retrieved on February 4th. And perhaps, just for reference sake, we'll look at document 006262 . This is the report respecting that attendance that $I$ am speaking of, and you will note there that Lieutenant Penkala talks of searching in the snow at the area, locating two frozen lumps yellowish in colour with hair frozen into the lumps, indicates that they were retained in a frozen state and that the exhibit would be submitted to the Crime Detection Laboratory at a later date, see the date at the top being February 4th. If we could go back to the notes, please. So speaking of those two items, Mr. Paynter, and looking at those entries, do you recall the receipt of those two vials?

A
$Q$

A The vials would be probably what was used then as, we referred to as pill vials, plastic vials with a snap-on cap that was commonly -- you would get from a drug store with pills in them. And in each
one, the one referred to as I2 I remember had a larger amount of material in it than $I$-- the II had more material in it than I2. They were both, I believe, frozen at the time. Umm, it has been referred to as being pale yellowish in colour, and as $I$ recall that was the closest colour that you could come to as saying it was pale yellow, it would be very pale, it was not a bright yellow colour, a very pale-ish yellow colour.

And did that apply to both of the vials, then, the substance in both of the vials?

I believe it did at that time.

And $I$ believe Lieutenant Penkala referred to the presence of hair; do you recall hair being present in one of the vials?

I don't recall hair being in it, but $I$ do remember that $I$ believe $I$ gave it to somebody else who would be examining it for hair, but $I$ don't recall, myself, as anything else being in it. And $I$ won't bring up the actual report, I'll refer to the document ID, it's 105544, a report by a Victor Molchanko; do you recall Mr. Molchanko?

A

Q
$Q$ Yes I do.

And would he have been in the hair and fibre section?

Yes he was.
And $I$ believe he reports that in fact he had received these vials from you and had located hair in one of them, and $I$ take it you wouldn't dispute that conclusion?

No. There is a note on the bottom of this page, that is up at the present, that I gave the exhibits to Corporal Molchanko on the 17th of March, 1969.

And would that not be something, then, that you would note in your notes at the time, the presence of hair in one of those vials?

I did not make a note of it, no.
Okay. And can you give us any sense about how much fluid was in each of these samples?

As I said, $I$ believe $I 1$ had a bit more than $I 2$, but it would be a very small amount anyway, probably -- Il might have had two or three millilitres of it and $I 2$ would have probably had less.

And $I$ think you indicated to us you do recall that you received these in a frozen state?

Yes I did.
And if we look at your entry, and again we'll maybe focus on $I 1$, it goes on to again indicate
some abbreviations, some of which we've spoken of, but if you could please explain to me the meaning of those entries?

A
Well, again, $I$ ran the acid phosphatase test, which was positive on $I 1$ but not on I2. I did a microscopic examination of some of the fluid in I1, it was positive for human seminal -- for human spermatozoa, therefore human seminal fluid. I ran an antihuman test on $I$ believe both, but it's not on the notes there, umm, on the second one, and it was negative for human material in I2. On I1 I also ran a test for blood grouping substances present in the sample, that is to say a certain percentage of the population will secrete their blood grouping factors or substances in their other body fluids, they are known as 'secretors', and in this case $I$ found a positive result for blood grouping substance A but not for blood grouping substance $B$. This would indicate to me that the probable donor of the seminal fluid was from a person probably of group A blood group.

And that last portion that you have been describing to us, this is the reference, then, that you are making there, positive for A substance?

A, we referred to it as a, a number of different ways; A substance, A antigen as in blood grouping antigens, yeah. But that would be what $I$ was referring to, yes.

And let's talk about that just for a moment. I take it that that, then, is a component of blood? Yes, it is.

And you have explained to us, though, that in secretors that component is also found in other bodily substances?

I believe that is correct, yes.
So using some examples, if a person was of type $B$ blood and was a secretor, I take it you would find
the $B$ antigens in other bodily substances from
that individual?
That is correct.
And --
And in this case $I$ could not rule out a person being $A B$, even though $I$ found $A$ and no $B$ does not mean that there was no $B$ there, it means that $I$ did not find any $B$ there.

Okay.

It could have been destroyed, it might have been weaker, or various reasons.

Okay. So that in a type $A B$ person -- and, again, I believe we're using the international grouping system terminology -- in a group AB person, then, you would find both A and B antigens?

You would expect to find them both.
If they were a secretor?
If they were a secretor.
Okay. And carrying through with the obvious, though, if they were a non-secretor then, when you tested the other bodily substances, I take it you would not find A antigens if it was a type A person?

That is correct. And that would be the reason why I wouldn't -- we would never have identified a stain as being blood group 0 , because there would be neither $A$ or $B$ antigens there, and therefore we would not know whether it was a group O or whether it was a non-secretor.

Okay. We'll talk about that a little bit more shortly. And when you talk about other bodily fluids, what fluids are we talking about that these A antigens in this instance would be detected in, if the individual was a secretor?

A

Q

A
$Q$

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
Q

A
Q

Well mainly in our work we referred to it usually in, just in seminal fluid or saliva.

And what about perspiration for example?
It could be in perspiration as well, yes.
Urine?
Umm, I can't really say whether it would be or not, but if it was $I$ would suspect it would be very weak, it would probably be a carryover from some other fluid.

And just for a moment, you indicated that the AH test was conducted in relation to item II, is that correct from your recollection?

Umm, it's not in the notes there, but I cannot fathom why it would not have been done.

Okay.
I see no reason why I didn't.
And in fairness if we turn to your original notes please, again back to document 082386, and if we turn to page 2 of that document we see 11 at the top of the page and $I$ note, again on the right-hand column, the 'positive AH'?

That is correct.
Would that indicate for $u s$, then, that in fact that test was conducted in relation to that substance?

That is what that would indicate, yes.
Okay. If we could go back, please, to the more legible notes, same page, and can you explain for me why this test was done, and in particular I'm talking about the test for the presence of $A$ antigens in both of these samples?

The reason it would be done would be to try to narrow down the field of possible donors for that seminal fluid sample. I should add that it was not a routine test that we did on every case because it was more involved and, for the reasons that I explained, is that you could not get as positive an answer from that as you could from the blood grouping because there was no backup test to confirm what you found or didn't find.

Okay. So -- but it was, am I hearing you correctly, an investigative tool, so to speak, that could be used?

It would be an investigative tool, help for the investigator, yes.

In other words, if we had a substance which was determined to be seminal fluid, you could narrow down the population of donors from all male persons to those persons, for example, that were of type A blood where A antigens had been found in
the fluid?
I would never have said that it was definitely from a person of group $A$, but that would be the area that they probably should be looking, yes. Okay. And had you been asked to conduct this test or was this a test that you decided to do on your own; can you recall?

I do not recall. I do suspect, however, that it probably came up in a discussion with the investigator and $I$ probably said $I$ would try it for them, but $I$ do not recall any conversation of such at this time.

And I guess it would be guessing, but perhaps we'll go down that road a little bit. What would be the nature of that discussion if a discussion took place with an investigator?

He would probably have asked me if there was anything else $I$ could have done to narrow it down and my reply would probably have been that this test was available, $I$ would try it for them, but $I$ would not positively commit to the results because of the lack of a confirmation test.

And when you are speaking of the lack of the confirmation test, is it solely for the reason that you started to describe for us, that the
presence of the $A$ antigen could mean that it was from a type A person or a type AB person?

No, it goes further than that in that in blood samples, blood stains we could test for both antigens and antibodies. If you have the A antigen, you don't have A antibodies. If you have the $B$ antigen, you don't have $B$ antibodies, but you have the reverse, and as I mentioned yesterday, the two tests for blood we could confirm whether one was present, the other one wasn't, whereas with this we could not test for any antibodies, so we had the one test for the substance and that test to be a positive actually gave no reaction in the sample, there was nothing, no positive result. If you added the substances together and if nothing happened, then you assume that the $A$ antigen was there.

Okay. And I don't want to get us too confused on this, but let's talk about blood in contrast then. I think what I'm hearing you say is that with blood, and we'll take again a type A person, that that individual's blood will have the presence of A antigens?

Yes.

And B antibodies?

A Yes.

Q

A

Q examination of a seminal stain, and you are telling us that the presence of $A$ antigens would suggest to you that it was a type A person, you couldn't confirm that necessarily because B antibodies, assuming it was a type A person, would not be present in the other bodily fluids of the individual if he was a secretor?

That is correct.
Okay. But nonetheless, that was a test that could be conducted that gave a conclusive positive result for the presence of $A$ antigens; is that
correct?

A
It gave a result that would indicate that $A$ antigens were there, but like I said, when I added the second, it would be actually adding $A$ blood cells to the sample and there would be no reaction in the final stage; that is, the A blood cells would not clump together like they would have if there was no A substance there, but there was no reaction, then $I$ concluded that it was probably an A substance there.

Okay. And we're going to look at your report in a moment and actually look at your conclusions, and again those will speak for themselves, and I take it then with respect to the second sample I2, quite clearly you detected no seminal fluid in that substance?

A
$Q$
I found nothing of any significance in that substance and $I$ have no idea what it contained. And I take it whatever it was, it was not of human origin either?

That is correct.
The last two items referred on that page of notes I don't believe fell within your area. And if we turn to your report then that $I$ assume arose from these tests, if we could look, please, at document
084976. I'll let you take a look at that for a moment. Do you recognize that form of report? Yes, I do.

That would be your standard form of report?
That was our standard form that we would send the results of our examination back to the investigating department.

And a couple of things I'll point out to you. I note the entry 138-69, what would that be indicating?

That was our file number at the laboratory for the case.

Okay. I note the date being March 12th, 1969. If we go back, I understand the items were submitted on February 7th, so we've got a little over a month between then and the time that this report is produced. Would that have been standard in terms of the time lapse?

That may have been average at that time, maybe on the low side of average at that time because we were short staffed and, as I mentioned yesterday, I had quite a bit of territory to cover, but that would probably be average.

And when you say perhaps on the low side, do you mean --
That would be the day, but it would carry on for
perhaps several days, or it may have been
interrupted by something and $I$ would have to come
back to it, but between the 6th of March and the
date of that report would be the time period that the examination was conducted.

Okay. So again a bit of a lapse of time between the actual receipt of the items and the tests being conducted?

Oh, yes.
And would that cause any concern for purposes of your testing procedures and ultimately the results?

No, it wouldn't.
Okay. If we can go back to your report, please, 084976 , we'll see under the first heading general simply an indication of the items received, we've gone through those. I see the second heading being purpose, to conduct a serological examination on the exhibits noted. I believe all of them are listed other than $J$ and $K$. Move to the next page. Under the heading data, Exhibit G, which we know to be the victim's blood, was examined to determine its blood group. Exhibit H, which we know to be the knife blade, was examined for the presence of blood, and number 3, those exhibits listed were examined for the presence of human seminal fluid. And then if we move to conclusions, you see number 1:
"Exhibit $G$, one liquid blood sample was found to be of Group "O"."

I take it there would be no reason to dispute that conclusion today, Mr. Paynter?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A

Q

A
"Human seminal fluid, highly probably
from a "secretor" of Group "A" was found
in Exhibit: I1 - sample of liquid."
And again in your own words, can you describe or explain that conclusion to us?

Well, that is stopping one step short of saying it did come from a person of secretor group $A$ and $I$ believe I've already explained why I would not go that far.

Okay. But you felt comfortable I take it with the language then that you used, that it was highly probably from a secretor of group A? Yes, I was.

And that's on the basis that you've described for us thus far?

That is correct.
I note that in your remarks you provide a definition of secretor, perhaps we'll read that, with reference to paragraph 3 of the conclusions: "A secretor may be defined as a person who secrets their ABO blood grouping substances (antigens) in their other body fluids. Approximately 80 percent of the population comes under this category. As approximately 40 percent of the population is group A and 80 percent of these are secretors, about 32 percent of the population would be secretors of group A."

And this was accurate information that you were providing at that time, Mr. Paynter?

That was the best of my knowledge at that time, yes.

And was that information that you needed to research at the time or would that be something that you would simply know in your work at the time?

At that time in my work it would be something that

I would know, it was something I had learned or had been told of previous to that time.

Am I correct that you told us earlier on that this was not a routine test so to speak though, testing for the presence of antigens in seminal fluid? I would say we did not do it on very many cases at that time, no.

Okay. If we go back to the conclusions, number 4 indicates:
"Human seminal fluid was found on Exhibit: B - one pair of pink panties." And again no reason to dispute that conclusion. I take it, Mr. Paynter, that that stain was not tested for the presence of antigens?

No, I would say it wasn't.
Could it have been tested for the presence of antigens?

When you say could have, yes, it could have. It would not be a test that $I$ would do under any circumstances because of the fact that the area where it was located would definitely be mixed stain and $I$ would not know what or where $I$ was testing it.

And when you say mixed stain, what do you mean? There would be blood present, probably vaginal
fluid, various other bodily fluids of that nature, and therefore $I$ would not have conducted a test for antigens on a stain on clothing in that area. Okay. But let's talk just hypothetically for a moment. If you had a stain on a piece of clothing which you had determined to be seminal fluid, and let's assume for a moment that it was pure seminal fluid, could that stain have been tested for the presence of antigens in 1969?

You are speaking hypothetically? Yes, it could. Okay. And for purposes of this particular item being the panties, though, you've described for us the reasons then why you would not have conducted that test?

Those would be my reasons at the time and still would be, yes.

And again though, going back to my hypothetical for a moment, if indeed you did have a pure seminal stain and could test for the presence of antigens and in fact your tests detected the presence of A antigens, I take it that would be consistent with your tests conducted on vial Il?

A
It would be consistent with a test, it would be the same test and the results or the conclusions would be the same, that is highly probable.

Okay. If we look at number 5 conclusion, it indicates no seminal fluid was found on the exhibits listed, and $I$ believe we've covered that in some detail. So if we take ourselves to the date of this report, Mr. Paynter, then, and we're looking at March 12 th following your testing conducted on March 6th, would it be fair to say then that your testing results suggested that the donor of the semen, again relating to Il, the sample of liquid, was very likely an A secretor? Yes, I would agree with that.

And so it would be fair to say at this point, looking at it from an investigative standpoint then, that the population of suspects could potentially be narrowed down to the 32 percent of the population that's described in your remarks?

32 percent of the male population.
Right. Would that be fair to say?
Yes, it would.
And if we follow through with your notes, I believe they indicate that you received another set of items on April the 21 st and we'll look at those notes in a moment. Perhaps first we'll look at a letter from Mr. Penkala and that document is 009259 . Again we see the date of the letter April

21st, this time it's directed to a Mr. Kerr, not Mr. Huber, and Mr. Kerr replaced Mr. Huber in that position that you described for us previously?

A Yes, he had.

It goes on to indicate that a number of items were received by identification, or from Identification Officer Lorne Grant, and again briefly:
"Exhibit $P$ - a wallet.
Exhibit $Q$ - victim's sweater.

Exhibit $R$ - sample of blue wool blanket.

Exhibit $S$ - a blue wool touque.

Exhibit $T$ - a sample of blood (suspect). Exhibit U - sample of saliva (2 pieces of cloth).

Exhibit $V$ - control sample of head hair (suspect)."

And perhaps for reference, relating to Exhibits $T$ and $U$, the sample of blood and the sample of saliva, if you could turn for a moment, please, to document 031373, perhaps we could focus in on the top half of the page, you'll see it's a report by Lieutenant Penkala dated April 18th. I won't read it all to you, but it seems to confirm that the exhibits we referred to, in particular Exhibit $T$ and Exhibit $U$, the sample of blood and
the sample of saliva, came from David Milgaard, note the saliva samples in paragraph 3 as well as the blood sample in paragraph 2, and he indicates that those will be forwarded on to the Crime Detection Lab for establishing the agglutinogens, and the agglutinogens, I'll pause there for a moment, not to further confuse the picture, but is that -- I'll ask you, what does that term mean?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
A
Q

Where is it on the --
I'm sorry, it's right here, agglutinogens.
I'm not sure whether that would be referring to the antigens or the antibodies, but $I$ suspect the antigens.

Okay. But in scientific terms, what does agglutinogens mean?

Well, if it's referring to the saliva samples, it would have to be the antigens, antigens, the blood grouping antigens.

The blood grouping substance?
That's correct.
Okay. And if we can go back then to the letter, 009259 , and $I$ note at the heading purpose, $I$ won't read those first two to you, but $I$ don't believe those fell within your area; would that be
correct? It's talking about some fingerprint examinations on the wallet and $I$ believe some fibre tests.

A

Q

A
$Q$


And number 4:
"Examine Exhibit $T$ (blood sample) to establish A.B.O. blood grouping in connection with this file, particularly previous Exhibit $I$ (liquid sample)."

And number 5 :

```
"Examine Exhibit U (saliva sample) to
establish A.B.O. agglutinogens in
connection with this file, particularly
previous Exhibit I (liquid sample). One
control sample of cloth is being
forwarded for test purposes if
required."
"Examine Exhibit \(U\) (saliva sample) to establish A.B.O. agglutinogens in connection with this file, particularly previous Exhibit \(I\) (liquid sample). One control sample of cloth is being forwarded for test purposes if required."
```

That would.

And with respect to those two entries, number 4 and 5, those would be matters that fell within your area of expertise, Mr. Paynter?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
okay. Then if $I$ can summarize that just for a moment, with respect to entry 4 then, the blood sample, a determination that the individual was of type A blood then would be consistent with that individual being the donor of the semen located in item I1?

A

Q

A

Q

A

2

A

Q

A It would be consistent with and further reduce the group to approximately 32 percent of the male population, yes.

Q Okay. So let's take a look at your notes that followed from the receipt of those items, if we could go to again the legible page, please, 082379 would be the page number from that document we were working from. Again, it just notes the items received from Identification Officer Lorne Grant on April 21st and we'll pass by items $P$, Q and R, those are not in your area, and look at item $S$ referring to the blue toque, and could you describe for us, please, the significance of your entries?

On the outside of the toque there was a stain that was found to be human blood and from looking at the notes $I$ would say it was of sufficient size that $I$ would attempt to do a grouping on it, but was not successful. On the inside there was a smaller stain where $I$ found it to be human blood, but the size was such that $I$ made no attempt to do any grouping.

Okay. So again we see the positive for the hemo on the right-hand side, that's the test you described for us, the hemochromogen test which tells you that blood was present, the positive for the AH which tells us that human blood was present? conducted on human blood stains to look for the $A$ antigens; that is, you add a blood grouping serum obtained from Ortho Diagnostics to a portion of the stain. If that blood grouping material was absorbed by material from the stain and not there
when you tested for it, that would indicate that there was that particular blood grouping antigen present in the saliva stain. Is there a name for that test?

I believe we referred to it as an absorption inhibition test. That's the best of my recollection at this time.

And was that a standard test then conducted in 1969 for these purposes?

We used it every day on blood grouping and, as I mentioned, occasionally on seminal fluid, but not as a routine examination.

Would it be something that you had regularly done in relation to a saliva sample, for example?

Not a great number, but it had been done, yes. Okay. And $I$ don't know if you can help us any further on that, was it uncommon, very uncommon? Somewhere between the two.

Okay. We'll refer to some numbers later on and maybe that will help us a little bit further on that point. So can you tell us what the significance of these results then were in relation to Il?

There's two ways you can look at it. If I found no antigens because there were no antigens ever
present, that would probably mean that the donor of that, and again $I$ say probably, could not have been the contributor of the seminal fluid. If I found no antigens because they had been destroyed somewhere between the time they were given and the time I tested it by various means or improper storage or whatever, which I have since been told is probably the case, but at that time $I$ was not aware of that, then it would be completely insignificant.

Okay. Well we'll circle back to this a couple of times, but you've referenced the destruction of antigens in a bodily fluid, and was that something -- or a possibility that you were aware of in 1969?

Oh, I would be a aware of the fact that any biological fluid could be destroyed fairly easily. At that time $I$ believe $I$ would have probably told the investigator that the best way to obtain these samples would be on a piece of cloth and allow it to dry before $I$ did anything else. Since, I have -- that time $I$ have been made aware that that was not the best way.

Okay, and I note we will touch on that. But, again, I want to try and capture a sense of your
knowledge in 1969. And if we consider 11 in particular, and the fact that you -- your tests indicated that $A$ antigens were present, were you aware in 1969, when testing a bodily fluid such as seminal stain -- seminal fluid, that antigens that would originally be present in that substance, for example from a secretor, could be destroyed and therefore not detected when later tested?

Umm, yes. That is why my report would never say it was, because of the fact that they could have been there and have been destroyed, I could only report 'this is what $I$ found today'.

Okay. And that's the reason for the two explanations for the significance of your findings in relation to $U 1$ and $U 2$, then, that you have just shared with us?

A
Yes.

Okay. Let's take a look at your report that followed from these tests, that document is ID 324690, and again it's the same form of report that we looked at previously. Note the date being April 23rd, 1969. I take it these tests and your reporting took place fairly quickly, I think the items were received on April 21st, so this turnaround would have been considered as a fairly
quick turnaround at that time?

A
Q

Fairly quick.
Okay. And if we look again at the items we've noted under the General heading, move down to Purpose:
"To conduct a serological examination on
Exhibits S, T, U1 and U2."
You indicate that:
"Exhibit $T$ was examined to determine its blood group."
"Exhibit $S$ was examined for the presence of blood."
"Exhibits $U 1$ and $U 2$ were examined for the presence of antigens of blood group

A and B."
Moving to the next page, look at your
Conclusions:
"Exhibit T, ...",
being:
"... one liquid blood sample, ..."
David Milgaard's blood:
"... was found to be of group A.
2. Human blood of indeterminate group was
found on exhibit:

S - one blue toque."

And:
"3. No antigens of blood groups A or B were found on Exhibits U1 or U2."

And based on what we reviewed in your notes would you agree that those were accurate conclusions that you were offering here, Mr. Paynter? They were.

Okay. And $I$ note, in number 3, you don't offer a conclusion of any sort that the donor was probably a non-secretor or anything of that nature?

No. You will note that none were found. If you went to the extreme on that, and really wanted to go out on a limb, you would assume that, if everything was working properly, that would be from a group O. But, again, you could not test for group O antigens at that time so it was -- it means nothing.

And would it be fair to say then, again sort of summarizing where we're at stopping in time here at April 23rd, that at this point in time your tests, test results, suggested that David Milgaard was not the donor of the semen found in I1?

Umm, I would say that $I$ had found nothing to indicate that he was and, as well, if all the tests were as appeared to be, that he probably
wasn't.
Okay. And for example, and I'll refer you to one of the investigator's comments in and around the time, it's document 250597 , it's a report by a Corporal Rasmussen of the RCMP, if we could turn to page 250606 , please. And just to get a date, maybe we'll go 250605 for a moment, the last date noted is March 20th. I think these reports generally flow forward. If we can go back to 606 and you will note at the end of this paragraph here, Mr. Paynter, if we could perhaps focus on that portion, the last sentence indicates:
"Milgaard was found to be of Group "A" however, is not a secretor and has also been eliminated as a possible suspect." Would it likely be based upon the test results that you had offered forward to this point in time, that we've been speaking of, that the investigator made that comment?

It would be based on those tests but, again, he did not read what $I$ had written in order to make that comment.

Q Okay. And, again, we can -- of course he will, in fact he will be testifying shortly, and we can't speak for him.

Q
$Q$
2

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: What was the number of that again, I'm sorry Mr. Hardy?

MR. HARDY: The document is 250597 , it's a report of Corporal Rasmussen that we previously identified.

BY MR. HARDY:

But it wouldn't surprise you, Mr. Paynter, if the investigators were interpreting the results in the manner that $I$ have suggested?

It wouldn't surprise me, no.
Okay. If we follow through with your notes we come to another entry dated June 3 rd respecting the receipt of some items, and if we could turn to a letter from Mr. Penkala, please, it's document ID 105534 , note the date is June 2 nd, again directed to Mr. Kerr. If we could call out the body of the letter, please, it indicates:
"The following exhibits are being re-submitted at the request of $S t a f f$ Sergeant B. Paynter of your laboratory. Exhibit I - two plastic vials of unknown yellowish substance.

Exhibit $U$ - sample of saliva (2 pieces of cloth)."

Do you recall the resubmission of those items,

A

Mr. Paynter?
I recall getting them back, yes.
And it notes, and we'll follow through with this, but it notes that these have been resubmitted at your request. Can you give us an idea of whether -- how that language might have arose -arisen; do you recall making a request for the items to be returned to you for further testing? I don't recall it exactly. I could give you a hypothetical of, probably, what happened.

Maybe share that with us, please?
Umm, it was not uncommon to be in touch with the investigators, and we would probably be discussing my probable results from my report. I knew that they did have a suspect in the case, and $I$ would probably be aware that my results did not agree with what they thought the suspect was or who the suspect was, and $I$ may have suggested to them that they send them back and $I$ would repeat the tests to confirm whether or not -- to do it again to make sure that $I$ was right the first time. Okay. And you don't have a specific recollection, then, of that, that's --

I don't recall the conversation but $I$ would be very -- I would suspect that that was probably the
general tone of the conversation.
Okay. And I'm going to refer to a couple of other documents which perhaps will inform this issue a bit further. I refer you to a letter again from Lieutenant Penkala, the document ID is 324697 , a letter dated June the 3rd. You will indicate, or you will note that although it's addressed to Mr. Kerr, it's to your attention, and if we could call out the body of the letter, please, it indicates:
"Further in connection with our discussion of May 30th, 1969, I have contacted Dr. H. Emson, Pathologist, St. Paul's Hospital, Saskatoon, who has submitted his suggestions on the matter of blood grouping of a semen specimen, Exhibit I.

I am forwarding you copies of

Dr. Emson's letter to me for your information. Dr. Emson has advised me that he will gladly assist you in anyway he can in connection with this, and that you may contact him direct at the st. Paul's Hospital in Saskatoon."

So it appears that you had a discussion with

Lieutenant Penkala on May $30 t h$, shortly before the resubmission of those items, and, again, you don't have a specific recollection of that discussion?

No I don't.
And we'll turn to Dr. Emson's letter that he apparently has enclosed with this correspondence, it's document ID 324695, you will note the date of the letter being June the 2 nd directed to Lieutenant Penkala. If you will bear with me I want to make my way through this letter. If we could call out the first paragraph, please, Dr. Emson writes:
"I write in response to your telephone inquiry of today's and earlier dates. As I understand it, the problem you pose is as follows. A specimen of semen found at the scene of a rape-murder has been identified as coming from a person with blood group A, of secretor status. In other words, this person as well as possessing the group A antigen on the red cells of his blood, also secretes this antigen in body fluids. This is a well known phenomenon and will occur in
approximately $80 \%$ of persons of blood group A.

I understand further that a suspect in this case has been blood grouped and found to be blood group A, but tests of his saliva for secretion of the antigen A have been negative, putting him into the non-secretor class. This is certainly an apparent anomaly."

And I'll pause there for a moment, and $I$ guess you can only speak from your perspective, but would this observation properly be described as an anomaly from a scientific perspective?

Umm, I really don't know how to answer that.
I guess, if we think of an anomaly as an
irregularity, am $I$ correct it would only be an anomaly if in fact the conclusion had perhaps been drawn that the suspect was, in fact, the assailant?

If the suspect was the assailant, if the suspect was a non-secretor and the contributor was a secretor, that would be what he described as an anomaly.

Unless, in fact, the suspect was not the

A

2
A

Q
assailant?
Well, yes, if he wasn't the assailant then wouldn't -Okay.

Then it becomes a moot question.
Okay. And, if we read further on in that letter, Dr. Emson states:
"However, there is one answer that occurs to me as a possibility. The specimen of semen had been frozen and thawed several times before it was examined for the group A antigen." I'll pause there for a moment. Are you aware of whether or not that substance had been frozen and thawed a number of times before it had arrived at your laboratory?

No, I wasn't.
Okay.
I believe it was still frozen when I received it, whether it had been thawed in between or not, I have no idea.

And I think we have heard some evidence that perhaps Lieutenant Penkala delivered the substance to Dr. Emson for some testing, at least on a portion of it, prior to delivering it to the Crime

Detection Laboratory; were you aware of that, assuming that in fact was the case?

A
$Q$

## 

I don't think $I$ was aware of it.

Okay. I'll just read on in that letter, it continues speaking of the freezing and thawing process:
"This process will certainly disrupt red cells and frequently disrupt other cells of the body. This may result in the release of group $A$ antigen held within the cells of a non-secretor person, and not normally secreted into the body fluids. It is a possibility that such a process involving disruption of body cells, might release enough of the group A antigen into semen which had been frozen and thawed a number of times to give a positive test for the A antigen.

I have looked up this problem in the references available to me and can find no indication that it has been considered this way before. There are several possible lines of approach." I'll pause there for a moment, does that discussion relating to the freezing and thawing
refresh your memory at all as to possible discussions that may have taken place with you prior to the resubmission?

A

Q

A

Q

A

Q
A
$Q$
Okay. I'll read on. Dr. Emson states, at the bottom of the page:
"It is possible that there may be persons with anomalies of secretion, in that group A substance is present in one body fluid but not another. However I know of no recorded case."

So assuming, perhaps, that Dr. Emson is
suggesting perhaps there are secretors who would only secrete their antigens in their semen but not their saliva, for example, do you recall considering that possibility?

A

Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

A

Okay. And then the second entry indicates, or he suggests that perhaps another department more expert in the field perhaps should be contacted; do you recall making inquiries of any other resource in considering this issue?

Not that I recall.
And does any of this, at all, refresh your memory as to discussions that may have taken place with Lieutenant Penkala or others prior to the resubmission or in the course of the resubmission of those items?

No, it doesn't. As I recall, $I$ can only give you what $I$ would suggest was a possible tone of the conversation that $I$ would have had with Inspector Penkala -- or Lieutenant Penkala.

Okay, so let's take a look at your notes relating to the resubmission of those items, and it's page 082380 . We'll see that, again, the items submitted on June 3rd, 1969, you will see the reference to I1 and I2 again, and relating to I1 you will see you have an entry there it's a positive heme; can you tell us what that entry means, please?

That is a screening test that we used on suspect stains or suspect samples of -- or exhibits where we suspected the stain or whatever may contain blood. It is a, we refer to as a presumptive test, much the same for blood as the acid phosphatase would be considered for seminal fluid. Okay. It did not identify something as being
positively blood but it was a very good indication that blood was present. In this case, that gave a positive test, indicating a strong possibility to me that blood was present in that sample of liquid.

And what was the name of that test?
That test was a very simple screening test we obtained from a commercial source, plastic strips with an embedded chemical on the end, these were referred to as hemostix and these would be used -the prime purpose was for hospital laboratories where they would check urine samples for the presence of blood. For them, that was good enough, it would indicate blood to them. We did not consider it a positive, completely positive confirmation test, but a strong indication that blood was present.

Okay.
And we would use it on stains that we obtained. And just help me understand; so I take it this is a, a stick, whatever the --

It was a little plastic strip about 2 1/2, 3 inches long and a quarter of an inch wide, with a chemical embedded on one end of it, an area of probably a half an inch long.

Q

A

Q

A

Q

A
Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

And you indicated its intended purpose, or usual purpose, was for testing for blood in urine? That was the reason they were sold commercially, yes.

Okay. And I take it, then, you would -- the process would be, in that instance, dipping the strip --

Into the sample.
-- into the urine sample?
That is correct.
But you had used this test in other circumstances for purposes of detecting the presence of blood? We used it as a screening test, to check a suspect stain to see if we would go further to confirm that it was blood.

And would that be only on liquid blood or would that be on dried stains as well?

That would be on dried stains as well. We could either dampen the stick and touch it to the suspect stain, or dampen the stain and put the stick on it, as long as it was damp and they came in contact with each other there would be an immediate very intense blue colour change.

And was this a reliable test, from your experience, in terms of detecting blood in a substance?

A
I had no problems with it myself. As I say, it was a screening test, it wasn't a confirmation test.

And I note that Dr. Emson didn't indicate this possibility in his letter; do you recall whose thought it was to conduct this particular test on item I1?

Well I was aware of the fact that they had a suspect that, if my first results were positive instead of probable, that their suspect was not the one that had contributed the seminal fluid. So I was actually checking to see if there was some other reason why $I$ would find the A antigens in this sample of liquid, and one of the reasons would be if that liquid sample was contaminated with blood, and from this test it was my conclusion that there was probably enough blood in that liquid sample, even though it was not
apparently visible, i.e. a big colour change in the blood, in the liquid itself, that there was enough blood in that sample of liquid to probably contaminate my earlier test results and, therefore, render the whole thing inconclusive. And I think $I$ have followed you, and maybe I'm dwelling on this longer than $I$ need to, but, again, the positive indication of blood, am I correct, would give an altern -- alternate reason as to the presence of $A$ antigens as originally detected?

That is correct. If there was blood from the person that contributed the seminal fluid, and if that person was an A, then there would be A antigens there. It could be A antigens there from his blood as well, so $I$ have no idea where $I$ was finding the A antigens from, was it blood or was it seminal fluid.

Okay. Notwithstanding the fact that he was a non-secretor then, using that again perhaps in hypothetical terms, it would give an explanation as to why you would have detected A antigens in that substance?

If the contributor was a non-secretor, there would still be A antigen present in his blood, which
could have caused the reaction $I$ found in my first test.

Okay. And were you able to do anything further, past the screening test as you have referred to it, to determine whether or not, in fact, it was blood present?

No. In order to conduct a confirmation test we had to be able to build up a stain from that liquid, and by that $I$ mean we would take a small drop, we would place it on a slide, allow it to evaporate, and it was a matter of a concentration of it until we had a stain that would be enough material in it that, when we added the chemicals for the haemochromogen test, there would be enough stain there to cause the reaction and build the crystals. In this case, $I$ was not able to do that.

So the second confirming test would be the haemochromogen test?

That is correct.
Okay. And there wasn't sufficient quantity to conduct that test in this instance?

That is correct.

Okay. And did you test again for the presence of antigens?

A

I see no indication of it, here, that $I$ did. And the entry is identical on your original notes. And with respect to item $I 2$ you indicate 'not examined'; $I$ take it you did nothing with $I 2$ then? No, it indicates here that it was a smaller sample when $I$ received it, it indicated here that there wasn't enough for a test, it had dried up, and in view of my results the first time I made no further examination of $I 2$.

Could you have done the hemostix test with I2? Yes, I could have.

And at that time, though, you didn't think that that would be --

I could see --
-- something that was necessary?
I could see no point in it if there was nothing in there of significant value anyway.

And would the fact that you had previously tested and found that the substance was of non-human origin be significant in terms of that decision? Again, I don't believe I said that it was of non-human origin, $I$-- or $I$ may have said it wasn't of human origin or nothing of human origin was found, but again, $I$ couldn't eliminate it as being human origin. Maybe there was not enough
there for the test to be positive.
You are talking about your original AH test - Yes.
-- on I2?

It gave a negative result, negative results, does that mean it's negative or does that mean there is not enough there to do the test or have been destroyed.

Okay. So those would be the two possibilities? That is correct.

And if we move down, then, to U1 and U2, you identify saliva sample on cloth, and positive for saliva follows both; can you tell us what those entries mean?

I would be doing that test -- as you are aware, or you may not be aware, but the exhibit was a piece of, a small piece of plain white cloth. Looking at it you could not see any stain on it, so $I$ ran a test for an enzyme in saliva, that enzyme being known as amylase, to determine whether or not $I$ was indeed testing an area that contained saliva, and this would indicate that there was saliva on the cloth. So that would rule out the possibility that $I$ found no antigen because there was no saliva, --
$Q$
A
Q

A

Q

A

Q
A

Q

A
$Q$

Okay.
-- there was saliva there.
Okay. Could you have tested, or did you test, these samples of cloth for the presence of antigens?

I --
Sorry, you've already answered that question for
us. Did you test, again, for the presence or non-presence of antigens?

It doesn't indicate so in the notes, and $I$ have no recollection of doing it again.

And why wouldn't you conduct that test again? Umm, no reason, other than perhaps I had faith in my first results.

Okay. And, again, that's something $I$ want to try to -- try to get to as we move along here. Was the assumption then, on your part at this point in time, that those initial results were conclusive insofar as concluding that the individual was a non-secretor, or the donor was a non-secretor, Mr . Milgaard?

Insofar as $I$ was aware of the limits on the testing.

I mean I'm just thinking through, and you've talked to us about discussions that were taking
place and theories that were being put forward, and it's easy for us to look from this standpoint but $I$ would think that perhaps one thought would be 'maybe we should re-test the secretor status of this individual'. I am just wondering if that thought process had crossed your mind at that time?

I can't recall whether it did or not.
Okay. You don't recall asking for or considering asking for another sample, for example, or another saliva sample?

No, I don't believe I did, but again, I can't recall that.

Okay. If we move down the page we see an item that actually wasn't referenced in the one letter from Mr. Penkala -- or Lieutenant Penkala that we were looking at, $W$, one pair of men's undershorts. And if we could go briefly, just to give some context to that entry, to document 031386 , please. You will see it's a report by Lieutenant Penkala. If we just look at the last paragraph, he notes that a pair of white undershorts were accepted from Mr. Milgaard and retained as an exhibit, and that they would be delivered to the Crime Detection Laboratory. If we can take a look at

|  | 1 |  | the next page of that document, please -- it's not |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 |  | as clear -- we have a letter dated June the 3rd, |
|  | 3 |  | again to Mr. Kerr from Lieutenant Penkala, |
|  | 4 |  | indicating: |
| 10:16 | 5 |  | "The following exhibit is being |
|  | 6 |  | personally delivered ...", |
|  | 7 |  | "Exhibit $W$ - one (1) pair of men's white |
|  | 8 |  | shorts (soiled)." |
|  | 9 |  | And perhaps we could call out the Purpose portion |
| 10:17 | 10 |  | of that, please. It indicates: |
|  | 11 |  | "Examine Exhibit $W$. .. for presence of |
|  | 12 |  | seminal stains and if present conduct |
|  | 13 |  | analysis to determine blood group." |
|  | 14 |  | And how would you interpret that request, |
| 10:17 | 15 |  | Mr. Paynter, in 1969? |
|  | 16 | A | In 1969 we normally would not examine the male |
|  | 17 |  | clothing in a suspected sexual offence for seminal |
|  | 18 |  | fluid because it would be my understanding that it |
|  | 19 |  | would not be uncommon to find it whether or not |
| 10:17 | 20 |  | that person was involved in any sexual offence. |
|  | 21 |  | However, in this case $I$ was asked to do it and I |
|  | 22 |  | believe I did look for seminal fluid. |
|  | 23 | Q | Was he, by his language here, was he asking you as |
|  | 24 |  | well to check for the presence of antigens or |
| 10:17 | 25 |  | would you have interpreted his request in that |

manner?

A
Yes, he was, in that question there, or that statement there he would be.

And why might this test be important, again if we put it in context with findings that had been made to this point in time?

Based on what $I$ had already done, I did not think that this would have added anything to it. If I, as you note it says in the previous paragraph, the exhibit was fairly well soiled, or was soiled, and when you are doing a stain where the results are based on a negative result to do your interpretation, $I$ would not be very inclined to do that test on something that was obviously mixed with a bunch of other material.

And again you are talking about the test for the presence of --

For the test for antigens.
Antigens, okay. And I cut off that last paragraph, $I$ think we dealt with that, he indicates that the exhibit relates to Exhibits I and U. If we go back to your notes then, page 082380, and again item $W$, we see again the BLD not examined, I think you explained that to us.

Seminal fluid, positive phos, positive micro. So
you detected seminal fluid by the acid phosphatase test and you also identified human spermatozoa by microscopic examination; would that be accurate? That would be.

And by your notes would $I$ be correct in concluding that you did not test for the presence of antigens?

Looking at my notes, $I$ would assume that was the case, yes.

Just looking at your original notes for a moment, and again would this be a discretionary call on your part? It would appear that Lieutenant Penkala was asking for that test to be conducted and you've given us some reasons why you would not be inclined to conduct the test. Would that be just a decision you had made at that time?

It would be a decision that $I$ made myself, yes. I was basically in control of any tests $I$ had done on any exhibits. It would be my discretion whether or not $I$ would do it.

Okay. And could a seminal stain on those pair of shorts, and here we might start to talk hypotheticals again, but could a seminal stain on that pair of undershorts have been tested for the presence of antigens?

A
$Q$

You could test the stain for antigens. I would not be comfortable with any result based on the condition of the, what appears to be the exhibit. Okay. Assuming though you had a pure seminal stain on that item, that test could be conducted? Yes, it could.

And in Mr. Milgaard's case, if that result, if that test had been conducted and the result was consistent with the tests that had been originally conducted on the saliva, you would not expect to find any antigens on those undershorts?

As I've often said, $I$ never went into any test with any expectations of what $I$ would find, but in an hypothetical case, that would be correct. Okay. Follow through then and look at your report that followed from that testing, if we turn to document ID 105559 , same form of report that we previously looked at, and $I$ note the date is August the 12 th, again some lapse of time from, I take it, the time that the tests were conducted. Just again taking a look at your original notes, bear with me, your original notes seem to indicate that you actually conducted those tests on July 29th, 1969 , which again $I$ guess would be sometime after the receipt of those items on June the $3 r d$,
and you would know much better than $I, ~ M r$. Paynter, would that compromise your ability to test those items, again accepting that the tests were conducted on July 29th, 1969 and the items had been received on June 3rd, and it's nothing on this document, I'm sorry, I hope I'm not confusing you, I've gone back to your original notes to try and get a sense of when you actually conducted the tests on the resubmitted items. It appears it was on July the 29th.

A

Q
A

Q

A
$Q$

A
 These exhibits were not received by myself from Ident Officer Kleiv. I was away from the laboratory when these were brought in by Constable

Dan Dyck of the Regina City Police and a Ms. Vinnick had taken them from him and retained them until $I$ returned to the laboratory late in July. Ms. Vinnick at that time was an understudy in our section and she was able to take these exhibits, she would make no examination, she retained them until I came back from wherever I was at the time and then $I$ would take them over, so this is a different -- oh, you are talking at the bottom. I was reading the top paragraph. I was in the wrong paragraph.

Yeah, I think they are in the report here, and again $I$ don't know if the dates referenced there can --

No, I was starting at the top. You are already halfway down the page.

So the items we've been discussing, again it seems to confirm received from Kleiv on June 3rd?

Yes.

And then again you've had a chance to look at your
original notes with respect to the testing on
those items, indicated the testing was done on

July the $29 t h$, and would that be possible, that
that amount of time had lapsed between the time of the receipt of the items and the testing?

A

If $I$ recall, that year $I$ had -- well, for the year before that $I$ had not been able to take holidays and when they came up that year I was able to take an extended holiday and $I$ believe $I$ was away for approximately six weeks and that would be the reason why she had the exhibits for that length of time.

If we can just go back to the, I guess we're there, at the report, and again we note those items under general, in particular here that we've been discussing, and if we move to the next page, we see the purpose, to conduct a serological examination of several items, and we'll deal with those other items in a little bit, but for our purposes relating to I1, I2, and U2 and W, you indicate $I 1$ was examined for the presence of blood, $W$ was examined for the presence of seminal fluid, and I2, U1 and U2 were not examined. I'll pause there for a moment. Would that be consistent with your notes particularly relating to U1 and U2? I think your notes might have indicated that they were tested for the presence of saliva. Sorry, Mr. Paynter, I'm just looking at --

Is this the first submission or the second
submission?
This is the second submission we're dealing with. The first submission would be in another report where they tested for saliva. The second time it would not be, it was not retested or examined. Okay.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Just before we break, I think the question which gave rise to all this was that two month interval, there was apparently a two month interval between receipt and testing and did that interval cause you any concern.

No, it didn't, it wasn't uncommon at that time for an interval like that.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: No, the interval wasn't that uncommon, but what effect might it have had on the samples; anything?

If they were properly dried as far as the blood samples and seminal fluid samples were concerned, I would have no concern.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: All right. So a sample of blood or semen, for example, in its dried form, so long as it wasn't subject to any mechanical degradation, would stay --

Would stay for a considerable length of time.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: In its present state. And to test said samples, you put them in a solution $I$ take it.

A

A

A

A

A

A A slide. Depending on the test, it may be done in a test tube or on a slide.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay. And then you recover the same granular material that was salt water solution.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Uh-huh. And then that's transferred to a slide and allowed to dry? Contral Booking Call lrene @1-800-667-6777 orgo to www.compucourtiv
on the medium where the sample was deposited?
A
I would then work with the extract that the granular was taken from.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Is that okay now for our break?

MR. HARDY: Yeah, thank you, Mr. Commissioner. Sure, we can break now. (Adjourned at 10:30 a.m.)
(Reconvened at 10:46 a.m.)
BY MR. HARDY:
Again if we could bring up Mr. Paynter's report, 105559, second page. Mr. Paynter, before the break we were talking about item 3 under the heading data and it had indicated Exhibits I2, U1 and $U 2$ were not examined. I was just attempting to clarify that with you and perhaps we could go back to your notes again for a moment, page 082380, and again these notes refer to the receipt of those items the second time on June 3rd, and I think you confirmed for us that you had conducted testing on $U 1$ and $U 2$ which told you that there was saliva present on those items?

A
Notes on this particular spot indicate that $I$ found a constituent of saliva on them which indicated to me that saliva was on the samples of
cloth.
Okay. And just back to that page on the report then, the only aspect $I$ was attempting to point out, it would seem then that perhaps contrary to what you've indicated in number 3 here, that U1 and $U 2$ were in fact examined?

If this report is the one from that particular examination, then that would be the case, yes.

Okay. And $I$ think we saw on the first page that it was related to those items submitted on June the 3rd. And maybe we'll move down to conclusions then, and if you look at number 1 --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Excuse me, they were examined in fact, but just for saliva?

At this particular time they were examined to determine whether it was actually saliva.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: But the next step wasn't taken?

No.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: No. Sorry, Mr. Hardy.

BY MR. HARDY:
No, that's fine, thank you, Mr. Commissioner. And under the heading conclusions, number 1:
"A positive result was obtained with the
presumptive test for blood in Exhibit:

I1 - one sample of liquid."

And can you explain for us, please, the language that you've used here in this conclusion?

Well, I explained the test a few minutes ago of how I tested it with the hemostix and that would be how I would, were the conclusions I obtained from that test. It's a presumptive test, that is, you can presume there is blood there, but there was not enough to confirm the haemoglobin confirmation.

And is it possible that you had received that positive result without blood being present? There are reports of various, some other materials that will cause the false positive with those, with that test. My experience, that it's very limited, the other materials that would, and the other materials that would cause, there are some other materials $I$ know would cause the hemostix to go more of a greenish colour than a blue colour which was blood, but no, there are other materials that would give a false positive.

And in 1969 what would your knowledge be of what these other materials were?

At that time we usually considered there were
certain green vegetables, the one we most often referred to was horseradish, and we often said that leather could, although in my experience $I$ never had any problems with stains on leather with it, but green vegetables were usually referred to as being a possible source of false positives. And just so, if we follow that through then, we use the hemostix test that you've been referring to, the strip that you've been talking of, you put it into a substance, you receive a positive reaction?

A
$Q$
And you are telling me that you would receive that exact same positive reaction if blood was present and if blood was not present, but one of those other substances was present?

A
I can't at this time tell you what the reaction would be with other materials. Some of them $I$ did test, I don't recall what the results were, but I cannot say with any certainty at this time how it would react. I know there were times when we did get a greenish blue result with certain materials, but $I$ can't remember what they were, but it was such that in my own mind with the experience $I$ had at that time that $I$ would know that it wasn't
working right for blood.
And the possibility of that false positive, is that the reason that you've used the language you have here, and I'm thinking in particular of the word presumptive?

That is correct.
No other reason?
None. We couldn't confirm that it was blood, so we presume it could be blood there.

And again as you've previously explained to us, you could not go on to conduct the hemochromogen test then to confirm it was blood?

I could not.
Were there any further tests at all within your knowledge at that time which could indicate to you
whether that substance was blood or something else?

Not that $I$ can recall, unless it's written in my notes someplace. I can't recall anything.

No, I haven't seen anything in your notes. Could the blood that was present, if we presume it was blood, be typed?

A
No, there was not sufficient -- I would not even attempt a typing if there wasn't enough to say it was blood. That would be the next step, would be
to say it was blood before $I$ would type it. It could interfere with any typing test if there was some there, but it would not produce reliable results that $I$ would be happy with.

And I want to speak for a moment about the hemostix test again in a hypothetical scenario. If you were to use that test and if you had pure semen and you had determined the presence of $A$ antigens and you used the hemostix test, could that situation give rise to a positive result on the hemostix test?

I can think of no occasion or reason why it would. I would not expect it to.

And this will sound simplistic, but it's not the presence then of the $A$ antigens which we know to be a component of $A$ blood that gives the positive result on the hemostix test?

No, I believe it comes from the haemoglobin itself.

Okay. And have I heard you correctly that the reaction with respect to this hemostix test is variable potentially, and let me give you an example. Let's say we know that blood is present. You are looking for a change of colour in the strip that you've been speaking to us about?

A Yes.
Q
And if it's a number of substances all of which we know have blood in them ahead of time and we apply that test to all of the samples, are we going to see the same colour reaction in every one of those tests?

Yes.
And is there a different colour perhaps when it's one of those other substances that you've spoken to us about?

All $I$ can say at this time is that with blood it was a deep blue, instant reaction. Sometimes we would get a very slow reaction and not be as deep a blue, it would be more of a greenish-blue colour, and in those cases $I$ would not be, I would not indicate that it was even positive presumptive test for blood, I wouldn't know what it was.

And what was the colour through your experience that you had seen when it was one of these other substances that was present, either sample you were testing?

I can't recall that, but it would be a shade of blue, but whether it would be a greenish blue or whether it would be blue $I$ can't --

I guess what I'm asking is was there any way for
you to determine a difference between the two situations, one being the substance having blood present, the other being a sample with one of those other materials such as horseradish extract that you've spoken to us about?

I would say there would be no conclusive way, or enough of a difference that you could say it was one or the other, no. It might be enough to make me suspicious, but it would not be enough that $I$ could be conclusive on it.

And what would be the nature of the difference that would make you suspicious?

A difference in the shade of the colour perhaps from a blue to a greenish blue, slower reacting. And being blood at the darker end of the scale, if I could put it that way?

Dark blue and very quick.

And if it's one of the other substances perhaps, although $I$ hear what you are saying, it could not be conclusive, but perhaps it would be a lighter shade of colour that you would see, bluish or greenish?

A
I have seen bluish-green reactions. Whether it was another substance or whether it was some other reason, $I$ can't say at this time. I can only say
that for me to think that it was blood to carry on further, it would be a deep blue, instantaneous reaction.

And do you recall what the colour was in terms of the reaction in this particular instance?

I don't recall seeing it, but from looking at my notes and the conclusion that $I$ gave, I would assume it was an instantaneous blue reaction. But because of the possibility of the other, we see the language that you've used; would that be correct?

That is correct.

And then if we move on to conclusion number 2 , simply indicate -- actually, that applies to a matter we'll speak of in a moment. Number 3 indicates human seminal fluid found on item $W$, the pair of men's undershorts, and again $I$ think we've confirmed that you did not test that item for antigens; correct?

Correct.

Do you recall or is there a way that we could determine whether or not you tested that item for the presence of blood?

If you look in the notes, it's probably there, but
I do not believe I did.

Q

And do you recall whether there was any follow-up after you submitted this report from Lieutenant Penkala relating to the fact that you didn't
indicate one way or the other whether antigens were present on those undershorts?

I don't recall any. I was with or in Saskatoon or they were in Regina on a fairly regular basis and we may have discussed it. We may have discussed it several times, but $I$ can't recall it at this time.

And if he had put it to you at that time, would your response be similar to that that you previously shared with us in terms of not being inclined to conduct that sort of test?

It would be.

Okay. So if we continue on reviewing through your notes am $I$ correct, Mr. Paynter -- and we can only go from your recollection $I$ guess -- that a number of other tests were conducted by yourself on a number of other items that arose through the course of this investigation?

I believe $I$ received a number of other exhibits that we haven't talked about, yes.

Okay, and I think your notes would confirm that, and I'm not going to review all of them in detail, but there is a reference, for example, to some testing that was done on a blood sample that had been obtained from Ron Wilson. Do you recall,
first of all, do you recall knowing of Ron Wilson at the time, or hearing that name?

I have heard the name.
Do you recall conducting a blood test in relation to a sample that had been obtained from Mr. Wilson?

I believe it's in my notes that I did.
Do you recall any discussions with anybody surrounding the submission of that item for testing or what the thought process might have been relating to that submission?

Not without something to jog my memory.
Okay. Perhaps we can reference a couple of documents briefly, the first one being 042742 , we note it's a report by Constable Dyck of the Regina City Police dated April 30 th and he refers to obtaining a sample of blood from Mr. Wilson. Perhaps we could focus in on the last two paragraphs. A saliva sample was obtained as well, and he indicates that those items were delivered to the crime lab on April the 30 th, and $I$ believe -- yes, it indicates April 30th, and: "... at that time turned over to ... Bruce Paynter the two envelopes and their contents, verbally advising him of
the request of the Saskatoon City Police of which he already was aware."

Does that refresh your memory at all in terms of the receipt of those items or the discussion that may have occurred surrounding those submissions? It doesn't bring back anything other than the fact that $I$ got the exhibits from Constable Dyck. Okay. And if we refer to page 082385 in your notes, then, we see the indication of the receipt of those items, the date is unclear there but $I$ believe the report indicated April 30th, and $I$ see you tested the liquid blood sample with what result?

A

Q

A
$Q$

A

Q
Okay. And there is a report that follows from that simply concluding, as we see on your notes -and maybe for reference, we don't need to turn to
it, 105558 -- and there are some items referred to in your notes as well, Mr. Paynter. And I'm not going to refer to them directly, but there were some items found by a Constable Bagwell in Regina, and in particular it was a blue seat cover and a pair of pants, and his report indicates those were located on May 7th and $I$ believe that some identification of Mr. Milgaard had been found in the pants. And we'll hear evidence on that and other respects, and already have heard some evidence, but I'll note the documents for reference; the preceding investigator -investigation report is 042757 , and the resulting lab report that you conducted was $009390--$ that's the page, actually, of the document number which is 009374 .

## And I would like to turn your

 attention next to a portion of your notes that refers to the receipt of a number of items on July 29th, 1969, and that's page 082382 of your notes, and you will see, briefly, that a number of items are listed there. And we'll go to the preceding letter, or $I$ should say investigation report, to give this some context, and that's page 009282 of 009281 , please. Note the date of this particularRegina City Police Department report, again by Constable Dyck, is May 30 th relating to the murder of Gail Miller. And you will note in the body, and perhaps I'll summarize some of it for you, it would appear that they had located Ron Wilson's vehicle, a 1958 Pontiac sedan, it indicates at one time owned by Ronald Wilson, which had been sold by public auction on May 3rd, 1969 to a George Fedor. And then in the next paragraph it indicates that:
"According to Fedor, who was just
beginning to demolish the vehicle for parts, the only article he could definitely recall being removed from this vehicle since he purchased it was a tube of lipstick from the glove compartment."

If we go down to paragraph 3 , it indicates the following items were located and retained by the writer; 1, a glove compartment; 2, a pair of ladies dark blue wool gloves; 3, a pair of men's black oxfords; 4, a paper bag containing men's shorts found in the trunk; 5, a maroon men's housecoat; 6, one black razor case, Phillishave; refers to a piece of paper -- and 7, a piece of
paper; plastic in 8; number 9, one pair of men's trousers grey in colour; and number 10, the complete front seat from the automobile which had a large number of stains some of which had appearances of dried blood. It goes on to indicate that he attended at the crime laboratory to deliver the items and in paragraph number 5, again just for reference, it looks like a telephone conversation took place with Ron Wilson and at that time he was asked about the above articles and advised that the grey trousers belonged to Milgaard, the black oxfords and shorts he believed were Cadrain's.

If we go back to your notes relating to those items, again page 082382-- and I'm going to summarize some of this, Mr. Paynter, but please correct me if I'm wrong -- looks like he took a look at the complete front car seat -you looked at the seat for blood, found no areas; seminal fluid, looks like you did some specific tests beyond just physical inspection; the acid phosphatase test, which was negative in the two areas that you selected. Would I be accurate in summarizing those findings in that manner? Yes, you would.



Q

A

And, again, $I$ note blood no areas; would that be a visual inspection or what sort of determination would that be?

At this time $I$ would think that it was a visual inspection, at which time $I$ would have a bottle of hemostix and a bottle of water in my hands and testing certain areas as $I$ went along, if $I$ got a negative reaction $I$ would discontinue on that stain and carry on.

Okay.
So I would suspect, where they referred to dark stains, those areas would have been tested with hemostix with negative results.

Okay. And moving on, BB, the pair of grey pants, blood no areas, seminal fluid -- again, looks like a couple of areas were selected for acid phosphatase testing with negative results; would that be accurate?

It would be accurate with the same qualification that $I$ mentioned on the previous exhibit, that I may have tested areas, but they were negative. For blood are you talking? For blood, yes. Okay. And moving down, CC, wine coloured housecoat, blood no areas, seminal fluid no areas;

DD, pair of blue gloves, blood no areas, and there you indicate several areas negative heme; what is that telling us?

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
A

Q

A
I -- here, that would appear that $I$ may have tested it for $A$ antigens, or $A$ and $B$ antigens, and
it was -- appeared to be positive for A although
it was -- would be a weak reaction which I could
not confirm.
Okay. And again, $I$ don't want to confirm this, but you talk about weak reaction; would it be, then, a different reaction than, for example, you had seen in $I 1$ when you had initially tested for antigens in that substance?

The file, the test in that case would be adding known blood cells, if there was no -- the reaction that you would expect they were looking for would be whether or not those cells would be clumping together in bunches or groups, maybe even severely clumping into one big group, 'weak' -- or it would just go, the reaction would vary from no clumping to one large clump, and this would appear to be somewhere in between.

Okay. So if you were asked for a conclusion on that aspect, based upon your notes and your best recollection, what would you conclude with respect to the presence or non-presence of A antigens?

Looking at what $I$ have there $I$ would conclude that it may or may not have been from a secretor group A, probably leaning towards the side that it was from group A. Okay.

A group.

And not a matter, likely, you can speak to, Mr. Paynter, I think the suggestion had been made by Mr. Wilson, according to the report, that the shorts he believed were Cadrain's, and if it was known at the time that Cadrain was of type $O$, and that whatever the substance was, was on that, that was on those shorts were from Cadrain, you wouldn't expect to find A antigens; would that be correct?

If it was a pure seminal fluid stain.
Right. And in fact, if it was any fluid from Mr. Cadrain, you wouldn't expect to find A antigens? Mr. Cadrain would not have contributed A antigens if he was a group O.

Okay. And then just continuing forward, $F F$, one pair of black shoes, blood no areas, seminal fluid no areas. Next page, similarly with the Phillishave box and the cardboard container, being the glove compartment.

If we move to your report, and
it's a report that we referred to previously, it's document 105559, and again those items that we've just referred to are listed there on the first page under General, and if we move to the next page relative to these items, your Conclusions you
offer, being that no blood was found, no blood was found on the exhibits noted; and number 3, human seminal fluid was found on EE, again, those being the pair of men's undershorts, and $I$ note that you make no mention of the presence of $A$ antigens; would that be consistent?

That would indicate to me that $I$ was not completely satisfied from the tests, where I mentioned in the other part where it appears $A, I$ was not satisfied to the point where $I$ would make a commitment that it was A.

And that would be standard in terms of your reporting, although you may indicate something of that nature in your notes, if you were not -It was an indication to myself. The notes were for myself, not for -- they didn't go to the contributing agency or anybody else, it was something that $I$ had made for my own information. Okay. And then the last conclusion, number 4, being no seminal fluid found on the items that we talked about.

And there's one page of your notes, original notes, that we haven't covered yet, Mr. Paynter, and that's page 082381. Perhaps we can go to that now, please. It speaks of an
exhibit being received from a Corporal MacDonald on January 16th, 1970, being:
"One pair of wine coloured Trousers in brown paper bag
legs cut off above
appear To have been washed Since last worn",
and then your testing results. And just to give this some context, we have a statement that was taken on January 14th, 1970 from a Maurice Cerato, if we could turn to document 045986, please. Just call out the -- that portion, please. Just read a short bit of this statement. He indicates, beginning here Mr. Paynter, again this is Mr. Cerato:
"After Dave came back from his Saskatoon trip in the winter of 1969 he met me back in Regina, then we worked our way back to Winnipeg where we stayed for quite a while. While in Winnipeg I bought a pr. of wine trousers from David for . 15 cents. This was in the motel room where we stayed. He was fooling around with his clothes and he brought out this pair pants and asked if I
wanted to buy them. Later I noticed there was what certainly looked like blood around the crotch of this pants so they were drycleaned the next day. I believe David told me he had lent someone these pants and that's how they came back."

And if we go back to your notes, 082381, what do those notes tell you about the tests that were conducted on these trousers?

A
$Q$

A
I always answered that question by qualifying it with 'it depends on the quality the wash', it could spread the blood around, or it could remove it completely, or anywhere in between.

So there would be circumstances where you would
find blood in instances where an item had been washed previously?

A

Q

A
$Q$
do not recall any other specific cases of any nature that $I$ could even hazard a guess as to who or what it might be. There would be no doubt that

I would receive a number of cases from the Saskatoon City Police that year and any other year that $I$ was involved in this work, but any relation
to this case or any other case, I would not be aware of any connection.

Okay. But no recollection, then, of being advised of the consideration of a couple of other rape cases in connection with the Gail Miller murder investigation and actually receiving items from those other cases for purposes of testing?

None whatsoever.

Okay. And to be fair we'll refer to some documents and I'll take you through this, Mr. Paynter, and we'll see if it refreshes your memory at all. Firstly, if we could take a look at document 324671 dated March 18th, 1969, again directed to Mr. Kerr, I do note that it's a couple of different occurrence numbers, not the 641/69 that we have seen on the Gail Miller murder investigation documents. The reference is alleged rape, (V2) (V2)- (V2)----- and (V1)--- (V1)-; do those names sound familiar at all, Mr. Paynter? No, they don't.

Okay. And, just following through, it would appear that you received some exhibits from Lieutenant $S h o r t$, or that the lab received some exhibits from Lieutenant Short, Exhibit A being a glass slide containing a vaginal smear of (V2)
(V2)- (V2)-----; Exhibit B being one pair of lady's green panties, her mother documents it's been confirmed that that would be an item relating to (V1)--- (V1)-; Exhibit C being one lady's blue plaid lined jacket, fur collar, bearing stain on inside lining, and again from other evidence that's been confirmed to have been from or related to (V1)--- (V1)-; and then I see the Purpose being:
"Examine Exhibits A (slide), B (ladies panties) and C (ladies jacket) for the presence of human semen and if present attempted to establish ABO agglutinogens."

And would you interpret that -- how would you interpret that request, Mr. Paynter?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
And how would you interpret that aspect of the request?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

Literally what it says, he wanted me to look at it for seminal fluid, and if $I$ found some to see if $I$ could find any $A B$ antigens in there.

Okay. And then under the Remarks section:
"This examination may be investigatively related to previous examinations conducted by your Laboratory in connection with Exhibit I (sample of liquid)."

It indicates:
"See your report \#138-69, March 12, $1969 . "$

I think you previously identified for us that the testing you were doing on the Gail Miller case was on file 138-69, and does any of this refresh your memory as to some testing you may have done in connection with these cases and the Gail Miller case?
. Well, $I$ can't give you any indication at this time. From reading that $I$ would assume that they
were checking to see if the same person was involved in the two or three different offences, but that's just from reading this report, not from any knowledge or any recollection of any conversation $I$ had, which at that time I probably did have a conversation with them but I don't recall it.

Okay. And your determination in terms of the Gail Miller murder investigation, your report, original report $I$ believe was dated March 12 th, so you would have reported on the findings of the $A$ antigens in $I 1$ by the time of this letter?

Yes, I would have.

Okay. And also offered your observations on the secretor aspect in relation to that original report?

That would be correct.

Okay. If $I$ turn your attention, then, to a report following from the letter we just looked at, 324672 , please. And, again, we see the occurrence numbers at the top, a lab file number which is a different lab file number, and reference to (V2) (V2) - (V2)----- and (V1)--- (V1)-. And if we move down the page, under General it indicates the exhibits you've received, Purpose:

A
"To conduct a serological examination on Exhibits A, B and C."

Then, if we can review your Conclusions:
"Human seminal fluid was found on:-

Exhibit A: Two smears on the microscope slides.

Exhibit B: One pair of blue panties.
Exhibit C: One plaid jacket."
Are those your initials at the bottom of that page?

Yes, they are.
And if we move to the next page, Conclusions continued:
"Agglutinogens of Type "A" were found in the stained areas tested on:-

Exhibit B: One pair of blue panties.
Exhibit C: One plaid jacket."
And would that have been the same testing method that you've discussed with us already in terms of the detection of those agglutinogens?

It would be.
Is that telling us, again, that $A$ antigens were found in those stained areas?

A antigens were found in the areas tested, yes. Okay. And then, if we go down to the Remarks

|  | 1 |  | section, number 1 you indicate: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 |  | "With reference to Paragraph 2 of the |
|  | 3 |  | Conclusions, this indicates that some |
|  | 4 |  | portions of the stained areas were |
| 11:26 | 5 |  | produced by a person of Group "A", |
|  | 6 |  | however, there is no way of knowing |
|  | 7 |  | whether this portion was the seminal |
|  | 8 |  | fluid, blood, or both." |
|  | 9 |  | What, in effect, are you saying in that |
| 11:26 | 10 |  | paragraph, Mr. Paynter? |
|  | 11 | $A$ | It says I don't know where $I$ was getting the $A$ |
|  | 12 |  | antigen from, whether it was the blood on the |
|  | 13 |  | exhibits or whether it was the seminal fluid on |
|  | 14 |  | the exhibits, or both. |
| 11:27 | 15 | Q | And you don't recall looking at this particular |
|  | 16 |  | exhibit, or these particular exhibits, I assume? |
|  | 17 | A | I don't recall anything about the exhibits other |
|  | 18 |  | than I obviously examined them. |
|  | 19 | Q | Okay. And if we continue on, number 2: |
| 11:27 | 20 |  | "No attempt could be made to determine |
|  | 21 |  | the presence of agglutinogen on Exhibit |
|  | 22 |  | A, as a smear on slides does not provide |
|  | 23 |  | enough sample for the tests." |
|  | 24 |  | And then just the first sentence in number 3: |
| 11:27 | 25 |  | "The above results would become more |
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A

2

A
$Q$

A
Q significant, however, if it were known whether or not (V1)--- (V1)- was a Group "A" secretor."

And I'm wondering about that last comment; why would the tests become more significant if that was known?

Well if she was a group A secretor I could be testing -- or even if she was a group A, her blood, that would indicate it could very well be grouping her, not the contributor.

Okay. Notwithstanding the detection of a seminal stain or semen on those items; is that correct? That is correct. If there was -- it indicates from up above that there was blood there as well as seminal fluid, and so $I$ would have no way of knowing, if she was a group $O$ it be would become significant again.

Okay.
Or a group B.
And I think you've already said this, but bear with me, I'm trying to make my way through this. So indeed, if she was group A, the presence of the A antigens could be explained by that fact alone? That's correct.

Whether it was in her blood on those items or any
other bodily fluid?

A
Q

A

Q

A

Q
A
Q

Any bodily fluid.
Okay. And that's why you indicate that the tests might become more significant if that was determined?

Yes, it would be.
And if she wasn't found to be a group A secretor what conclusions could you offer in that circumstance?

That $I$ would have to assume that, that most probably the A antigens came from whoever was responsible for the, even the seminal fluid that was found there.

The donor of the semen?
Yes.
Okay. Now you go on to give some instructions in relation to the obtaining of some samples. You indicate:
"In order to determine this, it is suggested that a blood sample and saliva sample from this person be submitted for examination. The saliva sample could be best obtained by having Miss (V1)- chew lightly on a piece of clean cloth (such as the corner of a clean handkerchief)
for a few seconds, mark the area, then allow this to dry at room temperature before submitting to the Laboratory." And that would be consistent with your knowledge in relation to that test and how it should be properly conducted at that time? That was my knowledge at that time. If we follow through for reference sake, have a look at an investigation report, it's 004102 . It's a report by Bev Cressman, it's on the Gail Miller matter, see the occurrence number in the top right-hand corner, dated April 15th, and a date is referenced there of a visit with Miss (V1)- on April 7th. If we move down the page to about middle of the page, this portion here he indicates a saliva test sample was taken from Miss (V1)-, a little further down it indicates a blood sample in a -- was also taken, and then if we look at the next page, 004103 , it simply indicates that those samples would be sent to the crime lab. If we follow through, there is a
further report at page 009386 of 009374 -- that's not the version $I$ was looking at but we can use this one. You will see the date of the report being April the 11th, and again the reference to

Q

A

Q
(V2) (V2)- (V2)-----, (V1)--- (V1)-; indicates General in relation to the receipt of those items, the liquid blood sample and the saliva sample; Purpose, to conduct a serological examination on those exhibits. You indicate that those tests were conducted and in your Conclusions you note, number 1:
"Exhibit D, one liquid blood sample, was found to be of Group "O"."

And what would that be telling us, Mr. Paynter?
It tells us that whoever we got that blood sample from was a person with group O in the ABO blood grouping system. this leads to the conclusion that (V1)--- (V1)would be of type 0 blood?

If that was her blood sample, yes.
Okay. And then the second conclusion:
"No agglutinogens of blood groups A and
B were found in Exhibit:
E - one saliva sample."
And the significance of that would be what, Mr. Paynter?

Well, first off there would be no agglutinogens from her in the stains, but secondly, I found none
there or in the saliva.

Q

A
$Q$

A

Yes, I would, as long as you don't change the interpretation to make it positive further down the road.

And would it be fair to say then that this testing
and the testing conducted in the context of the Miller investigation would suggest that the donor or donors of semen in both cases were type $A$ secretors?

They probably were.
Okay. And after we've reviewed all of those materials, does any of that refresh your memory as to this particular aspect that you were involved in?

None whatsoever.
Now, I understand, Mr. Paynter, that you were called to testify at the preliminary hearing and trial of David Milgaard?

I was.
I'm going to take a look at your trial testimony in particular in a moment. Do you recall any preparations prior to trial with anybody, including the prosecutor or defence counsel for that matter?

I don't recall any, and if there were, it would be very brief. Fairly often there was no consultation before at all. Whether there was in this case $I$ can't say at this time.

And this is entirely based upon my own assumptions, but given that there was some
science, so to speak, to wade through here, is it likely in that type of circumstance that some discussions would have taken place ahead of time? It's more likely that we were familiar with each other, we knew each other and in that case there probably wouldn't be any major discussion.

And did you have a working relationship then with Mr. Caldwell at that time?

Oh, yes, we were quite familiar with each other. And would consult in preparation prior to your testimony on occasion?

I would put it on the rare side.

And I'm just going to refer you to a couple of documents, the first one being document 006929 , and this one, just for the sake of reference, I don't think you will be able to speak to it, Mr. Paynter, these are some notes that have been, or we anticipate will be identified as notes of the prosecutor Mr. Caldwell in preparation for trial. If we make our way through to page 006934 of those notes, just a couple of entries that mention your name, I'm not sure that we'll gain any significance from it at this point, but you'll see at the top, 44, l believe it says:
"Paynter re breakdown within group. A-1

- A-2 - etc.

Paynter couldn't determine the blood group of the blood found in the seminal fluid."

Moving down:
"Checked seminal fluid for antigens found them - but couldn't say if they were from blood or secreting into seminal fluid. Get this straightened
out!!!! (with Paynter)."
And again just for reference sake, I believe it's the next page of that same document, near the bottom, you see item number 53 indicates:
"Paynter, Emson, re freeze \& thaw sperm

- re effect on antigens pre-trial."

I'm going to refer you to another document which is document ID 045917.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Could I have the document $I D$ for that 934, the one you just finished referring to?

MR. HARDY: It is 006929.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thanks.
BY MR. HARDY:
$Q$
And again we anticipate that this will be identified as some notes of the prosecutor Mr.

Caldwell. It looks like the date is January 14th, 1970 which would have been I guess the Wednesday prior to the commencement of the trial, and I'm going to read through those and we'll see if we can identify this at all. It notes Paynter at the top and continues on:
"A "secretor" is a person that has his blood antigens - or blood grouping substances - in his other body fluids perspiration, seminal fluid, saliva, tears. About 80 percent of people are secretors. This means you should be able to find out their blood group from these bodily fluids."

And would that be an accurate piece of information noted there as best you would know in 1969 ?

A
$Q$
Yes, it would.
And if we follow through:
"P --"
I take it for Paynter,
"-- checked the two frozen lumps, found
one I1 to contain spermatozoa, and since
it was a clear, pale yellowish liquid
when thawed, made no attempt to examine
it for blood as such. At this time he did proceed to check it to see if he could find any blood group antigens in it. He found "A" antigens in the liquid, which would indicate the fluid was probably from a group A person who would be a secretor."

And again, would that be accurate information as best you knew it in 1969?

A
Yes.

If we read on:
"At a later date, he examined the same sample in which he had found seminal fluid, this time examining for the presence of blood, and got a positive presumptive test for blood in the sample."

And again that would be accurate, Mr. Paynter?

Yes.

And the last paragraph stating:
"The presence of blood as such in the sample should account for the presence of antigens in the seminal fluid if a non-secretor, and since he found "A" antigens only, it indicates the blood
would be from a group A person. Because of the presence of "A" antigens, it cannot be Gail Miller's blood which is type "O"."

And would you agree with that last summary, Mr. Paynter, in terms of accuracy?

A
Q
A

2
A
Q
A
Q
A
$Q$

Okay. I want to talk about that last paragraph a little bit further, and I'm sure not suggesting that this arose from a discussion with you or otherwise, $I$ don't think we heard evidence to state one way or the other. Does this refresh your memory at all as to any discussions that took place with Mr. Caldwell?
Yeah, I think $I$ would agree with the rest of it.

A
$Q$

Okay. So just bear with me. We've got a sample of fluid, II, which has tested positive for seminal fluid, and you've detected the presence of A antigens and you later, upon testing, determine
antigens, it cannot be Gail Miller's
blood which is type "O"."
It wouldn't be Gail Miller's blood that
contributed the A antigen.

A
the presence of blood, and I'm wondering about the possibility that the semen would be from a type A secretor and that the positive hemostix test could be from a type $O$ individual. Is that a possibility?

That's a possibility, yes.
So the two aren't mutually exclusive then, so to speak? I mean, you could have both, you could have semen from a type A secretor present which would speak to the presence of $A$ antigens and the hemostix test nonetheless could come back positive notwithstanding it was actually type O blood that was present?

That would be correct, yes.
Okay. And in fact any blood would give that reaction, it could be a type $B$ person, similarly you would receive the positive reaction in that circumstance?

It could be any blood, animal or human.
So I take it then likely you disagree with that last sentence that says it could not be Gail Miller's blood which is type O?

I wouldn't say that it -- no, it couldn't eliminate her as being her blood.

So your test results would be just as consistent
if it was determined that the blood, if it was blood that was detected in that sample, was in fact blood from Gail Miller, you would have received the exact same results?

I would have got exactly the same results.
I would like to turn to your trial testimony now, Mr. Paynter, I'm going to refer you to some portions and ask for your comment on those portions, and the document ID is 041925 , and actually I'm going to pause there for a moment to touch on something that $I$ hadn't referred to earlier. Have you had a chance to review the autopsy report that was conducted in relation to this matter do you recall?

I don't believe $I$ reviewed it as such, no.
And were you aware at the time that there was what's referred to as a vaginal aspirate, a sample of fluid $I$ take it taken from the vagina during the autopsy which had been tested?

I cannot say whether $I$ was aware of it at that time or not. I became aware of it sometime because $I$ know of it now, but when $I$ became aware of it, I have no idea.

And would there have been value for purposes of what you were doing in receiving that item for
purposes of testing?

A
As far as determining whether or not there was seminal fluid there, $I$ could say no more. If I had done the antigen check for it, that would have been perhaps of more value because of the location of that sample versus the location of the sample from the snowbank, because the location of the aspirate is much more significant than something found in the area.

And that includes, for your purposes, in the testing realm so to speak?

It makes no difference to me in my testing, but for court purposes it would be quite more significant. The continuity on the sample of the aspirate, there was no doubt about where and who had it, whereas the sample from the snowbank, there could be some question on continuity.

And could you as well have done blood testing, hemostix testing, etcetera, with the sample from the vaginal aspirate?

Oh, yes.
Do you recall any discussion about that aspirate and the non-availability of that item for testing at the time?

No, I don't.
$Q$
Back to your trial testimony, start at page 041930, starting at about that portion, and briefly you are indicating at this point some of your academic qualifications, you indicate:
"A I entered our laboratory system in 1959 at Ottawa, Ontario; and from that point attended Carlton University where I obtained a Bachelor of Science degree, majoring in chemistry.

Q And have you had any other academic training in the way of degrees in your field?

A No sir.
Q And once you got that degree, what did you do, Staff?

A I obtained the degree in 1964 and $I$ was transferred to the Regina laboratory in September of that year; and was an understudy in the serology section for the remainder of 1964.

Q And what did you do then?
A Since the beginning of 1965 I have been doing case work and giving evidence in the courts; $I$ have given evidence in the courts in the Yukon
and Northwest Territories and the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Nova Scotia."

And that would be an accurate summary of your training and experience at the time, Mr. Paynter? I would say so.

I refer you next to page 041932 , start here, please:
"Q And during the period from 1965 till the present have you in fact analysed a number of liquid blood samples?

A Yes I have, sir.

Q Could you give us an approximation of how many?

A I could not say, sir; it would be within the two or three hundred range probably but $I$ could not give a definite number.

Q During that period have you examined stains for the presence of blood and in some cases to go on in grouping - to determine whether it was human blood and sometimes go on and group the blood?

A Yes I have, sir.

Q And what numbers would this run into?

A Again $I$ could not give a figure but this would be a few thousand.

Q And have you examined stains for the presence of human seminal fluid and/or spermatozoa during that period?

A Yes sir.

Q And in what range of numbers of such examinations?

A Again $I$ could not give a figure but again it would be well over a thousand."

And would this basically be accurate information that you were providing at that time, Mr. Paynter?

A
$Q$
I believe so.

And so with those numbers in mind, could you give us an idea of on how many occasions over the same time period you would have checked for secretor status, so to speak, checked for A antigens in another bodily fluid?

I have no idea at all on that.

Could you give us an estimate?

No.

Would it be less than a hundred? Help me out.
I can't help you on that at all.
$Q$

You've told us previously that it was not a routine test; is that correct?

That is correct.
But you can't go beyond that in terms of placing a number with these standards in mind?

No, I can't.
Okay. If we turn our attention to page 041935 , start there, please, he's speaking of the two vials of frozen substance here, and again this is Mr. Caldwell examining:
"Q And I believe you examined the item which is $I$ believe $P .13$ for identification - the two what are now two empty vials?

A Yes I did, sir.
Q Now, when you received the vials what were the contents - in what form were they?

A The vials when I received them contained a liquid. This was a pale yellowish or clearish liquid.

Q I see; and was this true of both vials?
A That is correct, sir."
And does that description that you've indicated there fit with your recollection today of the

A
appearance of the contents of those vials, Mr. Paynter?

Colour wise it does. I can't say whether it was still frozen or whether it was liquid when $I$ received it, but colour wise it would, yes.

Okay. And I noted that, I think your notes maybe referred to receiving them in a frozen state.

Yes.
And you can't recall that for purposes of today? I can't recall that.

But you are comfortable with the description in terms of the colour noted?

Yes, $I$ am.
And if we read forward from that point:
"Q Now, I'd like to pause at that point, Staff, before going into what you did with the vials and ask you whether your training and knowledge and experience includes some knowledge of the matter of the secretion of blood antigens into the bodily fluids of some persons?

A Yes sir.
Q Now, is there a name to describe the class of those persons, Staff?

A Persons who secrete their blood group
antigens in their other body fluids are known as secretors."

The Court then has some questions for you:
"Q Who secrete their what?

A Their blood group substances or antigens.

Q Did you say or?
A They are usually called antigens.
Q Yes - they're known as secretors?
A The persons are known as secretors, yes, My Lord."

Mr. Caldwell continues:
"Q And I take it antigens is one and the same thing as blood group substances?

A Yes, I use the two interchangeably." The judge then had some further questions for you:
"Q Well, just explain that, will you please for my benefit and the benefit of the jury - what is a secretor in plain language, what does he do?

A A person who is group A blood will have the same group $A$ substance in his other body fluids - in saliva, perspiration, tears, seminal fluid -
the same antigens as he does in his blood.

Q In other words, he doesn't have blood there, he has the antigens?

A He just has the antigens the same as are in the blood, yes sir. A person who is a non-secretor will not have these antigens in their other body fluids but they will be in the blood." Next page at the top:
"Q Well, I take it that antigens is just one portion of the blood?

A Yes, sir."

Mr. Caldwell then continues:
"Q And when you speak of antigens in this sense, Staff, $I$ take it you are speaking of them as opposed to whole blood?

A Yes sir. This is just a portion - a chemical in the blood that is used in the grouping under the $A-B-O$ blood grouping system in this case.

Antigens can be other substances besides the "A" antigen. Many substances can be classified as antigens but in this instance $I$ am
referring to the blood group "A" antigens."

And would this be an accurate summary of information, $I$ should say would this be accurate information that you were providing on this occasion, Mr. Paynter?

I believe at the time it was accurate and I still believe it is, yes.

I'll move you forward in the transcript to page 041938 and I'll start mid page, Mr. Caldwell is examining:
"Q As I understand you, Staff --"
And he's still speaking of secretors:
"Q As I understand you, Staff, in the case of a secretor from what you say you should be able to ascertain his blood group from one of those bodily fluids?

A Yes sir.
Q Alright now, when you checked the two vials which form P. 13 for
identification, on the first time in which you examined them, Staff, what examination did you make of the vials?

A The first examination was to examine the contents of the vials for the

I believe if we go back, it was in the request that came from the Saskatoon City Police to do

5
that.

Q I would doubt it.

MR. HARDY: Okay. Mr. Commissioner, I know we're just before noon, perhaps this would be a good time to break. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Sure. (Adjourned at 11:56 a.m.) (Reconvened at 1:30 p.m.)

BY MR. HODSON:

Good afternoon, Mr. Paynter.
Good afternoon.

Q
If we could go back to the trial transcript, please, I believe we were at page 041940 . Focus in starting at this portion here, Mr. Paynter, Mr. Caldwell is examining here:
"Q Now I'm sorry, Staff, but your second examination ...",
and I'm sorry, again we're speaking of item II, the vial of substance. Back to the transcript:
"Q Now I'm sorry, Staff, but your second examination as part of the initial one $I$ think you said ..?

A .. is an examination for the presence of these antigens and $I$ found "A" antigens present in the sample of liquid.

Q And was that in the same one in which you found the seminal fluid?

A Yes, sir; it was the vial that was marked I-1 when I received it.

THE COURT:
Q Just a minute please; so that you conclude from that then that he had "A" blood grouping, did you?

A There is another problem in grouping the other bodily fluids, My Lord. In
the blood group the persons that have "A" antigens and no "B" antigens would have "B" antibodies. And in grouping blood we also check for these antibodies before we will determine what the blood group was. But the other body fluids, there's no antibodies to check for. And this creates the problem in stains or materials such as this as we do not know if there was a "B" antigen present and it was destroyed or if there was never any "B" antigen there.

Q So you couldn't tell whether it was "A" or "B" then?

A All I can say is that $I$ found "A" antigen, so it would be from a Group "A" or a Group "A-B".

Q A Group "A" or a Group "A-B"?

A Yes.

Q Not "B"?

A Not "B", no sir."

And this would be accurate information that you were providing, Mr. Paynter?
$A \quad$ Yes sir.

Q

So nonetheless, in terms of your mindset at that time, you allowed for the possibility, whether it be A antigens or $B$ antigens in a substance of that nature, that they could be destroyed?

A

Q
Okay. And if we turn to the next page, please, 041942 starting at the bottom of the page:
"Q And I believe the situation is that you later received them back again?"

Again, we're talking about the vials and the saliva samples:
"A Yes sir. I again received the same vials from Ident. Officer Kleiv of the Saskatoon City Police at our laboratory on the 3rd of June 1969.

Q Now, was there any contents in the vials at this stage?

A In the one that was marked as I-1 there was still liquid in the vial. The other one the liquid appeared to have dried leaving a stain in the vial.

Q I see; and did you examine $I-1$ again?
A I did.
Q Now, on this occasion what did you examine for?

A On this occasion examination was to determine if there was any blood present in the liquid.

Q And just to be clear, Staff, I take it you're speaking now of blood as opposed to any constituent of blood?

A As opposed to antigens, yes sir; this would be blood."

Continue on from there:
"Q Now, did this involve a different technique than you had used previously?

A Yes, it did.

Q And what was the result of this second examination?

A If I may explain the test. This test is one used by hospitals to test for blood in urine and they find that it is specific for their purpose in testing for blood in this liquid. I have used this test and tested it with several substances and $I$ found that it will give a false positive reaction with certain green vegetables and with leather.

Q What do you mean by a false positive reaction?

A It will give a positive result - the same result with these substances as
it will with blood.
Q Have you found it will give a false positive reaction with other substances than those two?

A No, I haven't, sir.
Q And I take it you've tried it with others from what you say?

A Yes, we've tried it with many substances."

I'll pause there for a moment. Is that accurate information that you provided at that time, Mr. Paynter, as best that you can recall? Best as I can recall, yes, it is. And I'll continue on, the Court had some questions at that point:
"Q In other words, it's something from the vegetables that's there and not blood and mistaken for blood, is that what you mean?

A No sir; I'm saying that the test when tested against other substances a few other substances will give a false positive and for that reason $I$ cannot positively say that a substance is blood from using this test alone.

A
$Q$
A
Q

Q It's not much good then, is it?
A Well, we use it as a screening test to eliminate stains and then if it is positive we attempt to do a further test to positively identify it as blood if there is sufficient there." And Mr. Caldwell then continues:
"Q But those are the two subjects if you will on which you found it to give a false reading so to speak?

A That is correct.
Q And have you found it did give a false reading with any other substances you have tested?

A No sir."
And, again, would that be accurate information that you were providing at that time, Mr. Paynter?

I believe so, sir, yes.
And, again, your explanation here; this is why you would have originally described the test result as presumptive, and I'm talking about the blood in the II sample?

Yeah, that would be the reason.
Okay. If we continue on at the bottom of the
page:
"Q Now, when you on the second occasion tested the contents for the presence of blood as such, what result did you obtain?

A I obtained a positive result for blood with this test.

Q And is that the extent of what your finding showed you?

A Yes, sir; there was insufficient blood in this sample - or coloring in this sample that $I$ was able to attempt any confirmation tests to absolutely prove that there was blood present."

The Court then has a question:
"Q It turned out to be useless then, didn't it?

A Chemically I could not say that it was definitely blood there."

And that was, again, accurate information that you were providing at that time, Mr. Paynter?

I believe it was, yes.
I turn your attention to the next page, 041946, there is a bit of an exchange between the Court and counsel included here, but for reference sake

I'm going to read this, Mr. Paynter. And if we could start here please, it's Mr. Caldwell asking the question:
"... All right now, if indeed there was blood as such - I'm asking about this time - in the sample at the time you checked for blood as such ..

THE COURT: .. excuse me, but there was no blood.

MR. CALDWELL: Well, My Lord..
THE COURT: .. you just can't ask
hypothetical questions like that unless you're prepared to prove that there was blood there. If you can't prove that there was blood there through some witness or other $I$ won't allow you to pursue it.

MR. CALDWELL: Well, I'd like to pursue what the result of that test indicated at any rate, and perhaps ..

THE COURT: .. Well, it was positive for blood but he has already said that that might be false because of the other factors that he mentioned and he said that there wasn't enough to make a
positive identification as to whether it was a false positive or not a false positive.

MR. CALDWELL: I understood the ..

MR. TALLIS: .. excuse me, if I may
interject here. He even went further, My Lord, and said chemically I would not say it was blood."

Do you have a recollection, at all, of that exchange during the trial?

A recollection? Without reading it, no, I don't. Okay. But to your last point there, again, that would be accurate information that you were providing and probably the best information you could provide at that point?

It was.
Okay. Just continuing down, Mr. Caldwell continues:
"Q From the results you did get on that what could you narrow the item down to being? From the result you got what could you narrow down the cause of that result to?

A With this particular test?
THE COURT:

Q Yes; what were the various things it might have been?

A It would be blood or an extract from a leather product or an extract from green leafy vegetables such as lettuce, horseradish and vegetables of this nature.

MR. CALDWELL: Perhaps, My Lord, I could ask the witness this -

Q If the result you got as I understand you was caused by any of those causes what can you say about the effect of this second or latter test, Staff, on the result you got in your first test?

A If this test was caused as a result of blood in the liquid this would eliminate the necessity of the antigens being produced by a secretor that $I$ found in the first test, because the antigens could be there as a result of blood being in the liquid.

THE COURT:

Q So if it was blood the person might not have been a secretor?

A That is correct; he would not
necessarily be a secretor if it was
blood that caused this positive test
that I obtained."
And, again, that was accurate information that
you were providing Mr. Paynter? Okay. Okay. I'll turn your attention next to page 041949 , please. If we can start near the top, right there, it's talking about your
examinations for seminal stains. This is
Mr. Caldwell continuing:
"Q Now, Staff, did you examine P. 6 - the panties - for the presence of human seminal fluid?

A Yes I did, sir.

Q And with what result?

A I found human seminal fluid present at the back of the crotch area in the panties.

Q Did you mark the location, Staff, on the exhibit?

A The area outlined in the crotch area the black mark - and the hole cut inside this area is the area of the cloth that $I$ used in my test.

Q Right; now, Staff, did you examine P.5, the black coat, $P .7$ the panty girdle, P. 8 the half slip, P. 9 the brassiere, P. 10 the white uniform dress for the presence of seminal fluid?

A Yes I did, sir.
Q And with what results?

A I found no seminal fluid on any of these items."

And, again, that would be accurate information, Mr. Paynter, that you were providing at that time?

Yes it would.

I turn your attention to page 041954 , bottom of the page, it's just speaking of the saliva samples from Mr. Milgaard:
"Q And I believe you carried on a test on the item which is P. 24 - the two vials containing saliva samples?

A That is correct, sir.

Q And in what form were the samples when you received them, that is was there any actual liquid or moisture as such?

A No sir; they were given to me as saliva stains on pieces of cloth. The cloth was dry when $I$ received them.

Q And what test did you conduct on those two items?

A These items were tested to determine if $I$ could find either "A" or "B" antigens in the saliva on the cloth.

Q And did you determine any such antigens?
A I found none.

Q And from that, Staff, just from that
alone what would that indicate to you, if anything, about the person that supplied these samples?

A This would indicate that the person was a non-secretor."

And that would be accurate information that you were providing at that time, Mr. Paynter?

At that time, yes.
And $I$ note that you didn't qualify your answer in any respect. When you look at that, are you comfortable with the response you provided, in terms of what you knew in 1969 about -From what I knew in 1969 I was quite comfortable with it.

Okay. I turn your attention to page 041962, please, starting here. This is now on cross-examination conducted by Mr. Tallis, he is again speaking of the two vials of substance, Il and I2, and here he is speaking of $I 2$ in particular. I'll read a portion to you:
"Q Now, you told my learned friend in your evidence-in-chief that you tested I think the one marked $I-2$ for seminal fluid, which forms part of ..?

A .. I-2 was tested for seminal fluid,
yes.
Q .. P.13; and as $I$ understand it that one vial the substance in there was negative for seminal fluid?

A That is correct.
Q And negative I think you told my learned friend for human material?

A Yes sir.
Q Now, I believe you also described it as being a yellowish sort of color?

A Very pale ..
Q .. pale yellow?
A .. color liquid, yes sir.
Q Now, how much was in that vial when you first received it - what quantity?

A I could not give an exact amount; it would possibly be one c.c. or two c.c.'s - but a small amount of liquid.

Q I see. And you could notice the coloration of it when you held it up to the light?

A Yes.
Q That is you could see it with the naked eye?

A Yes sir.

Q Well now, you made the notation that it tested negative for human material; did you go further and test it to determine what type of material was in there?

A I did not, sir."
And could other tests have been performed on that vial, I2, to determine what substance was in there?

A
Not by myself, but maybe some other department could have, I'm not sure.

And why do you say not by yourself?
Well I would be looking for blood or seminal fluid, and $I$ conducted all the tests $I$ could test in that matter, and we did not examine for other materials.

Okay. I'm going to read forward from there:
"Q I see; and all you can tell us is that it was this pale yellowy color?

A Yes sir.
Q But I take it that the test when you say the absence of human material - this would negative body substances including urine and things like that?

A No sir.
Q I see, it wouldn't?

A It wouldn't negative urine, no sir.

Q Well, when you said human material what were you referring to?

A Blood, seminal fluid, saliva, perspiration.

Q I see; things like that?

A Yes sir.

Q So that you just - you are just not able to from your scientific knowledge - or testing because of no testing - say what was in there when you got it?

A That is correct."

And that would be accurate information that you provided at that time, Mr. Paynter?

A

Q
Q I
I turn your attention to page 041968. Beginning at the bottom of the page, the court had some questions for you, again relative to I1:
"I'm sorry, I'm going to have to interrupt you, Mr. Tallis, to clear up a point on this business of being a secretor -

Q You say at the time you made your report that in your opinion the seminal fluid came from a secretor of group "A"?

A Probably came from a secretor of group "A", I believe it was. I do not have my report here but ..

Q .. just a minute please - that was your opinion at any rate - it probably came from a secretor ..?

A .. yes sir.

Q .. and that secretor had group "A" blood?

A Yes sir.

Q Alright; and if the substance that you found there turned out - that is the free blood, which you thought was free blood - turned out to be not free blood - you understand what I mean? One of those other substances that you referred to that came from leafy lettuce and so on? If it wasn't blood - if it came from one of those other things, what would that do - confirm or ..?

A
. . this would indicate that it came from a secretor of group "A" or group "A-B", yes, sir.

Q If it was not blood?

A If the substance that gave me this
positive test was not blood?
Q But if it was blood ..?
A .. if it was not blood $I$ could not say whether or not it was a secretor because ..

Q .. and yet you can't tell me or tell the jury whether it was blood or it wasn't blood, is that right?

A I cannot tell you definitely. In my opinion it probably was blood but I cannot tell you positively.

Q It might not have been blood?
A There is a chance, yes.
Q All right; so that you can't say definitely then that the person whose seminal fluid you examined on this occasion was a secretor or not a secretor?

A I cannot say, no, sir."
Would this have been accurate information that you provided at that time, Mr. Paynter?

I believe it was.
And in your answer to one of the last questions posed you indicate in your belief or opinion it probably was blood, and do you recall on what
basis you were saying that?

A
Q
A
$Q$

A
Q

A
$Q$

A

Q

On the basis, oh, probably on experience.
From your experience did you say?
That would be what $I$ would assume.
And would there be any indicators that you could share for us that would lead you to that conclusion?

Nothing that $I$ can think of at the moment, no. Okay. And would there have been any way, at that time, of determining whether the blood was more likely from, in this instance, the assailant or the victim?

No, sir.
Again, that test simply told you that there was blood there, or that it was a positive reaction for blood?

The only way you could tell them apart would be through grouping tests and there wasn't enough there to do it.

Okay. I'll turn you to the next page, starting here, again this is Mr. Tallis on
cross-examination:
"Q I see; well let's take it then ...",
he is speaking of blood grouping:
"Q I see; well let's take it then with the
"A" group; I understand that in the "A" group you can break down the "A" group into a number of sub-groups?

A Yes sir.

Q And for example you can break it down into $A-1, A-2$ and so forth?

A That is correct, sir.

Q And I take it then this reflects the fact that within the "A" group there are differences which you can isolate into sub-groups - if $I$ may use that term?

A Yes sir.

Q And as I understand it, for example, you are in the "A" group yourself?

A I am, sir.

Q And if you take it down a step further you are in sub-group $A-1$ ?

A I am, sir.

Q Yes; and this is an illustration to other people might be in the $A-2$ group?

A That's correct, sir.

Q Now, when you were doing your blood grouping in this instance did you do any sub-grouping?

A No sir."

A
Q

A

Q

A

Q

Would that be accurate information that you provided on that occasion, Mr. Paynter?

It would.
And can you -- does the grouping of blood focus on the antigens in the blood; is it that component of blood that assists you in grouping blood?

We -- we determined which antigens were present, yes.

And, sorry, you might have to help me along here, but if I'm talking about let's say a type A person
having $A$ antigens present, and when you go to group that blood, what component of the blood is it that you are looking at in order to group it and make that determination?

If we're talking about a liquid sample you could do it by testing the, for the $A$ antigens or the $B$ antigens, in a dried stain we would also check for antibodies.

And perhaps, then, carry that forward. When we talk about the subgrouping aspect, again, what component of the blood are you looking at in order to subgroup, for example, a type A person into Al or A2 or A3?

Well the difference between an A1 and an A2 is almost insignificant. It has no effect on
anything other than the fact that, to put it very simplistically, the antigens may be a bit weaker, and as they decrease in weakness they -- some organizations or factions have listed it as A1, A2, A3 or A4. But for our purposes, and any purpose that $I$ am aware of, there is no significance whatsoever in the difference between the two.

Okay. And let's use our example here, and again we'll refer to $I 1$, you detect $A$ antigens that are present; would there -- could you have subgrouped the blood type of that individual by looking at the A antigens present in the seminal sample? I have no idea whether I could have or not. We used an anti-A product for the anti-A, or for group A1, which would identify all of the A groupings; there was one available for dividing liquid blood samples into A1 or A2, but I do not know of any available commercially, any sera for dividing them any further than that.

Okay. Now I'm just trying to apply this information to the present case and see whether it would have had any use whatsoever at the time, and maybe I'll just ask the question. Knowing all of the information that you know, do you believe that
the ability to subgroup blood could have provided any assistance in the determinations that were to be made in this particular case?

A
Again, as far as $I$ know, the subdivision would only occur or could only be done, or $I$ was only aware of it being done in liquid blood samples, so I would not even try it on a stain or on another body fluid, and $I$ would be very skeptical of any results obtained with it trying that test.

And I don't want to push this too much further but, just, I want to make sure I understand. I can understand your reservations about why you wouldn't necessarily want to engage upon those tests, but again, is the ability to subgroup blood; does it arise from that component of the blood that we have been speaking of, and in particular let's use our example, the A antigens? To the best of my knowledge, I would say that is where it is contained or derived from, -Okay.
-- in the antigens.
But in 1969 you know -- you knew of no instance, for example, from your experience where an attempt had been made to subgroup the antigens, for example, that had been located in a seminal stain?

A
Q

A
$Q$

Neither seminal stains or blood stains.
And you can see where $I$ 'm going with this thought process. If in fact that could be done, for example, and it could be determined that it was a subgroup A2 in terms of the seminal sample, and that your suspect donor was in fact A1, I would think that that could have some investigative significance?

If it was possible to do it, but again, I say $I$ don't think it was possible to even consider doing it.

Okay. Okay. Thanks for bearing with me on that. We'll turn to page 041975 of the transcript, beginning at the bottom of the page:
"Q Mr. Paynter, just a few more questions . . .", this is Mr. Tallis continuing:
"Q Mr. Paynter, just a few more questions with which you can perhaps assist us dealing with this vial labelled I-1 which forms part of $P .13$ you recall being asked a number of questions by my learned friend and myself about this substance which you couldn't scientifically identify and $I$ want to
just ask one or two more questions in connection with that. I take it that a visual examination of this seminal fluid did not reveal any reddish color of any sort?

A No sir, there was no reddish color to it.

Q No reddish color to it; and this substance if $I$ may use it when you were endeavoring to isolate it scientifically, was a very very minute quantity, as lay people would think of it, wasn't it?

A The sample of liquid or the substance in it?

Q The substance in it
A It would be a very small amount, yes.
Q And if $I$ may get down to terms in which I think of to illustrate size, it would be smaller than a pinhead?

A I couldn't say, sir, in that while it was in the liquid form what the size of the pure substance would be.

Q I see; well, in any event it would be a very minute amount?

A Yes sir.
Q And when we talk in terms of a pinhead it might be even smaller than that?

A It could be. I'll put it this way, sir; a pinhead of blood in two or three c.c.'s of blood would cause the reaction with no difficulty.

Q And a small quantity of blood would cause coloration that you could see?

A Whether or not a drop the size of a pinhead would or not, I could not say.

Q But a relatively small amount?
A It would not take a great deal to start giving a pinkish colour to the liquid.

Q That's right; and you had enough to do with the samples that it's fair to say you didn't even detect a pinkish color . . ?

A .. I did not suspect any blood in it when I first received it, sir.

Q And when you looked at it even later on there was no pinkish coloration or anything like that that the naked eye could see?

A No sir.

Q And I suppose that this examination would be under good lighting and whatnot?

A Yes sir."

And this was accurate information that you were providing at that time, Mr. Paynter?

As best as $I$ could recall, it's very accurate, yes.

I refer you to the next page, 041978 , starting here:
"Q Now, you also told my learned friend I think that with reference to the panties which are here as an exhibit - P.6 - you have told us about finding seminal stains in the crotch; and was there a fairly substantial area of seminal stain there?

A The stained area is to the rear of the crotch area, outlined with the black and the area cut out. The amount of the staining material, $I$ could not say, sir.

Q Now, were you able to run any tests on the dried seminal stains apart from
ascertaining that it was caused by seminal fluid?

A I did not, sir.
Q Well, is it possible to test dried seminal stain to take into account this secretor and non-secretor aspect?

A Yes sir.
Q I see; but I take it that no test was made of that area, or was it? Just take a moment to check your notes if you please.

A No sir."
And again $I$ think we previously covered that, Mr. Paynter, and that information would be accurate as you provided it here?

A
I think so.
And I'm correct, Mr. Paynter, that you were not asked at trial, as best you can recall, about several of the other items that we reviewed in your notes including, for example, the items retrieved from the vehicle and Constable Bagwell's involvement in terms of locating the pants and $I$ believe a blue seat cover, and again all $I$ can ask is for your best recollection. We have the transcript which will speak for itself, but you
don't recall speaking to those matters do you?

A
Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
Q
At the trial?
Yes.
I couldn't recall it without looking at the
transcript.
No, fair enough. And were you aware at the time,
Mr. Paynter, that Dr. Emson was also testifying at
this trial?

Well, $I$ would know that he would be called as he was, he did the autopsy, so $I$ would assume that he would be called.

And were you aware at all of his testimony provided at that time?

I don't believe so.
I just want to refer you to a couple of very short portions, if we could go to document 255230, please, and page 255256 , this is the examination by Mr. Caldwell, if I could start there, please, I'm going to read a portion to you again:
"Q Are there conditions under which human blood as such can get into seminal fluid or spermatozoa in the male person?

A Yes.
Q Could you tell the Court what they are please?

A One would be local injury to the male genitals. A second and quite common occurrence would be any inflammation either internal or external of the male genitals.

Q Are there any other causes?

A There are rarer conditions but $I$ think the injury and the inflammation are the most common ones.

Q You understood my question to be speaking of blood as such as opposed to any constituent of blood?

A Yes - blood cells."

I'm going to continue, but we'll move to the next page. I'm sorry, page 255272 , starting here:
"Q Now, you told my learned friend --"
And this is on cross-examination:
"Q Now, you told my learned friend also that blood is sometimes located in the seminal fluid of a male person and you told my learned friend, the jury and His Lordship certain things that may cause this. Now, would I be correct - well, have you ever found blood in say a sixteen and a half year old boy where
you have tested his seminal fluid - have you personally ever found that condition?

A I don't ever recollect having done it before on a sixteen and a half year old boy.

Q I see; you've never personally done it?
A No.
Q And I take it that - well, do you recollect ever having done it on we'll say a seventeen or eighteen year old boy - in that area?

I'm afraid $I$ can't give you the ages of the patients on whom this has been done. It is I think accepted medical knowledge that small amounts of blood commonly find their way into seminal fluid of males of any age beyond puberty, in conditions particularly of slight infection anywhere in the genital or urinary system; and less commonly in the events of external injury.

Q And is it fair to say that it is less likely - that these inflammations are
less likely to occur in a younger
person?

A No, I don't think so.
Q There is no distinction?
A I don't think so.

Q But you haven't personally conducted any tests on any group ..?

A .. I have never done any series of this.

Q I see ..?

A .. but the type of inflammation of which one thinks of the urinary bladder or prostate is not uncommon in young people at all.

Q And this is determined by clinical testing?

A Yes."

And perhaps I'll ask you at the outset, do you have any comments on the information that Dr. Emson was providing at this time, and in particular would you agree with that information as to its accuracy?

A
I have no comment on it. I have no idea of its accuracy. Common sense would tell me that it probably is accurate, but $I$ have no reason to base
it other than common sense that this is what could happen. It's the way the body is built.

And in particular relating to his conclusions that it was not uncommon at all to find this occurrence in a young person, particularly blood in seminal fluid, and $I$ guess you can only speak from your experience in testing, do you recall whether you had seen an occurrence of that nature as of $1969 ?$ I don't ever recall testing for it, I don't ever recall seeing it, and $I$ wouldn't be looking for it anyway.

And just based on your knowledge generally I guess of science at the time, would you have been able to comment on whether or not that was a common finding?

I couldn't comment on that at all.
After Mr. Milgaard's trial and conviction, what's your recollection of your next formal involvement in Mr. Milgaard's situation as best you can recall, Mr. Paynter?

In his situation?
Yes.
Formal involvement? This hearing.
No other contact between the time of the trial and now from any interested party?

A

Q
A

Q

A
$Q$

A

Q

A

Interested party? I can only recall one inquiry that $I$ received a phone call from a television program at one time wanting to ask me about my involvement in it and whether $I$ thought it would be worth them doing a piece on it. That program was the CTV W-Five program.

And what happened as a result of that phone call? Well, we talked about it on the phone once and maybe twice and $I$ explained my involvement to him and his opinion $I$ believe at that time expressed to me was that they didn't think that they would be involved in doing a program on it. That would be sometime between 1985 and '90.

And I take it then other than that contact, no other interested party contacted you through the years relating to this matter?

Not that $I$ can recall.
Did you become aware of various efforts on behalf of David Milgaard particularly during the later 1980s to have his conviction reviewed?

Basically what $I$ read in the press.
And was that your source of information then in terms of anything that was happening on this matter?

How do you mean that?
$Q$

And I think we're going to speak of some of that in a moment. Again, I'm just trying to isolate for now, leading up to 1992, in particular when we know that the application that I'm speaking of took place, whether you shared with us your best recollection of any contacts you may have had. Not that $I$ can recall. I knew that there was an inquiry going on by the RCMP. I was not contacted by any of those members doing that investigation. I had retired at that time and basically, shall I say, lost interest in my past life.

Fair enough. Did you become aware of certain reports that were coming forward, and again I'm
going to use that time frame around the later $1980 s$, early $1990 s$, but certain reports that were coming forward that were commenting upon your original serological work in this case?

I became aware of it sometime. Whether it was in that time frame or not I'm not sure, but I do remember, or hearing some comments.

And we'll deal with them specifically, but generally speaking, how did you learn of those reports?

I can't recall that. It may have been in discussions with former colleagues, it may have been in the press. I remain good friends with a couple of people that remained in the laboratory, there could have been discussions with them, but I can't say at this time.

Okay. I'll turn your attention to the first one that $I$ want to look at, it's a report by a Dr. James Ferris, and if we can turn to document 002486, please. It's a report dated September 13th, 1988 by James Ferris directed to Mr. Wolch. We know from other evidence that this was a part of the original application to have Mr. Milgaard's conviction reviewed and just noting briefly from the first page, it would appear that Mr. Ferris
had the opportunity to review various original lab reports as well as some testimony from the preliminary hearing and the trial and I've taken a look at the letter, it would not appear that he had your original notes that we've been looking at today and it would not appear at least from the face of the document that he had had any contact with you in preparation for this report. Do you recall any discussions with a James Ferris in relation to your original serological work?

I do not recall ever talking to Dr. Ferris.
Do you recall any request for your original notes in that context?

No, I do not.
Generally speaking, and $I$ guess we can only speculate at this point, but what would have been your response if you had been contacted by an individual who was taking a look at your original serological work? If he wanted my original notes? Okay, yeah, sure, we can deal with that one. My response would have been no.

Okay. And what would have been your response in terms of wanting, for example, to speak with you? I would talk to him, no problem there, I would
talk to him, but --
Okay. So let's take a look at this report. I'm going to turn you first to page 002489, take a look at this paragraph in particular. It states: "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 the integrity of these seminal samples, they were considered admissible evidence."

I don't know that this is something you can speak to directly, Mr. Paynter, but am $I$ correct that you were aware of the circumstances of the retrieval of those two frozen lumps of substance?

A I'm not sure $I$ was aware of how long after the occurrence that it was picked up, but again, that was not my concern, $I$ would not be concerned with continuity until the moment $I$ received them. Anything before that would be up to somebody else to be concerned about.

Would knowledge of those circumstances, accepting for a moment that there was the opportunity for contamination, would knowledge of those circumstances have affected your approach at all to your testing methods in $1969 ?$

No, it would not.

And would you be concerned at all about the results that were obtained as you've reported them with knowledge of those circumstances?

No, it would not.

Okay. I turn you to the next page, you'll see the heading serology of seminal stains, and the first paragraph or so discusses initially the issue of blood in the semen and the hemostix test, and $I$ believe that it's fairly consistent with what you've told us thus far. Dr. Ferris goes on to set out some assumed facts, starting about in this paragraph, and one of those is that Gail Miller was of type O blood, also that David Milgaard was
a type A non-secretor. Then he notes:
"Finally $I$ have assumed as a fact that in 1969 the techniques available in the serology section of the R.C.M.P. Laboratory in Regina were unable to distinguish between type $A$ and type $A B$ blood in a case where only A antigens were detected in the semen."

And would that last assumption be accurate, Mr. Paynter?

A
The last one?

Yes, that I've just read to you.
The last part would be, yes.
And from those assumed facts, he goes on to -Excuse me.

Yes.
I did not say that David Milgaard was a non-secretor. That can't be attributed to anything I said.

No, and I wasn't asking you to comment on that, I just wanted to highlight what the assumed facts by Dr. Ferris were, and I'm sorry if you didn't understand me, Mr. Paynter, I was simply asking for your comment on that last sentence in this paragraph which starts finally, and I think you've
confirmed, and you can read it again, but you've confirmed that that particular -If we're talking about that particular sentence, yes.

Is accurate, okay. And based upon those assumed facts he goes on to offer some conclusions stating:
"Assuming these facts there are a
limited number of interpretations which can be based on this evidence."

Number 1 , he states:
"Semen which is proven to contain type A antigens is most likely to have come from an individual who is blood type A and a secretor."

As of $1969, \mathrm{Mr}$. Paynter, would you have agreed with that conclusion?

I would.

We'll move on to number 2, it states at the outset:
"Semen which contains type A antigens could have come from a secretor or non-secretor and have been contaminated with antigens from type A blood. In this case it is alleged that the
apparent bloodstaining of the seminal fluid recovered near the scene must have been contaminated by blood from David Milgaard."

I turn you to the next page, there's a portion where he indicates from his review that there was no evidence to suggest such an injury, but for your purposes, if we could look at that short portion, he states:
"I have also spoken to a number of personal contacts in other forensic science laboratories and on the basis of their experience and my own experience, we are not familiar with a single case where seminal fluid or stains have been found to be contaminated by blood from the alleged assailant."

Again, Mr. Paynter, do you recall whether you had had experience with such a finding as of 1969 ?

A
$Q$
Okay. I turn your attention to point number 3, move down the page, just at the outset of the paragraph he states:

A
"In my opinion there is clear evidence
from the circumstances of the scene and
also from the apparent contamination of
the scene by the victim's blood that if
this seminal sample was contaminated
with blood, it was almost certainly
contaminated with type $O$ blood from the
victim."
And just for starters, accepting that theory,
again that would be consistent with your serology
as conducted in 1969?

Blood from the victim versus blood from the assailant.

Well, you could almost guarantee there would be blood from the victim, and again, there would have
to be an injury to the assailant to cause him to bleed or those facts mentioned by Dr. Emson which I have no knowledge of.

Okay. And then point number 4 he indicates:
"It is not possible to completely
exclude the semen sample as having come from a type AB secretor assailant. Such
an assailant could not be David

Milgaard."

And just in terms of the first sentence, is that something you would have agreed with?

A
$Q$

A

Q
Yes, I would.

In 1969 ?

Yes, I would.
If we turn to the last page, 002492 , and just this paragraph right there, Dr. Ferris writes:
"On the basis of the evidence that I
have examined, $I$ 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."
Would you agree with that statement, Mr. Paynter,

A
in terms of what you knew in 1969?
My statement there would be that the evidence did nothing to either link him to it or exclude him from it.

Based again on the science and the testing that you applied, did you have any ability to comment on likelihoods at that point in time?

No, I did not.
And would you have the ability to comment on whether the bulk of the evidence more strongly suggested that David Milgaard was not the donor of the semen versus being the donor of the semen? If $I$ had conclusive evidence that he was a non-secretor, then $I$ would have believed that it leaned toward eliminating him, yes. I did not have that evidence in 1969.

I'm not sure if this is a fair question for you, Mr. Paynter, but I'll put it to you anyways. If -- in which direction in your view, based upon your findings in 1969, did the balance tip? I never considered that and I don't believe I have a comment on it. It wasn't my position to weigh the evidence and decide what the evidence was. I received the exhibits, did my examination, reported my results and that was it. I didn't
make any comments.
And perhaps $I$ should state it a little more fairly, and again let's not speak of Mr. Milgaard necessarily, but when $I$ talk about the bulk of the evidence tipping the balance towards a non-secretor being the donor of the semen versus a secretor?

Well, I mentioned that it was probably from a secretor and if you want to consider that as being more towards eliminating him on that basis, it would, yes.

There's a follow-up report that $I$ don't need to refer to. I'm going to turn you next to another document that arose during the course of these various reports that were coming forward and I'll turn your attention to 016920, please, and it's from Patricia Alain of the serology section of the, $I$ believe the central federal lab, and it's a memo to Mr. Eugene Williams discussing the case and there's a short portion on this first page that $I$ wanted to bring your attention to, and $I$ should have pointed out the date, I believe the date is August 8 th, ' 89 and I'll read this to you. Ms. Alain states:
"Another possibility of "A" antigen
source that may not have been eliminated or could not be eliminated, unless one had access to the notes of $S /$ Sgt. Paynter is contamination due to a bacterial soil or other environmental source. The possibilities, that other sources such as this were not explored in the trial as recorded in the transcript."

And were you aware of this possibility when you testified, Mr. Paynter?

I don't believe so, no.
Do you accept though that that is valid in terms of what Ms. Alain is saying here?

I have no reason not to.
Not something you were aware of though in 1969; is that correct?

That is correct.

Okay. I'll turn you to the next page, it's 016921 , and just at the bottom of this paragraph speaking of the saliva samples, it indicates:
"In other words, the absence of "A" or
"B" antigens in a stain that has been
identified and proven to contain saliva does not definitely prove that a person
is a non-secretor."
And I think we've covered this, Mr. Paynter, but were you aware of this, accepting it as true, were you aware of this at the time of trial? Not in 1969, no.

You were not aware of that?
Pardon me, $I$ was aware of that, yes, this part here.

Okay. And sorry, what were you thinking or wanting to say?

I was thinking of something completely different. And then if we go down to, a little bit further down the page, right there, I'll read you a short portion starting at the second sentence, it states:
"In his transcript --"
Page such and such,
"-- he states that he has found that false positive reactions can be obtained with "certain green vegetables and with
leather". As well, it is known that chemicals such as bleach, and oxidized metals, such as copper can give a positive reaction."

And I take it you weren't aware of those
possibilities, again accepting them as true in 1969, Mr. Paynter?

I was not aware of them.

Then continuing on to the next paragraph, stating at the beginning:
"If the substance in Exhibit Il did contain "A" blood, the amount of blood present would not have been sufficient to give an "A" antigen result." I'll ask the question at the outset whether you agree with that comment.

Well, at the time $I$ felt that it did and I have had no reason since to believe that it didn't. And help me along in understanding this, but I think the suggestion here is that there was no doubt enough A antigen present to in fact detect the A antigen --

That is correct.
-- in Il, and $I$ think the suggestion is made that if indeed there was blood, whatever amount of blood was there wouldn't have been sufficient to actually give that result?

A

Q
I believe that is what she is saying, yes.
Which I guess would lead to the conclusion again that the presence of the $A$ antigen did not come
from blood, but in fact from the donor of the semen?

That again is what she is saying, yes.
And what -- did you have any thought about that possibility in 1969 as best you can recall? My thoughts in 1969 would have been that it came from either the semen or, if not there, there was enough blood contamination that it could have come from a group A blood.

Okay. I'll turn your attention to a memo which followed shortly after this document that we were looking at, it's document 002473, just reading the portions that $I$ had highlighted on this document. We may have covered this, Mr. Paynter, just give me a moment. I think I'm satisfied with what I had been going to ask you in relation to that document.

I'll turn your attention to a further report by Dr. Markesteyn and that's document 004772 . If we turn to the next page, it's the beginning of the report. You'll see it's dated, Mr. Paynter, June 4th, 1990 directed to David Asper. Can you go back up to the top of the page, please. Were you aware of a Dr. Markesteyn previously, Mr. Paynter?

A

I believe $I$ had heard of the name, yes.
Okay. I would like to point out a few portions of his report for your comment as well. If we could turn to page 004776 , please, actually we can go to 004778 . You will note the heading at the top, Seminal Stains At Scene (Yellowish Stains in the Snowbank), and starting at the second paragraph Dr. Markesteyn indicates:
"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."

Skipping ahead one sentence:
"Dogs have antigens which serologically cross-react with human A-antigen."

Do you recall whether you considered the possibility that this substance was dog urine in 1969, Mr. Paynter?

I would doubt very much if I did. I don't recall it.

I think we'll, and we'll follow this through, I'm
just going to take you down to the bottom of this paragraph here and read you some further portions.

Dr. Markesteyn indicates:
"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.

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."

Do you recall any discussion of this nature with Dr. Markesteyn, Mr. Paynter?

A
I do not recall ever talking to Dr. Markesteyn.
And if, indeed, he had asked you about testing the human origin of the substances; what would your

A

Q

A

Q

A
$Q$
.
response have been?
My response would have been to tell him exactly what $I$ did in the case, and what my conclusions was, and what $I$ based it on.

And would you have been able to confirm for him or offer a conclusion that you had tested for human origin?

Yes, $I$ believe we've gone through that a few times today on what $I$ actually did, and that would have been what $I$ would have told him.

Okay. And do you recall a request being made, at any point during this time, for your notes for Mr.
-- for Dr. Markesteyn's purposes?
I do not recall them ever being mentioned, I do not recall talking to him, and they were available at that time, although, like with Dr. Ferris, they probably wouldn't have been provided to him without some court order.

You don't recall, though, indicating that the original notes were no longer available? I don't even recall talking to him.

Okay. I'll read the next paragraph as well:
"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 I'm going to step back for a moment, here, Mr. Paynter. Were you aware -- and I think you've confirmed this for us -- but you were aware, generally, of this assertion that the substance that you may have tested in 1969 was, in fact, dog urine?

I became aware of his assertion at some time much later, probably in about the time of this letter. And do you recall what your reaction was to that? Well, at the time, $I$ was wondering why he would question my results when he had not even seen the exhibit, and he was able to determine it was dog urine without looking at it, so $I$ did not have a lot of faith in what he was saying. Okay. And in the midst, the middle of that last paragraph, he says:
"The human antibody test doesn't make it human if there was any contamination with human blood."

Would the human antibody test be the test we have been seeing as AH positive?

It would be --
Anything else?
-- but it also, as described here, he refers to it
as a 'species specific antigen-antibody reaction tests', and that was basically what it was.

Okay. And I wanted to move to that last sentence. He says:

> "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 maybe we'll deal with the second one first; is that a test that you conducted in 1969
according to your notes?
I believe it was.
And is that the AH positive test we have been referring to?

I believe that would be referred to as that kind of a test, yes.
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
A

Q

A
Q

## 正

And, in terms of his mention of the morphology test, would that test have been conducted?

That would be the identification of the human spermatozoa using a microscope, and that was done as well.

And the implication $I$ guess being, here, that the morphology of human spermatozoa is
distinguishable --
It was.
-- from that of dog spermatozoa?
It was quite definite under the microscope that we used at the time, yes.

And you would have recognized that difference at that time then?

Yes, I would.
Okay. I turn your attention to the next page of that report, please. I just want to look at a single paragraph, being the middle paragraph, it indicates -- Dr. Markesteyn indicates:
"I agree with the opinion expressed by Mr. Brain 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 haemochromogen negative,
the amount of blood would also be too small to show the presence of

A-antigen."

Am I correct that this is just another way of stating what Ms. Alain had pointed out in that previous report that we looked at? It could be.

How do you interpret this paragraph?
I don't agree with it.
And on what basis?
My experience of doing the tests.
Can you be a little bit more detailed with me?
Well when we did the, when we did our tests, you could get a positive result for our antigens doing our absorption inhibition method on blood stains that were diluted, and they were diluted. But when we did it we didn't make them full strength, they were often diluted to the point where the liquid was clear and we would still get a reaction to the tests even though -- to the point where they were diluted to where they were clear, it would be absolutely impossible to do the haemochromogen tests that we did at that time. Okay. And if we carry that further to the circumstances of this situation, though, comparing
the amount, if $I$ can put it that way, of the $A$ antigens which were detected in the seminal sample -- are you following me so far?

I think so.

If we then note that you conducted a positive test for the presence of blood, but there was an insufficient amount to go forward with the haemochromogen test, would that be consistent with -- and, again, if $I$ can say it this way -with the amount of $A$ antigens that you had already determined to be present in the seminal sample?

I don't think $I$ can answer that question. Umm, I believe $I$ was of the opinion that it was possible that there was enough there to interfere with the reaction to the point where $I$ could not positively say what it was or what was causing it.

Okay. That was your knowledge as of 1969?
That is correct.

Okay. I'll show you one article that followed in and around this time. There were some other press articles but $I$ have picked out one of them, Mr. Paynter, I'll refer your attention to document 039070 , a Saskatoon Star-Phoenix article June 6 th, 1990, Key evidence in conviction called flawed, and I'll just point out a couple of

```
portions starting here, please. Those two
```

paragraphs note:
"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." Skip past that next paragraph and continue here, please. It states:
"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."

David Asper, Milgaard's lawyer,
is more blunt about the report.

It concludes that what Penkala
found in the snow could well be dog urine," said Asper."

And were you aware of this article or articles like this, Mr. Paynter, in and around this time? No I wasn't.

And were you ever contacted by the press for comment in relation to this issue at all?

I may have been, but $I$ don't recall it.
And I think we've covered it but your position, if you were contacted, would be that you had excluded that possibility in 1969 during the course of your testing?

My response would have been the same as it was at the trial, this is what $I$ found, and this is what was there as far as $I$ was concerned, and it wasn't dog urine.

I don't think $I$ have any questions, further questions following from that for you, Mr. Paynter. Just give me a moment, there are a couple of other documents.

I turn your attention to
document 185365, just a short portion of this page, a letter from Patricia Alain again dated June 12, 1990 to Mr. Eugene Williams commenting on Dr. Markesteyn and Dr. Ferris, and just a short
portion in this paragraph I'll direct your attention to. It states:
"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 problem in distinguishing between human and canine spermatozoa." Would you agree with that conclusion, or would you have agreed with that conclusion as of 1969 , Mr. Paynter?

I was not aware of and $I$ still have no knowledge of the $A$-like antigens in canine blood. I would agree with the last part about the differences in the spermatozoa, yes.

Okay. I turn your attention to document 009789, it's a letter to Mr. Murray Brown, Director of Appeals, dated January 3rd, 1992. The letter is from David Asper and just one portion of this correspondence $I$ wanted your comment on. If we could turn to the next page, please, and focus in on the top of this paragraph it states:
"Finally, it is our understanding that following the presumptive test for blood in the alleged semen samples, a positive result was obtained. This alone, however, would not chemically identify the presence of blood, and we understand that it would naturally follow that a secondary screening test called a haemachromagn test would be performed. We have heard that such a test was in fact performed and resulted in the negative for the presence of blood." To the best of your knowledge, Mr. Paynter, was this second test performed?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
Okay.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: What was the date of the letter, please?

MR. HARDY: The date was January 3rd, 1992.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thanks, and it was addressed to whom?
Not by myself.
Do you have any idea on what basis Mr. Asper is making this suggestion that the second test was performed with a negative result? No I don't.

MR. HARDY: It was addressed to Murray Brown, actually, Director of Appeals, attention Murray Brown.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.

MR. HARDY: I know we're a little bit early
for the break, Mr. Commissioner, but this might be a good spot if it suits you?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes, it does.

MR. HARDY: Okay.
(Adjourned at 2:48 p.m.)
(Reconvened at 3:09 p.m.)

BY MR. HARDY:
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

Mr. Paynter, are you aware that further tests were again conducted on a new sample of saliva from

David Milgaard in 1992 by the RCMP Central

Forensic Lab, and that these tests concluded that

David Milgaard was in fact an A secretor?

I was aware of the fact that he had been
determined that he was an $A$ secretor.

Which was contrary, of course, to your original
findings in 1969 ? Perhaps $I$ stated that too
bluntly, you can restate it for me.
I think you stated it a little bit more than what

I said.

Okay. How would you state that?
I don't think we need to look at the actual lab
report, but just for reference, the report that
sets out that finding is doc. ID 019279.
And following that finding,
Mr. Paynter, a further report respecting the
original serological findings was prepared by a
Dr. Colin Merry from Winnipeg on March 6th, 1992,
and perhaps we can turn to his report. It's
document ID 032355, you will note the date of that report is March 6th, 1992 directed to David Asper and, again, this is by Dr. Colin Merry. Are you
familiar with that name?

A
I had not heard that name until $I$ was reviewing some material just prior to the hearing here. Okay. And, again, $I$ just want to read you a couple of portions of Dr. Merry's report. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I can't see his last name; would you spell it for me, please? MR. HARDY: Oh sure, I'm sorry, it's $M-E-R-R-Y$. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thanks.

BY MR. HARDY:

Actually on the first page, just picking up on the last word there, you can actually move to the next page, it indicates:
"From the transcript it appears unlikely
that the original specimen of saliva
obtained from Mr. Milgaard was
immediately heat inactivated, as is
required in determining antigen secretor
status. Failure to do this would result
in the enzyme pryalin, which is present
in saliva, digesting the A-antigen
before the specimen was examined. This
would account for the false negative
A-antigen secretor status obtained."

And were you aware of this technique in 1969, Mr. Paynter?

A

Q

Q

I don't know how $I$ became aware of the fact that that was an improper method. I think it was probably through general conversation with a friend that I had still employed at the laboratory
that $I$ found out about Mr. Milgaard being a secretor. But, again, $I$ don't know when or the circumstances but that would be my best guess.

And $I$ guess $I ' m$ talking, though, in terms of learning about the proper technique?

I'm not sure when --
-- in relation to saliva samples?

I'm not sure when $I$ became aware of that.
Okay. I'm not going to review very many portions from Dr. Merry's report. You've had a chance, though, to take a look at this report; have you? I think $I$ read it, yes.

I'll turn your attention to page 032357, I believe we've dealt with most of this already, it's under the heading on the previous page Frozen lumps of "yellowish substance" found in snow bank, later thawed to a "yellowish liquid". Just in this middle paragraph, here, it indicates:
"This "yellowish frozen
substance/yellowish liquid" could only
have been urine which contained
spermatozoa. There is no other
yellowish body fluid which contains
spermatozoa!"

And I think we've covered this; your testing
procedures in 1969 confirmed that that substance was of human origin?

There has been no doubt in my mind, or no doubt in my mind then or since, that that is what $I$ found. And I take it from your previous answer you were never contacted by Dr. Merry for your comment in relation to this matter?

And as I say, I don't even -- other than reading this piece of correspondence in the material that you gave to me, I do not have any idea who he is or anything about him, no.

Okay. And, Mr. Paynter, were you aware of an investigation that was conducted by the RCMP in 1993 in relation to alleged wrongdoings surrounding the David Milgaard matter?

I was aware that there was an investigation going on, yes.

Were you ever interviewed or contacted by an RCMP member in relation to that investigation?

No I wasn't.
Okay. Mr. Commissioner, I think I'll just refer to some documents, $I$ don't see any need to review those documents but I'll identify them for reference sake in relation to the $R C M P$ review, and they are 045807, 035878, 045969, and 041902 .

A
$Q$

A

Q

A

Q

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: What was the first one, please, 04?

MR. HARDY: 045807 .

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay, thanks. And they all relate to the '93 RCMP investigation?

MR. HARDY: That's correct.

BY MR. HARDY:

And Mr. Paynter, are you aware, as the $1990^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$ continued, of attempts to conduct DNA analysis in relation to the original items in connection with this case?

And I'll just refer, for reference to the documents, 231077, and I don't need to -Pardon me, I reviewed the report during this previous last couple of weeks, but $I$ was not made
aware of it, of anything before that.
Okay. That's how I understood you, Mr. Paynter. And if $I$ could summarize it, and the report will be there for all of us to take a look at, but the tests conducted detected semen and sperm on Miss Miller's panties beyond the semen that you had detected in 1969, and as well on Miss Miller's dress, and furthermore that there was semen on the coat but no sperm. And you've likely been asked this question before, but if one were to ask you how or why you didn't detect those additional semen spots in 1969 , how would you respond? My response at the time would have been I don't know how or why I didn't detect it, otherwise I would have done it, umm, and even since then $I$ don't know why or how, but they obviously weren't visible in the tests that $I$ used. And I believe, reading some of the other correspondence, there was several other people that came to the same conclusion that $I$ did, and that the people in Britain did the acid phosphatase test basically right on the material, doing the whole garment, and that was how they located 'em. They were not visible to the naked eye to them, and that test that they used at that time was not in use in

1969, I would say I started using it -- it would be -- I'm going to put 1973 plus or minus a year or two.

A
A

Q
A
$Q$

A
 result in a sexual assault case, the best evidence we could find would be seminal fluid found in the vaginal aspirations or slides made from that. The second best would be on her clothing from that immediate area. If we go down to the point where we were saying there was seminal fluid on the car seat, I personally considered it a waste of my time and everybody else's, but sometimes we did it
to keep people happy, so the best evidence depended on how far away you got from the actual point, and once $I$ determined that there was seminal fluid on the panties, it would not have added anything that $I$ could have said at that time by finding seminal fluid on the dress, jacket or any of her other clothing as far as a sexual assault goes.

Okay. Of course no DNA analysis at that point in time?

There was none.
Am I correct, Mr. Paynter, that you testified at the preliminary hearing and trial of Larry Fisher? I did.

And I do not have any portions of those transcripts to review with you, I'll simply identify the transcripts for the record, they are IDs 315727 and 311611, and, Mr. Paynter, those are all the questions I have. Thank you for your patience. My friends may have some questions for you.

MR. HODSON: I believe, Mr. Commissioner, there may not be any questions. Oh, sorry.

MR. GIBSON: Just a couple.
MR. HODSON: Ms. Knox, Mr. Gibson. Anybody else?

BY MS. KNOX:
Mr. Paynter, as you know from an introduction that was made yesterday morning by Mr. Caldwell, my name is Catherine Knox and I act as counsel for him, and with the exception of that introduction yesterday and the time we've spent in this room together, would it be fair to say that you and I have never met, don't know each other?

I would say so, yes.
You managed to have that relief in your life. I apologize that $I$ 'm going to be a little bit muddled here, but somehow this came up on me a little faster than $I$ expected, but $I$ wonder first if I could ask staff to bring up document number 045918, or 917 I think would be the first page. Now, Mr. Paynter, do you remember being shown or being referred this morning by Mr. Hardy to some notes that have been identified, he said that he believed to be the notes of Mr. Caldwell, and which $I$ can confirm to you are handwritten notes of Mr. Caldwell, the date on the top of the page indicating that he made them on the 14 th of January, 1970 which just would be around the time he was preparing for the commencement of the .
trial.

A
$Q$ Right. So basically what he's, he may not be as clear on because of his absence of a scientific background is that distinction, but there's no

A
Q
doubt that the A antigen could not have come from Gail Miller?

Oh, no doubt.
Okay. Now, sir, you indicated that you didn't have a meeting with him at this point in time.

You also indicated that you knew him fairly well, that you and he worked together a lot before then and subsequently. Was it an uncommon or a practice that if he as a prosecutor had a question about a scientific report that had been delivered by your lab, that he might pick up the phone and call and have a chat with you, or if you were down here on another case he might talk to you about something to do with a current or a pending case? There would be no reason whatsoever of why it couldn't have happened, but $I$ do not have any recollection of it ever happening.

So my point only is that while you don't have a memory of talking to him, it's possible that in part these notes may have been as a result of efforts on his part to get you to give him a clear understanding of evidence that he had to present to a jury a short while later?

That is possible. My personal opinion is this would probably be made up from having my report
plus probably talking to the police officer that was responsible for the case preparation, but I cannot say that it wasn't me.

And I'm going to suggest to you that there was a further source of information that could have come from you and that in fact was the transcript of your evidence given at the preliminary inquiry four months earlier, you testified on September 5th, 1969?

That would definitely be available to him. And available to you as well prior to giving your testimony at trial if you wanted to review it? If $I$ wanted it, $I$ could have asked for it. I never did. It may have been given to me before the trial or it may not have. It was available. In his attempt to prepare he had your report, he had the opportunity to examine you and hear you cross-examined at the preliminary inquiry in September of ' 69 and he may or may not have had subsequent conversations with you that formulated the information that he put into trying to get a comprehensive explanation for this scientific evidence for the jury?

That's correct.
Okay. Now, sir, with respect to the, what was

A

A
said by him in the courtroom, at the trial, if $I$ could refer to page 041948 , please, and if $I$ could just refer to this question that's right here, if we could have that brought out, please. Now, there's a question directed to you by Mr. Caldwell there, and it says:
"Q Now, Staff - and I expect you have told the Court but just to be clear on this are "A" antigens any part or is there any way that they can be obtained from "O" blood?"

And your answer to that was, "No sir." Do you remember giving that evidence?

I don't remember giving it, but --
Was that correct information that you gave him at the time?

It was.

And is it in part what he summarized in that one quick note at the bottom of those earlier handwritten notes that we just referred to, that the A antigen could not have come from Gail Miller's blood because she was O blood?

That could be the very reason why he did write that, yes.

Now, I've reviewed, and I've done a quick review
of the rest of your transcript and $I$ don't see anywhere else that there's reference to it, but essentially right here you didn't offer any more information than very specifically that the $A$ antigen could not have come from Gail Miller, or from O blood, which we knew through other evidence you had earlier given was the case for both Ron Wilson and Gail Miller?

I felt that was as clear as I could probably make it.

Now, sir, there has been a great deal of review done over the years and some done in the evidence that has been tendered this morning through your cross-examination and your cross this afternoon about the accuracy of the testing results and the information that you obtained in 1969 , and $I^{\prime} m$ sure you've had some time to think about that? It probably has crossed my mind a few times. Okay. Were you present, and in thinking about it, have you ever taken the opportunity to review or were you present in the courtroom when Mr.

Caldwell as prosecutor summarized for the jury what they could or could not conclude from the evidence that you had found and that you had given at the trial of David Milgaard?

No, I would not be there.
I'm going to ask to have brought up the transcript of the address to the jury that was done by Mr. Caldwell and the first page of the document for identification purposes is 141905 and if I could go to 141938 , please, and starting, if we could bring up below this paragraph here. Perhaps it will be easiest for the record if I read to you what's in front of you and then $I$ will ask you after we've looked at it whether or not what he has stated, or tried to state to the jury was in fact a correct representation of your evidence, and he started by saying, with regard to that evidence:

> "You remember that the spermatozoa in the body was blood stained and Staff Sergeant Paynter found "A" antigens in the vial which contained the lump and he tested, later, the same sample for the presence of human blood and got a reaction indicating the presence of either blood or those two other extracts he mentioned, mainly leafy vegetables or leather..."

And is that a correct summary of the evidence
that you gave and your findings?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
Q

A
$Q$

A
Q Q
Okay. Now, he goes on to summarize a bit of evidence from Dr. Emson that you had reviewed with you by Mr. Hardy and I'm sure you've read and I'll
read it just because of the second part of it, he says:
"The evidence of Dr. Emson, as I said, was that the spermatozoa in the body was blood stained and that there was a number of ways in which blood can get into spermatozoa within the male person..."

And you know or you've been told that that was Dr. Emson's evidence and that was what was contained in that letter that Sergeant Penkala sent to you in June of 1969 wasn't it?

A
I believe it was.
Okay. Mr. Caldwell goes on to say:
"...and all of this, I submit, while it
does not have the effect of identifying Milgaard alone as the source of that spermatozoa, certainly had the effect of not eliminating him either, and that is the effect $I$ ask you to give it. I am not saying it could only be him, I am saying that it certainly has the effect of not eliminating him, he is one of the thousands."

Was that a correct summary of your findings and
the scientific evidence available to you and the opinion that you formed based on it up to January, 1970?

A
$Q$

A
Q
I would say that is in effect what $I$ said and explained very well, yes, what I said.

So basically what he said to them is, like, you have his evidence, it doesn't include him, but it doesn't rule him out, so you treat it as you will?

That is correct.
And if we could go to the next page, 141940, and I'm just going to the last part of the top paragraph, the sentence, and he finally concluded on that particular point, and he does talk, and the next point he talks about is the presence of $A$ antigens, but $I$ just want to go to his summary sentence:
"So I leave that phase of the matter by stressing again that while this part of the evidence does not, of itself, identify the accused, it most certainly does not eliminate him."

And again would you agree with me that that was a fair and accurate summary of the scientific evidence that you were able to find and present with respect to your test in this case?
$A \quad$ Yes, it would.

MS. KNOX: I don't have any further
questions for Mr. Paynter.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thank you.

## BY MR. GIBSON:

Just a couple of questions, $I$ won't be too long with you. You mentioned, Mr. Paynter, that you weren't willing to share your notes with individuals had they contacted you, but you would have spoken with them. You of course worked for the RCMP for a number of years and I believe you said you retired in 1993; is that correct?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A 1990.
1990. And would you have been aware of access to information and privacy legislation as to what you could and couldn't share when you held information in relation to a third party?

I don't recall whether that was a common thing at that time or not.

But as far as sharing RCMP documentation, if you had to or were requested to share something, you may well have consulted within your department as to what you could share concerning information about a third party?

I probably would have discussed it with him on the
phone without talking to anybody about it because I had no reason not to. As far as him, or supplying him with my written notes, I would be dead set against them leaving my control at that time and going somewhere else and, as I mentioned, if somebody showed up with a court order, that would have been the only way they would have got them as far as I'm concerned.

And to your knowledge, $I$ take it that no one ever made an access to information request to get those notes?

A
$Q$
As far as $I$ can recall, no one ever asked to see the notes, never mind obtain them.

Very good. Just a document that I'm going to reference, it's not necessary to put it up, it's 278893, it's a memo from Cathy MacMillan, a scientist within the RCMP, and it's dated March 22nd of 1993, and she eventually concludes on the basis of tests that were carried out that both Mr. Milgaard and Mr. Fisher were A type secretors, and I think Mr. Hardy made you aware of that fact when he questioned you?

A
He mentioned Mr. Milgaard. I'm not sure whether he mentioned Fisher or not. He may have. I could have been having a nap.

If in 1969 you have two individuals and they are both A type secretors, is there any other testing that you can do to try and differentiate between those two individuals with respect to a seminal stain or sample that may be available for testing? None that $I$ was aware of, no.

So there would be no way to differentiate between those individuals?

None.
Now, let's say you located additional seminal fluid or spermatozoa from an $A$ type secretor, if you would have had more of this sample, would there be any other testing that could have been done?

Not by me, no.
If we could put up document 252047 , please, and you'll see that this is a document that you went through with Mr. Hardy, it's a letter directed to David Asper from a Dr. Markesteyn dated June 4th of 1990. Sorry, 041,252041 . And in that document it references a number of documents that he went through and one of the items that's referenced there as "I" is excerpted evidence of Staff Sergeant Paynter, and I'm assuming that's in relation to the trial where you gave evidence in

1969, and the only point that $I$ want to discuss with you is if we can go to 252047 of that document and if we could just call up that part, and you'll recall that you had some fairly lengthy discussion with Mr. Hardy about the saliva testing that you carried out and in order to determine Mr . Milgaard's secretor status from doing the saliva testing, and the only thing $I$ wanted to point out on that document is it appears that Dr. Markesteyn here is indicating that the determination of the non-secretor status of Mr. Milgaard, although perhaps acceptable at that time but now no longer serves as proof of his non-secretor status, and I appreciate that we've discussed quite a bit now that you are not taking the position that you definitely identified Mr. Milgaard as a non-secretor, but that the tests that you carried out at the time was that it was likely or probable that he was a non-secretor. Is that fair to say? Yes. I have never said that he was a non-secretor. I said whoever supplied the sample probably was a secretor, but I've never said that either of the people involved were non-secretors. And as far as the testing that you carried out in 1969 and the collection of the saliva samples from

A

Mr. Milgaard, I take it that that was the acceptable standard at the time for doing that; correct?

To the best of my knowledge it was.
And it appears that Dr. Markesteyn agrees with you, that that was perhaps acceptable at the time for the tests that you carried out. Now, again we've spent a lot of time talking about secretor tests and blood grouping. With the advent of DNA, Mr. Paynter, and I appreciate that you retired in 1990 and $I$ guess that was just sort of the advent of DNA testing coming in --

Yes, they started practicing with it or testing it in our laboratories two or three years before $I$ retired.

Now, is there anything that you can help the Commission with as far as whether it would still be testing carried out by labs with respect to secretor status and blood grouping on such samples as blood and on seminal samples with DNA now available, is that still the type of testing that can go on, like --

I can't say for sure, but $I$ would doubt it very much. I could see no point in it if they could get a DNA profile from the sample, then any other
tests would be irrelevant.
And $I$ think we all know the answer as to why, but perhaps you could just expand on that a little bit.

Well, the DNA will bring it down to such a fine point that secretor status, ABO or any of those other tests are a waste of time and don't say anything compared to what the DNA can say, so there's no point in doing it.

MR. GIBSON: Thank you. Those are my questions. I believe Mr. Elson had a question.

## BY MR. ELSON:

Mr. Paynter, my name is Richard Elson, I'm counsel for the Chief of Police and the Saskatoon Police Service. I wasn't originally planning to ask any questions, but something just occurred to me in the course of some of the more recent questions. In Dr. Merry's report, and I'm not sure we need it produced, he identified an enzyme that was found in saliva, and the enzyme, $I$ believe if $I$ recall the question Mr . Hardy asked in the report correctly, was an enzyme known as pryalin. Do you recall that enzyme being put to you in the report in the question Mr. Hardy put?

I recall it being on the screen when we were
talking about it.
Now, one of the things that this Commission has been concerned with, and certainly from our client's perspective, is the fact that not only has the law changed, but science and technology has changed. In 1969, based on your training to that point in time, were you familiar with the enzyme pryalin in saliva as well as the characteristics of that enzyme with respect to A antigens?

No, I wasn't.
Now, are you aware as to whether or not that was generally known within the scientific community, about the presence of the enzyme pryalin in saliva in 1969?

A

Q I am not aware of that, no. Now, as $I$ understand it, and $I$ may have missed it, in the testing that was done to determine blood grouping in bodily fluids other than blood, would there be any difference in the conduct of the test if one were to have seminal fluid on one hand and saliva on the other hand? In other words, was the test that you used to determine the blood grouping of seminal fluid the same as the test that would be used to determine the blood grouping of a
saliva donor?
The tests would be the same to do seminal fluid, saliva and it was the same test as one of the tests we used on dry blood stains.

All right. So -- and clearly the implication from
Dr. Merry's report is that the manner of testing for antigens in saliva is different than the manner of testing for seminal fluid due to the presence of the enzyme pryalin?

I have no idea what that enzyme is or does and I couldn't really comment on that.

You would agree with me that if you were aware of the -- first of all, I take it you were not aware of the presence of the enzyme pryalin in saliva at all in 1969?

To the best of my knowledge, I have never seen the word until today.

All right. You would agree with me that were you aware of the presence of the enzyme pryalin in saliva as well as its characteristics, namely, the ability to digest the A antigen, in 1969 the test you would have conducted would have been done in such a way so as to avoid the impact of the enzyme pryalin?

It wouldn't have affected the test on the

A
material. It may have affected how the material was preserved until $I$ got around to doing the test.

All right.
I think that is what he's referring to when they state they heat the sample instead of drying it in order to kill that enzyme so it doesn't react on the antigens. That would be my assumption of what he's talking about.

MR. ELSON: Thank you. I have no further questions.

MR. WOLCH: Mr. Commissioner, I just have one question.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.

MR. WOLCH: I shouldn't say one, but possibly one.

## BY MR. WOLCH:

Mr. Paynter, you and $I$ know each other from --
I think we go back a fair distance.
We've had a few cases together.
Probably longer than we want to talk about.
You're right.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Just for the record.

BY MR. WOLCH:

Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

Hersh Wolch for David Milgaard. My question only arises out of Ms. Knox's question. When she was asking you to comment on Mr. Caldwell's address to the jury, and I'll try and paraphrase what she said as best $I$ can, or what she said he said about it, it doesn't identify or include David and doesn't exclude him, jurors make of it as you will, that's the gist of it. May I ask you this, and it's perhaps a difficult question, but if you were a juror in that case, what would you make of your evidence, what would you understand you to be saying?

Having never been a juror, called once and refused because of my profession, $I$ can only say that $I$ would lean, in that case $I$ think, try to be very fair and lean towards saying that it eliminated him more than it pointed towards him. evidence to help the juror decide if David was innocent or guilty?

Q
A

A

So it was more favourable than not?
Yeah, $I$ would say it was more favourable if they listened closely to what $I$ said, I believe that's how $I$ would interpret it if $I$ had been on the jury.

That's right. Because basically what you are saying is if he's a non-secretor and the individual is a secretor, then he couldn't have done it, but there could be errors?

That's right, there was always that small chance that, you know, that the test didn't work, and as it turned out there was a valid reason why it didn't work which $I$ was not aware of, but they didn't know that and $I$ didn't know that at the time and, as $I$ said, $I$ would have definitely leaned towards eliminating him at that time. Right. And what eventually proved to be an error was David's testing itself, and error may be not the right word, but did anybody ask to your knowledge for David to give another sample, because as we know he was always willing to give samples, he never --

I never heard of a second sample being required, no, or asked for.

So you never asked for a second known sample?

A
Q
A

Q

A know to anybody.

MR. WOLCH: Thank you very much.
MR. HARDY: No questions on re-exam,
Mr. Commissioner.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thanks.
MR. HODSON: That is all.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Mr. Paynter, thank
you very much for coming. You are accused.
MR. HODSON: The next witness is Mr. Jack Wood, if you could come forward, please.

## JOHN ALDEN WOOD, sworn:

## BY MR. HODSON:

Q
Good afternoon, Mr. Wood. Thank you for agreeing to testify before this Commission. I understand that you are, although your full name is John, as you say, A. Wood, that you often go by Jack Wood;

Certified Professional Court Reporters serving P.A., Regina \& Saskatoon since 1980 Central Booking - Call Irene @ 1-800-667-6777 or go to www.compucourt.tv
is that correct?

A
Q

A
Q
A
Q
A
$Q$

A
$Q$ ,

A
Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
Q

A

Q

That's right, sir.
And so if we take a look at January 1, 1968, we're going to be talking about the Gail Miller murder investigation, the murder was January 31, 1969, at that time you were detective superintendent; is that right?

That is right, sir.
And so you would have held that position for about a year prior to Gail Miller's death; is that correct?

Yes, I think that was correct.
And then prior to that, at least for the previous 11 years, you were a traffic inspector and in traffic, and other than for three years in the early '50's where you were a detective you would have been in traffic; is that correct?

Yes sir.
And then $I$ think, if we take a look at following your detective superintendent on April 1st, 1971, you moved to operations; is that correct?

Yes sir.
And I think that's where you were when you retired in 1977; is that correct, sir?

That's correct, yeah.
I'm going to call up an organizational chart, it's
325569. And, Mr. Wood, this is a chart -- and I have shown you a copy of this before -- this is a chart that we obtained from the annual report prepared by the chief of police back in I think 1970 that sets out the organizational chart, and you are familiar with this chart, are you, sir? Yes sir.

And would this accurately reflect the organization of the police force, at that time, in 1969 ?

I would think so, yes, I think that's when it was made.

Okay. And then if we could just go, we'll call up the document that has the names on it, 325569 -oh, sorry -- 571, and we'll just take a look here. You will see at the top, Mr. Wood, that James Kettles, he was the chief of police at that time; is that correct?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
What, we have not seen much about James Forbes, at least in this investigation, what was -- what were his responsibilities at that time, generally?

Well he was second in command of the police
department.
And would he have -- would he be involved in day-to-day investigations or would he be more administrative?

Administration.
And then we see over here your position as superintendent of criminal investigations, and then underneath you we see the detective division, morality division, and identification division; is that correct?

A
$Q$

A
Q
And would it be fair to say, then, that those three gentlemen would report to you as the Superintendent of Criminal Investigations?

Yes sir.
And that you, in turn, were the one that --
And direct to the chief too.
Okay.
And direct to the chief, their reports would go to me and to the chief of police.

And when we look at this organizational chart,
let's talk about what actually happened at the time as opposed to what, what's on paper, and if it's the same then please tell us, but what -back in and around 1969, or your term as superintendent of criminal investigations, did for example Lieutenant Short report to you on a day-to-day basis about what he was doing, and did you in turn give him instructions and direct him in his work?

Yes sir.
And would that same go for Inspector Nordstrom and Lieutenant Penkala?

A

Q
Not necessarily, unless there was something important enough.

Okay. Would your relationship as senior -- I'm not sure $I$ 'm using the right term here. Certainly in the org. chart Lieutenant Short in detectives would report to you and it would appear to be in the same position as Nordstrom and Penkala, in actual practice was your -- was the reporting relationship with Short to you any different than with Nordstrom and Penkala to you?

Well Lieutenant Short would work opposite to me, he would work the afternoon shift if I -- I worked the day shift normally, on my days off, Lieutenant

Short would be in charge of the department.
Q

A

Q

A
Q

A

Q

A
$Q$
A Of which department?

The detective department.
Okay. And when you were working, were you in charge of the detective department as well, then? The detective department was my department.

Okay. What about morality and identification; were you in charge of those departments as well? Normally by the chart, yes, but normally -- not by work. A morality officer would -- they would be separate identities. Operation -- detective work would be separate too, and then morality would be separate, and then detective would be separate, in that fashion.

So, back to my question, let's talk about Nordstrom and morality. I mean if I look at this chart it would seem to me that both Short and Nordstrom would report to you and that you would be their senior officer, and was there a difference in their -- in relationship between those two officers and you?

Well, only in this, that they were in charge of those sections.

Yes?
Morality, Nordstrom was in charge of that section,
and he didn't have to report to me daily unless there was something important enough to report to me. He would do all as scheduled in this other report here under the morality functions. The same thing with identification, ident., Penkala. That's a specialized field and he wouldn't report to me unless it was something in connection with what our report was on at that time.

Did Nordstrom and Penkala report more to Chief Kettles than to you?

Well they would, they would, everybody would report directly to the chief. All reports normally ended up in the chief's office at one time or another, but they would ra -- there would be nothing to report to me unless it was an investigation within the detective department.

And I think you --
If it was a simple assault or something like that, that it was under their heading, they wouldn't necessarily have to report to the detective part. See, and $I$ think you said earlier that you and Lieutenant Short -- and I don't know if this was your word -- but almost 'platooned', you worked opposite each other; is that right?

Yes, except on my days off, then he would work the
day shift, yes.
And so that either you or Lieutenant Short would be there pretty much at any given time other than --

A

Q

A
Q
A
$Q$

A
Q

A

Q

A
$Q$



And would it be fair to say, Mr. Wood, that you would have spent -- and again talking '68 to '71 when you were superintendent -- that you would have spent -- more of your focus of your time would have been on the detectives division than on morality and ident.?

That's right.
And can you tell us, again you are the most senior officer from the time that will be testifying
before this Commission, can you tell us just a bit about how Chief Kettles operated, and I'm talking in 1969 in and around the Gail Miller investigation, as far as what his role was in the direction of the police officers and investigation and how hands-on was he with what was going on? Normally, all reports that would go through the department overnight -- now you have got to understand that at that stage of the game in the reporting everything was put onto tape, and those tapes would then go up to central records who would type out the information off the tapes, and that would then end up in the chief's office where he would read them, and then they would come out to the individual department.

So let's just pause there. Would these be -- and we will be looking at some of them in a moment -would these be the investigation reports; is that right?

So they would be typed and everything would go through the chief's office?

Would normally go through the chief, if he was available it would go through him, if not then it
would go directly to the court or direct to our department or to morality or to ident.

And when you talk about 'going through his office' are you talking that physically the piece of paper would be given to him where he would normally read it?

Yeah, that's right. What we called occurrence reports.

Q
A
These were occurrences, see, the first original occurrence reports would normally -- he would see them if he was there, if he was available, if he wasn't well then they would have to keep on going into the various departments.

And what about investigation reports, would they all --

A
$Q$

A
Q
A
Q

A
Q

A

Yes.
$Q$ all

That's the same thing.
The same thing?
They all came in through the tape, -Okay?
-- they were all reported on tape and retyped.
And based on your dealings with Chief Kettles at the time, to your knowledge, did he take an active part in reading these reports and --

I would think so. I think, if $I$ remember back, at
one time he used to stamp them all and put his stamp that they went through his office, but $I$ don't recall, $I$ haven't any forms here to show that.

Yeah. And then what would happen, again help us out on the paper flow, once he got -- let's take the Gail Miller occurrence report would get typed up, would go through his office; what would he do with it then?

It would come to our department, the detective department.

Okay. When you say 'our department, detectives', again I -Detectives, yes.

And when $I$ looked at this chart you are talking about it would go to the detective department over there as opposed to you as superintendent of criminal investigations; is that fair?

It would go to that department because it didn't matter who was working, well, it was myself or Short.
$Q$
So if we talk -- and perhaps we can just go back and call up page 325570 , and so here we have the detective division, and $I$ think it covered homicides; correct?

A Right.
And morality would cover moral offences, which would be sexual assault or rape at that time; is that correct?

That is right, yes.
So that an occurrence report or an investigation report would go to the chief, the chief would then send it down to detective division or to morality, depending upon which division was looking after the file; is that right?

A
$Q$ So can we conclude, sir, that -- let's talk about the Gail Miller murder investigation -- that the occurrence report and all of the investigation reports would have likely passed through the chief's office and, as well, through your office?

A

A

And when they passed through your office when you were working, you would have read them while you were on shift, is that right?

Right.
And while you were not on shift Short would usually be on shift, and he would read them, is that fair?

That's right, yes, yeah. And then they would go to the recording officer.

And who was the recording officer?
Sergeant Mackie and Reid both were working in
that. They were all recorded in one location.
When you use the term 'recording officer' what do you mean by that?

Well they would take the files and they would make up a file and record it into their own book, type of thing, and then turn it over to the investigators.

So if $I$-- the Gail Miller murder is January 31, if on February 28th, '69 I walk into the police station and say 'lookit, $I$ want to read the police file on Gail Miller', where would it be and who would be responsible for it?

It would be with Sergeant Mackie or Sergeant, Reid, who has all the files, and then they farmed
them out or sent them out to the various
investigating officers, but they would have knowledge of where the file was.

So they would keep one set of everything; is that correct?

Well, they would keep the recording of it, as to what it was.

And would there also be a copy in central records as well?

The original would go to central records, yes.
Now we've heard some evidence of a fellow named Jack Ward, who I think passed away in 1969, -Right.
-- being involved; do you recall him being involved in this file?

A
No, I don't, I don't recall what he would have done.

So who would be -- I mean $I$ think you said you would have read some of, some of the investigation reports; is that fair?

I think I would have read all the -- that would come over my desk while $I$ was working.

Q
And --
But to remember them, $I$ can't remember what would be in them.

A

And what was your purpose in reading them, why did you read them, what were you reading them for and what did you do with them?

Well to where $I$ was going to send them. See, not only those reports, the Milgaard murder report would go to one place, we had many other files that would go to other individual investigating officers. So it wasn't just that we were getting one file coming up on Milgaard, we had break and enters, we had every other type of file that would come up.

Okay. You are referring to the Gail Miller file; is that right?

Pardon?
To the Gail Miller file?
Well that information would come up, but we wouldn't -- don't just stop at one file. Yes.

There might be 10 or 12 of them come in in a day's time, or overnight even, and break and enters and thefts and whatnot, that all comes under that heading.

Q Right. Well then they would be read and sent out to the individual detectives who were going to

Q
investigate 'em.
So one purpose in you reading them would be to see where you should send it; is that fair?

That's right, yup.
And would you also read it for the content, to see what was happening on the investigation, so you -I would read the whole file, yeah.

And let me give you an example. Let's say the police report said, you know, 'we got contacted by someone who said they may have seen Gail Miller on the morning of her murder and someone should follow up with photos and someone should call Mr. X'. If that's in a report, when you read the report, would it be your job or responsibility to say 'okay, well someone better follow up', or would that be someone else's? Whose job would it be to make sure that happened?

Well, it would come out of my office and it would go to whoever is going to -- on the job, whoever is working that day, to follow up on the file. If there was an inquiry or we would have many reports coming in with information, suspects around that they think should be checked and whatnot, well then that would be sent out to the investigating officers to go out and follow up on it.

Q

A
$Q$

So when you read the report, though, would you be reading it so that you could identify tasks that officers in the detective division should be doing that day or did you leave that to somebody else to handle for you?

Well that would go, if it was regarding the Miller case, then it would go to Sergeant Mackie and Sergeant Reid.

Okay. So let's talk about the Miller case and that type of report. If you read that, saying that 'somebody should follow up with Mr. X and show photos', are you telling us that you would give that to Mackie or Reid and it would be their responsibility to, number 1, read it -Yeah.
-- and, number 2 , send someone out or decide what should be done?

That's right, yeah.
So are you telling us, then, that the actual file decision-making would have been at the Mackie/Reid level as opposed to your level?

Well, at the investigation level, yeah.
Okay.
Yeah.
And what about Short, then, what role -- would he

A

Q

A
$Q$

A

Q

A
$Q$
-- would it be fair to say that, as far as the Gail Miller investigation is concerned, he would have played a similar role to you, or was he more hands-on on the investigation, or --

He assisted in the investigation along with
Detective Karst and the other officers that was on the investigation.

Okay. So he, partly he was in the office reading reports much like you when he was covering --

When $I$ wasn't available.
And, in addition, he was out in the field doing some investigation work?

That's right, yup.
And do you recall whether you were out in the field doing any investigation work?

No, no, I didn't have time for it.
Now would there be occasions where you might identify something in a report and jot a note to somebody, 'check this out', or 'follow up on that'?

I would get reports coming over my desk with the information or -- as $I$ pointed out before, we went to the public and asked for help, all the help we could get, and any reports that would come in, then $I$ would read them over and $I$ would write
letters, and in fact several letters show up in the file, so -- of this type of information, that we sent men out to follow through with it and have it cleared one way or the other.

So if you could describe to the Commission what you understood your role to be in the Gail Miller murder investigation, what is that, what was your role as you saw it?

Well the investigation on the Miller case, I -- I received the first call on the Miller case that was phoned in to the department that morning, and I in turn then called Detective Reid, I believe it was, and Parker I believe, Detective Parker, and sent them. Because the call came in as a suspicious person in a back lane, and they were sent to investigate, and when they appeared at the investigation and found what they found they radioed back immediately to ask for the identification section to be sent out to check the area and to do what they have to do, and that is the photography work, fingerprint work, and all that type of thing. See, they are specialized in that field, and detectives aren't normally specialized in that type of work, so ident. section was sent out, then, to follow up on the
investigation.
And beyond that, and let's go from the date of death after that first call until charges being laid at the end of May, what was your role, sir, in the active investigation? What were your responsibilities and what was it that you were doing?

Either to follow up on reports and send out letters of inquiry and reading the files and sending them out to the respective places.

Who would be the decision-maker, or
decision-makers, in deciding things such as how many officers should be devoted to the Gail Miller file compared to other investigations, who it should be, who should interview these witnesses, etcetera?

A
I don't believe we set any actual number. I don't remember any number being set of how many would be attached or sent for that specific thing, but all detectives worked on it at the start, and then it ended up with just maybe four or five, maybe six officers that were working mostly full-time on it.

Q Okay. Yeah. I tried this question with Penkala, and he is not a football player, maybe you can help us out. Who, if there was a quarterback of
the investigation, who would be calling the shots
in the Gail Miller investigation as far as if
there was one person or two persons that were
making the majority of the decisions as to what should be done, when it should be done, and who should be doing it?

I believe mainly the top investigators of the case would be the ones. Umm, they went -- often would go to the chief for direction on which way to go --

Okay.

A
$Q$
A

Q

A
$Q$
A
Q
A
$Q$
A
A
2

Ray Mackie?
Yeah, Ray Mackie, he was the one that was singled out mainly to do the recording and looking after the files.

A
$Q$

6
7

Q

A

Okay. And what role, then, would the chief have played in, again, the decision-making about what to do?

I don't think he would play that big a role except that they -- he would be more -- they would report to him more than anybody else. He would, anybody that was out and had to leave the city or go anywhere out of our jurisdiction, approval had to come through the chief's office.

Okay. And so if an officer, for example, had to go to Regina to interview Ron Wilson, Chief Kettles would have to approve that?

That's right, yeah, --
And --
-- the expenditure would have to be approved by him.

And help us out, was it an approval -- was it a bureaucratic 'I got to approve the money and there is a budget' or 'I want to know who is going where'?

Well he has got to be -- report back to the Commission as to the expenditure --

Right.
-- of the money.
But what was driving the need to have the chief
approve the trip, was it money or --

A
Well, yes, we didn't have money to -- the departments didn't have, each individual department didn't have a budget as such at that time to play a role in financing or saying to somebody, 'oh, just go ahead and go'. The chief has got to look after it through his own Board of Police Commissioners.

Right. But apart from the budget concerns would the chief want to know who is going, where they are going, why they are going, and would the chief have some input as to --

I think the chief was pretty much on top of everything that was taking place.

Okay. Now what about coordination, if we can talk a bit about that, between the detective division, morality division, and identification division? I think you told us that morality sort of operated, not on their own, but Nordstrom would report more to the chief than he would report to you; is that fair?

A
Yes. Well I would say that, yes, because we had -- the chief set up a department -- or a coffee break time in the department, every morning at 10:30 all the senior officers were to report at
this coffee break time, at which a report would be given from what took place in each individual section over the last 24 hours --

And so who would be the --
-- to bring the chief up to date on what was taking place.

So who would be, who do you describe as 'senior officers', what rank and what --

From the lieutenant up.
So Short, Nordstrom, Penkala, you, the chief; is that fair?

That's right, yes, deputy chief.
And deputy chief?
Yes.

So there would be a meeting every day?
Monday to Friday, because the coffee shop wasn't open on Saturday or Sunday.

Okay. And so, what, would there be regular attendance by these senior officers at that time? Not -- well Short wouldn't be there because he would be in the afternoon shift, --
$Q$ Okay.

A -- but Penkala and Nordstrom, the deputy chief and myself and the chief, we would be there. Penkala. And would this be an informal 'tell us what's

A
Q
happening, what you found out'? bit later, but we know that prior to Gail Miller's murder there were two sexual assaults and one attempted sexual assault within a couple of months and then one right after the conviction, and do you have any recollection, Mr. Wood, of those occurrences?

No, I don't. I can't say I do, no.
Okay. Is it fair to assume that those occurrence reports and investigation reports would be the type that might pass across your desk and that you may have read them? I appreciate you say you
don't remember them.
A
Not the assaults, $I$ don't think $I$ would have access to the assaults, because there were assaults all the time that would go direct to the morality section that $I$ wouldn't be aware of. Okay. Let me back up and maybe I misunderstood. When Chief Kettles got investigation reports, let's say he gets a murder investigation report, a sexual assault investigation report, and Penkala's ident. report on something; now do those three reports cross your desk on a daily basis or not? Not, not really, because I don't think you would find three of them coming in at the same time. Well let's assume that they came in over the course of a week.

Yeah.
Would -- first of all, the homicide report would go across your desk, right?

Right, yeah.
And then you told us you would send it down to detectives?

A
Q
Would an occurrence report on a sexual assault go across your desk from Chief Kettles' office?

I can't really say because a special assault,
assaults is assault, and so we had lots, so many of them, so $I$ can't say that that would be going through my office and then to morality, or it would be discussed, even, in the chief's coffee break.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I wonder if you could just be clear to the witness that in '68 the complaints would be two rapes and one attempted rape.

BY MR. HODSON:
Fair enough. Sure. And at the time they would be rapes, Mr. Wood, so a rape file that would be handled by morality; so back in '68-'69 would an occurrence report on a rape file go from Chief Kettles across your office, or would it go directly to morality, to Nordstrom?

A
$Q$
A

Q Okay. So then back in the ident. report, that let's say Joe Penkala types up an ident. report on a rape case, it has nothing to do with detectives,

A
Q
A
$Q$
8
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it goes up through Chief Kettles, is that something that would go from Kettles through your office or would it go directly to Penkala's?

It would go directly to morality, yes.
Okay.
Yeah.
So then when we have -- let's go back to these morning meetings; what were the type of things that were discussed and what were the purpose of these meetings?

Well just to bring the chief up to date on anything that occurred in the last 24 hours, it was mainly arrests and stuff, not -- that was the -- even when the Milgaard murder trial was in place, the investigation. But that would all just be discussed normally, what they had done, what files $I$ had seen and he may not have seen, and so what morality might have had and ident. might have had what files they might have come across. For example, and we have seen reports and we've heard evidence that in the course of the Gail Miller murder investigation some police officers looked at the two previous rapes and attempted rape files and draw -- and drew some comparisons with the Gail Miller investigation, and so
there's -- for example Joe Penkala prepared a document saying that there may be a connection, and so there was some cross-over, if $I$ can call it that, between morality and detectives in the investigation of the Gail Miller murder; were you aware of that?

No. No.
Is that something --
He might have discussed that with morality and not even mentioned it to the detective department. Okay. Is that the type of thing that might be discussed at these morning meetings between morality and detectives?

No, not really, other than just the fact what occurred in the last 24 hours.

Let me put it this way. Let's take a case where there is a murder file and a couple of sexual -or a couple of rape files and there are similarities and there may be a connection; tell me how the police service, at that time, would cause the right hand to communicate with the left hand so that the people investigating the murder would know what they need to know about the rape files and vice versa?

Well, first, $I$ don't think you would find a murder
trial and three rape files coming through at the same time, the murder -- the murder file probably would come in at one time, and maybe a week later they would have the assault, and maybe --

Fair enough, yes.
-- a week later the assault, and it wouldn't mean anything other than the morality were investigating that.

Yeah.
And it probably just wouldn't have twigged anybody to say 'well maybe there is a connection with the murder trial'. I don't recall ever seeing anything connecting the assaults with the murder. All right. And $I$ will show you, Mr. Wood, and I think $I$ have shown you in your preparations for your testimony, that there are some documents where other officers have connected the two, and $I$ appreciate you don't have a recollection about it. What $I$ am trying to get from you, though, is, based upon your experience and your position at the time, how did the police service operate? How was it that one division would know, where necessary, what the other division was doing? Or maybe they didn't. Do you understand my question?

I think so. I don't think they would know unless
it was brought to their attention, because the file would go to morality and morality had their own investigators -Okay.
-- to do their investigating, the same with the detectives, had their own investigators, and not necessarily unless information came to the morality section about the murder or vice versa, then they might connect at that stage, but that's about the only way.

Well let's back up and put aside when they come in, let's assume they come in over a three month period, that you have three unsolved rapes or attempted rapes with witness statements and a description of an assailant and a method of attack, etcetera, that morality is investigating trying to find out who the assailant is, okay. You then have a murder which is investigated by, for the most part, different officers, detectives, and let's assume for the moment that there may be similarities and that as a police officer or as a police service it might help the murder investigators to have the information in morality, and let's assume that it's the same assailant, the same person who committed the rapes committed the
murder. Are you telling us that detectives would go off looking for the murderer, morality would go off looking for the rapist, they would never cross paths?

The investigators may have crossed paths, I can't say, but $I$ don't recall anything going over to my office where the two were together.

I appreciate that, but from how the service operated at the time, you were the superintendent, and at least on paper in charge of detectives, morality and ident, how is it, or what systems were in place so that there was an exchange of information on the investigation front where necessary?

It would only be word of mouth talking with one another from the different sections. Morality section was in one part of the building, detectives in another, ident in another, had their own separate identities.

Well, let me put it this way, do you think it would be a good thing for police officers to know what other investigations are going on that might impact on the investigation they are doing?

I agree it would be, yeah, if there had been closer contact, yes.

A

And if, for example, in detectives division, let's say rapes, as they were called then, were moved over to detectives so that detectives were looking after homicides and rapes, then they would all be working or similar files; right?

Yeah, but $I$ can't speak for the investigators who were on the case because maybe they were doing that unknown to me.

Okay. And again just the last question on this point, $I$ think you would agree that if the rapes and homicides were in the same group, there would likely be the same detectives, likely be more sharing of information or more knowledge because it would be the same officers; right?

I would think so, yes.
So the fact that rapes are being investigated by a different division on a different floor, what was it that you did as superintendent in charge to make sure that there was proper communication between the two divisions so that where necessary homicide investigators would know what the morality investigators are doing?

Well, I wouldn't have access to the files usually in the first place because they would have gone right to morality, they wouldn't have gone -- if
all files had come up to my office where $I$ would have read all the files, then $I$ would know before they went to the separate divisions, but from records all the files were placed into, you might say, bins or whatever you want to call them to go to the morality section, detective section or the ident section.

Sir, I'm not trying to suggest that you should have been the person that was coordinating the two, I'm trying to understand what happened at the time, because we know for a fact, we've heard evidence and we'll hear more evidence that officers worked on both rape files and the murder, the Gail Miller file and the rape files and some officers drew comparisons and connections, so it did happen. My question to you is to try and find out what systems, if any, were in place so that that would happen or was it just by luck that they happened to be crossing paths?

No, it would be by reports that would come through the office. It would have been by files and what reports.
$Q$
Fair enough. Why don't we turn to the occurrence report. If we could call up 006255 , please, and we'll come back to that, Mr. Wood, maybe when I
get some specific documents we can revisit that, and $I$ think this is the original occurrence report, we have spent some time with this document before, and $I$ think there's a reference here, Parker and Reid got a call from you to proceed to the alley. Is that right?

That's right, yes.
And Reid and Parker, would they be the detective sergeants on duty that morning, is that why they got the call?

That's right, they were working in the patrol car, detective car.

And we've heard from other witnesses that subsequently Ray Mackie became the officer in charge with Parker -- or in charge with Reid. Do you know how that came about or who would have made that decision?

Well, it would have depended how the shift was made up and who was working with who. Usually there was two detectives worked together. But my question is this, Parker and Reid were the officers who went to the scene?

A
$Q$ Right.

For the rest of the investigation the officers in charge, two officers were assigned responsibility
for the file and they were Mackie and Reid and I'm wondering who made the decision to put Mackie and Reid in charge of the file?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A

I don't really know. It was just -- I can't really say.

At the time -- we're done with this document. Who
would have been responsible with the police
service back at the time of the Gail Miller murder
to deal with the media?
There was no one appointed at that time. The media just had access to the police building, you would find them all anywhere and everywhere until such time as the chief put a stop to it and said they could only come in at a certain time of the day and get their information, but at the start, I don't know, they were all over. I talked to them, and reports show.

Yeah. Who would they go talk to, whoever they could find or were you the person that was to speak to them?

In the detective department $I$ would talk to them normally, yeah.

So in a murder investigation, the person who would talk to the media would be you; is that correct? Right, yeah.

A
Q

A
Q

A

And I think we'll see newspaper reports in a moment. And would other officers be talking to the media?

Not to my knowledge, not officially.
And $I$ think you were saying that they were always there at the police station; is that right, the media?

Always.
And so I take it at that time it would be newspaper reporters, radio reporters, television reporters?

No, I think it was just newspaper reporters.
Newspaper?
Yeah.
And at that time do you remember whether there was any proactive efforts by the police to be communicating information out through the media to the public?

No.
And we'll see in a moment, or tomorrow, some newspaper articles where you would be asking the public for help on the investigation?

Where I was?
Yes.
A That's right, yes.

And I take it that would be proactive, look, reporter, help me out here, can you run a story, we're looking for $x$, is that how that would happened?

A
Q

A
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