

the surface which it first met, namely the cavity, there would be no undercut surface; there would be nothing for it to grip to, it has very little adhesive qualities. As to whether I did not see any sign of such insulation in my examination with the eight times magnification, I did not see any sign of anything.

TO MR. READ: As to whether the usual procedure would be as stated in Mr. O'Brien's evidence on page ~~21~~ 21 of the transcript ~~that~~ in regard to the filling of the second bicuspid - "That tooth had been previously filled, but apparently further decay had occurred, and I found that was close to the pulp also, and I either supplemented that filling by putting in an additional filling alongside it or removing the old filling and inserting a new filling. I am not clear on that, but I have a note here that I put in a layer of cavatine", Cavatine is merely a sandrack varnish, which is a clear varnish. Asked if the porcelain filling had fallen out after being immersed in a formalin bath for some years I would expect to find any sign of the cavatine varnish in the tooth, there again it is just a sandrack varnish and I do not really know the action of formalin on it; but it would be quite possible for that thin layer of varnish to come out with the filling. I was asked about the mark or the depression which appears on the photograph produced (Exhibit 20.) In my opinion the ~~big~~ shadow on that photograph occurs on the surface of the upper left cuspid tooth. On the cast produced (Exhibit "A") there is a mark on the upper left lateral incisor. That is a different tooth to the tooth in the photograph. As to seeing any sign of it on the model produced (Exhibit 12), there is a depression in the model, in this case on the upper left lateral incisor. The depression is on the same tooth in both the model and the plaster cast. It is a different tooth to the tooth in the photograph produced. (Exhibit 20).

TO THE CORONER: According to the photograph that tooth is missing.

(Signed) Everett R. Magnus.

TAKEN AND SWORN BEFORE ME AT MELBOURNE THIS 24th DAY OF MARCH, 1944.

W. King

.....
CORONER.

GC.BH. ✓

MAGNUS REC.

71

LILLIAN KING, on her oath saith:

~~act~~
~~woman~~
~~XXXXXXXX~~ My ~~full~~ name is Lillian King and I am a married woman residing at No. 428 Princes Highway, ~~at~~ Tom Ugly's Point, New South Wales. I am the wife of Sergeant King, a previous witness in this case. I knew a girl named Linda Platt. I could not definitely say the date I first met her. I have no idea of the approximate year. I have not the least idea as to whether it was before 1930. I was introduced to her by some of the other young ladies. I was never employed as an usherette. I think it was Mrs. Bland who introduced her to me. When I first met her, I was living at Tom Ugly's Point Police Station. I was then married. The other girls brought Linda Platt to my place for the weekend. She did not come very frequently, just occasionally. As to the approximate period of time, she used to visit my home prior to a man named Agostini coming there, not very often, I did not see very much of her at all, really. She stayed at my home one weekend. I remember a man named Agostini coming out to the home. I see him in Court today. After that, I never saw very much of them at all. I was never told by Linda Platt of her marriage to Agostini. I was told that by others. The other girls who used to come to my place were Miss Crawford, and Mrs. Bland and, I think, Mrs. Dunn came out once, but I do not think she stayed the weekend. On about the 4th March, 1944, I went to Police headquarters, Sydney, and there saw the body of the deceased. When I was shown that body, there were some police officers present, no one else. I recognised that body as the body of Linda Platt.

TO MR. BARRY: I was in Court yesterday while my husband gave evidence and also this morning. I remember he mentioned a photograph. I had some little snaps; we had different ones. They were just little snaps taken, but not enlargements. When I went to look for them they were missing.

M/ECL.

L. KING.

Looking at Exhibit 16, I do not think my copy was exactly like that; it was the same sort of position, but I could not say it was taken off that. If it were suggested I did not have any snap like that, I would say I did not say it was that snap but it was the same position. I do not suppose it was like that. If you said I did not have a snap like that, I would say, as best as I can remember, it was like that. If it were put to me that I did not have a snap resembling that photograph, I would say it was resembling it. I do not pretend I have an identical snap; I have not got it. I would not say I never had it; I had some. If it were suggested I never had an identical snap of which this exhibit is an enlargement, I would say I just don't know, it is very much like it. It was like it. I do not know when I last saw it. We had shifted so many times, and when I went to look for it, it was gone. I agree it is said three moves are worse than a fire. It is a long time ago and one does not keep old photographs. As to how I came to get these snaps, Linda gave them to me. I had a couple of them in different positions. As to whether either of them was identical in position with that snap, one was the same position - side face. As to my suggesting that I ever had a snap which was identical with that exhibit except that the exhibit is enlarged, I did say it was similar to it. I could not say it was exactly the one off this. I have not the least idea where the snap is. I have not seen it for some time. Linda Platt was not very friendly with me at all. I had seen her quite often. I had seen her more than five times. As to whether it was ten times, I could not say the times; I saw her frequently, sometimes. As to whether I saw her as many as twenty times in all my acquaintance, I expect I have. I could not say whether it would be as many as thirty, I never counted them. As to when I had a feeling the Pyjama girl was Linda Platt, I never had a feeling

about it. If I were asked when my husband said "You know, I have a nasty feeling the Pyjama girl may be Linda Platt", I would say he said that somewhere about 1938, when he viewed the body the first time. I do not think he said anything about it previously. My husband and I did not discuss the identity of the pyjama girl as possibly being Linda Platt before 1938, except that, when the photographs came out first in the police station, we looked at them. That is all. As to my then feeling it was a photograph of Linda Platt, I did not feel, I had an idea it might because no one had heard of her. One could not compare the photographs in the police station very well with the photograph I had. If it were suggested I did not see in the photographs I saw in 1934 and thereafter any resemblance to Linda Platt, I would say I never went into it so very heavily like that. I had a look at the photographs that were available to me at the police station. They were stuck up on the office. I agree, they were in the office on the wall, the wording of the document being that assistance was required to identify the person. Looking at those photographs, as to whether I felt there was a ^{re-}semblance between the face depicted and Linda Platt whom I had known, well, Linda Platt was not missing and I never went into it like that. I did not feel there was any resemblance. I do not think I had any conversation with my husband; I think Miss Crawford and I had a conversation, that is all. We just looked at them, that is all, and did not say anything. We just thought whether it was her. As to my telling you a moment ago that I thought Mrs Crawford and I said something about it, I never said anything about Miss Crawford, only that I knew her. I can hear myself as I give evidence. When I went to police headquarters, I knew my husband had already been some time ago. My husband and I went in together to the police headquarters. Mrs Dunn was not with us but she was there. When I got to police headquarters, those I knew were Mrs Bland, Miss Crawford, Miss Cole that was, and

my husband, and there were quite a lot of others that I knew. I knew I was being taken there for the purpose of seeing whether the body of the pyjama girl was that of Linda Agostini or Linda Platt. I was not aware that Agostini had been arrested and was in custody. That was never discussed with me; I was out when they came for me. As to whether, when I went along, I was aware that my husband was of the opinion it was Linda Agostini, I heard him say he thought it was. He told me that in 1938. I pay a great deal of respect to my husband's views.

TO MR. READ: The body I have seen in Melbourne is the same body.

(Signed) LILIAN KING.

TAKEN AND SWORN BEFORE ME AT MELBOURNE THIS 24th DAY OF MARCH 1944.


.....
C O R O N E R.

GERTRUDE CRAWFORD on her oath saith:

My name is Gertrude Crawford and I am ^a ~~the~~ manageress residing at No.25 Flat, "Havilah Flats", 9 Darlinghurst Road, Kings Cross. I knew a girl named Linda Platt, very well. I first met her in 1926 or 1927. I have been in Court and heard Mrs Dunn's description of her early history. I knew her earlier than Mrs Dunn as far as I know. I remember that she came to reside at 88a Darlinghurst Road a fortnight after she arrived in Sydney from New Zealand. She told me she had come from England to New Zealand and from New Zealand to Sydney. In those days she was a very nice girl. She seemed a girl with some education, very vivacious, and full of vitality. She was very smart in appearance. In Australia, her first employment was as an usherette at Hoyt's Theatre, then at the corner of George and Central streets, Sydney. During that period, I saw Linda Platt all day practically when we were home together. She had a room next door to mine. I saw a great deal of her, As to whether Linda later changed her occupation from an usherette, she lost her position at Hoyt's and I do not remember her doing anything after that. I do remember her being a hair-dresser on the Aorangi. She had been taught hairdressing in a place in Pitt Street. She took a position as hair dresser on the S.S.Aorangi. I remember some little time after Miss Platt came to Darlinghurst Road, Mr.Agostini came to live at 88a Darlinghurst Road. As to whether Linda Platt met him there, we were all introduced to Mr.Agostini by the landlady. He and Linda Platt became friendly. After some time, Linda Platt and Mr.Agostini moved to "Tranby Croft", Darlinghurst Road, Kings Cross. Shortly after that, Linda Platt went home to England. Mr.Agostini wanted to marry her and she said she wanted to see her mother previously, so he let her go to England first. She informed me she went to England. Later, when she returned, she said she had been to England and seen her

M/ECL.

CRAWFORD.

mother. I cannot tell you the exact date when she returned to Sydney. I went to meet her when she returned to Sydney and Mr. Agostini was there also. I cannot remember what year that was. I remember it was the same year that they got married. I know when they got married. They were married in April 1929, I think, although I could not be quite sure about that. It would be 1929 or 1930, to the best of my knowledge. Before they got married, on her return from England, they then lived at "San Jose", No. 15 Kellett Street, Kings Cross. That is where Mr. Agostini was living at the time of her return from England. It was some short time after her return from England that they married. After they left "San Jose" they ~~xxxxxxx~~ ^{went} to live in William Street in a flat. Whilst they were living there together I went to see them very often.

(Mr. Read intimated he desired to record that there was a conversation at that stage which, in his opinion, should not be tendered at this particular time.)

At that period when they were living at the flat in William street, Sydney, as to whether I heard any arguments between Mr. and Mrs. Agostini, I would not say arguments, they had little differences, and that was all I observed. After leaving William street, they went to a flat in Hughes Street. I do not know whether, prior to that, they went to Orwell Street, or Hughes Street. It would be accurate to say, after leaving William Street they moved to a flat in either Orwell street or Hughes street. I remember them leaving Sydney for Melbourne. I was there on the Saturday night previous to their leaving. That was about 1933, as near as I can remember. I said "Good-bye" to both of them, and I have not seen her alive since that time. During that long period of my acquaintance with Linda Platt, and later Linda Agostini, we were very, very friendly. I inspected a body that was lying in a formalin bath at the Sydney University. That was in 1935. At that time the body was in a formalin bath. The hair was wet. As to whether I was able to express any opinion at that time as to whose body it was, I spoke to the men who were in charge, and they asked

M/ECL. 77 CRAWFORD.

me if I could say it was or was not. I said "No, I would not say it was and I still would not say it was not." Her bust was one thing that stopped me from saying that. Her bust was smaller in death than in life. I had seen her naked many times. My view was her breasts in death were smaller than I recalled them in life. I did not ever notice, in lifetime, anything about her ears. I had never seen it, but she had often passed the remark about it. She often passed a remark to me about her ears. Sometimes she would come in fooling and say "Look where the pig bit me." One day, someone was there, and said "What do you mean about the pig." She said "When I was a baby, they put me on the lawn and a monkey came down and bit me on the ears." I had never seen it during her lifetime. She had very big hands and large feet. As to the length of her legs in comparison with her body, she had long legs - she had a long body and was short from the waist downwards. After I had seen the body at the Sydney University, I was working at a bookstall on Circular Quay, Sydney. Some time while I was there, I saw Mr. Agostini and had a conversation with him. I could not tell you the date, but I think it was about 1938. As accurately as I can remember it, that conversation was that he just arrived from Melbourne and he came to see me, and when I saw him I just said "Hello, Tony, how are you." He said "I am well, Crawford," I said "Where is Linda", he said "Is she not with you, I came to ask you." I said "No, I have not seen Linda since she left for Melbourne." He said "Will you come and have dinner with me." I said "Yes." and I had dinner with Tony that night. I went to dinner with him to a small flat that he had taken. That flat was either at Orwell or Hughes Street. We talked about Linda. Looking around the flat, I did not see anything at all belonging to Linda. He said that Linda had gone away and she had been three months in Adelaide doing hairdressing and had come back. He also told me that he had been to

Adelaide and Western Australia and told me about various things that had happened. Asked whether he said anything about why she left him in Melbourne, or why they parted, he told me Linda had been having drink and he had objected to it and the company she was keeping. Practically the general conversation that night was more or less talking about Linda and the things that had happened - what we had done. As to whether I can remember anything else, whether he said anything about her friends, or associates, he did not mention any names. He said he did not like them; he did not approve of them. As far as I remember, he did not say anything else. He gave me a letter he had from Linda's mother in England, where she had mentioned my name and asked if he would ask me to write to her mother. He showed me a letter he had from Linda's mother. I replied to that letter, but she never answered my letter. During that conversation that night he did not say anything about where he thought Linda would go. As to whether I remember anything else that was said about Linda, in regard to anything, the whole conversation that night was in regards to Linda and I just cannot remember everything. As to whether there was anything said about the girl who had been found at Albury, I told Tony that I had been to see a girl at the University and he asked me what I thought. I told him there was a lot for and against. He said he would go and see it the following day, which he did. I saw him again after that. He came to see me at the Quay after he had been. I said "What do you think, Tony". He said "Oh, no, definitely not." I said "It is Linda's hand and Linda's feet", because she had big feet. Tony said "Linda had small hands." But Linda had large hands because I remember them so well. After that I very often saw Mr. Agostini. Every time I met him we used to speak about Linda. Tony was very fond of Mrs Agostini and she was of him, too. On the 4th March, of this year, I went to police headquarters at Sydney and I there saw the

CRAWFORD.

body of the deceased. When I saw the body on that occasion it was not in a formalin bath. It was lying on a stretcher, or slab, at the police headquarters. Having viewed that body, I say that it is Linda Agostini. I have, at the mortuary of this morgue, also seen the body of the deceased. I say that is the same body. I have seen the hair on the body. Looking at the hair (Exhibit No.9) I say it is similar but Linda used to tint her hair which made it fairer.

TO MR. FAZIO: As far as I could see, Agostini seemed to be very fond of his wife and she appeared to be very fond of him. As to whether, in my presence, she ever exhibited any signs of jealousy of him, sometimes, when Tony was dressing and going out, she would say "He is going out to see his other girl," and the same thing applied to her, when she was dressed she would say "I am going out to see my boy." I suppose that was to encourage affection on the part of the other. It was no surprise to me when he told me in 1938, that he had objected to her drinking. I had seen some evidence of her drinking in Sydney. As to whether it is correct to say drinking, not in moderation, Linda was always a lady. Linda never got to the stage when she never knew what she was doing. Sometimes she took a considerable amount. I said that they had little differences. Some of those were over his complaints of her drinking.

TO MR. BARRY: When I saw the body of the deceased in March of this year, it was lying on a slab covered to the chin. The face had been tinted up and the lips rouged. I could not say the face was powdered but it was covered with make-up; it had been made up. The face was not the only thing I inspected, I inspected her hands. The face and hands were the only things I inspected on the 4th March. As to whether I knew I was being taken to identify the body as the body of Linda Agostini, I was taken to view the body. I do not know that I was aware, at that time, that the theory was

M/ECL.

CRAWFORD.

entertained favourable that ~~xxx~~ it was Linda Agostini. As to my being aware that, up to that stage, there were some indications that the idea it was Linda Agostini ^{was} ~~xxxx~~ finding favour with the police, they were trying to trace and see if anyone could verify the body. When I was at police headquarters, and before I saw the body, I saw Mrs. King, Serg. King and Mrs. Bland. I saw Mrs. McPherson, who was formerly Miss Cole. All those people were known to me as people who knew Linda Agostini. I agree, before I inspected the body, being a person of intelligence, I was aware there was some idea in the minds of the detectives that the body was that of Linda Agostini. I inspected the face and the hands, and then felt certain it was the body of Linda Agostini. As to what there was then which removed the uncertainty I had felt in 1935, Linda had not been found, we had not seen her, she was not with Tony, a friend of mine had been to England and called on Linda's mother in England, and she had not heard from her, and I had had the bust explained to me and had seen a photograph of the body when it was found. That was a photograph of the body after removal from the culvert. It was not the photograph, Exhibit 7. It was a photograph, Exhibit 6. I would not say the breasts there shown are small firm breasts. ~~Looking~~ As to whether there is anything pendulous about them, they do droop on the left side. They droop on the left side, lying down, the lower one. That is not the breast on the photograph where your thumb now is. I indicate where the breast is (indicating on photograph). That is the right on the figure but it is left to me as I am looking at the picture. I suggest that that right breast is hanging down. As to whether I would regard that as a large breast, not large, but not small. Linda Agostini had drooping breasts; she did not have large breasts. She did not have well developed breasts. Looking at the photograph you now produce, I recognise that as a photograph I gave into headquarters. That is a photograph of Linda Platt.

EXHIBIT "B" Photograph of Linda Platt.

Looking at the second photograph you produce, I recognise that. I also supplied that photograph. That is also a photograph of Linda Platt.

EXHIBIT "C"..... Photograph of Linda Platt.

Looking at the breasts on Exhibit "C" I say they are low breasts. Linda did not have big breasts but they are low. I agree they are not the kind of breasts disclosed in the photograph of the corpse. As to whether I agree that photograph Exhibit "B" indicates pendulous or hanging breasts, it is very difficult to say under a frock. This particular copy of the photograph is not as good as the one I handed in to the New South Wales police.

TO THE CORONER: I handed the originals of those photographs to the police.

TO MR. BARRY: The explanation I got about the bust before March 1944 was that a postmortem had been done and, after rigor mortis had set in, I understand that they alter. As to when I was told that, I had viewed the body four times, and I cannot remember which time it was that I was told. As to whether it was in 1935 or in 1944, in 1935 I did not know anything about the bust and that was the reason why I would not verify that it was Linda. It was in 1944 that I was told. I was told at C.I.B. Headquarters one time when I went up and saw Det. Wilks. I could not tell you whether it was 1935, 1936 or 1938. I was told that the bust was altered after they had a post mortem examination. That that had altered the bust. As to whether they told me this photograph, Exhibit No.6, was a photograph before the post mortem, that is before, I can tell that by the bust. The only item of doubt that I had, after viewing the body in 1935 was the doubt that arose about the bust. I agree, at some stage, thereafter, that doubt was removed by an instruction on physiology given to me by the police. That made known to me that the body was the body of Linda Agostini. From that time,

M/ECL.

CRAWFORD.

the time of getting that instruction, I was certain it was Linda Agostini's body. I inspected the body between 1935 and the 4th March 1944. I saw the body three more times - four more times in all. * I saw it in 1935 and, on the 4th March 1944, I saw it again. I saw it twice in between at the University when in a formalin bath. On either of those occasions, I did not express a definite view that it was the body of Linda Agostini. It was not on the second or third occasion that I was informed by the police that the body had altered in regard to the bust by reason of the post mortem~~and~~ rigor mortis. As to whether, on the second or third occasion, I was told anything about alterations in the bust being due to the postmortem examination, I would say it was explained to me previous to the second time I saw the body. I saw the body the second time in 1935, with another friend of mine. I saw it twice in 1935. As to whether the other friend knew it was Mrs. Agostini, it was in a very dark room. The other friend knew Mrs. Agostini. As to whether, in 1935, she and I ~~was~~ were unable to say it was Agostini, we were not definite. On the second occasion I saw the body in 1935, we were unable to say to the police "That is Linda Agostini's body." The next time I saw the body, the third time, was between 1935 and 1938. I cannot give it to you any better than that. I was employed at the New South Wales Book Stall Co., at the time. I have been employed there for 23 years. It was some time between 1935 and 1938. It may have been in 1938. If I were asked whether I could relate it in any way to Mr. Chamberlain and Munich, I would say I can ask you questions. Asked to see if I can stick to what you are asking about and tell you whether I can give the date of the third inspection with any greater precision than three years, I say I cannot, because I cannot even tell you what date Tony arrived in Sydney. I had a conversation with Tony as a result of which Tony said he would go and see the body, and later he said he had. The third visit was prior to Tony arriving in Sydney.

It may have been three months or four months prior to his arrival. It may have been more, I cannot remember. The C.I.B. should have the dates. As to whether it was within a measurable period of three or four months, it may have been six or eight months, I cannot remember. I would not take the range as being between 3 and 8 months. I agree, whatever it was, on my third visit, I was still unable to tell the police that it was Linda Agostini. I ~~am~~ cannot tell you that year when I saw Sergeant King, but I met him on the way to work. I heard him give evidence yesterday. I noticed that Sergeant King, when giving evidence yesterday, said he saw me in 1937 and also said that at that stage, neither he nor I had seen the body, but I would say that is incorrect. I heard portion of Sergeant King's deposition, on page 56, read to me from "As to whether at that time I learned from Miss Crawford" down to "at least she told me so." I also hear you read portion from "When I was here in 1938" down to "made a mistake." If I were told he finishes that up, after various questions, by saying that at that stage when he saw me in 1937 I told him that I had not seen the body, I would say I did not tell him that; in fact, I had seen the body. I hear you read a further portion of Serg. King's deposition on page 67: "I would say she had not been there when I first met her." I agree, in March 1944, I was able to identify the body positively because I had seen a photograph of the body, taken shortly after its discovery, because I had received an explanation about the effect of an autopsy on the breasts, and viewing the body again. The only facts relating to the body, additional to those which had been in existence on the previous three inspections, were the explanation about the effect of an autopsy on the breast and the seeing of a photograph. The explanation that I had received about the autopsy on the breasts had been given to me on my third visit. It was before the third visit but not before the second. It was given to me at the

M/ECL.

CRAWFORD.

third visit. I had not seen the photograph before the third visit. I would ask His Worship whether I must answer the question as to when I first saw the photograph. As to why I do not want to answer it, I saw the photograph on the train coming over here from Sydney after I had identified it on March 4th. As to my realising that I have been conveying to you, at least, the impression that the seeing of the photograph of the body, (Exhibit 6) assisted me in my identification on March 4th., I did not intend to convey that impression. I saw the body on March 4th and, on account of Linda being missing so long and seeing the body under different circumstances I was positively sure it was Linda. If I were asked to tell you, seeing that you cross-examined me as to my identification on March 4th., what in the world my seeing a photograph weeks after March 4th had to do with an identification I made on March 4th., I would say nothing in my mind as to who it was. If it were suggested I did not want to say when I saw that photograph ^{because I realised} what affect it would have on my testimony, I would say I asked His Worship because I wanted to know whether it was correct or not. As to why I did not think it was a proper question to ask, I did not know whether I should have seen it or not. As to whether that is a candid answer - that I did not know whether I should have seen it or not - to my knowledge that picture was never published. As to my suggesting it was in my mind that some police officer may have acted improperly in letting me see it, I do not think so; you probably have exhibits that are not shown to people. I do not want to answer the question as to what it was that I thought would have caused the showing to me of that photograph to be improper. As to my realising perfectly well that I have got myself into this position, I say I am not frightened to convey anything. I did not try to convey to the Court that I was assisted in my identification by Exhibit 6. Asked what I said to Detective

M/ECL.

CRAWFORD.

Wilks after the third interview, when I had been told of the breasts, we discussed everything about it. He also had the teeth and everything there at the time on the table, they were getting further details about it. As to what I said to him about it being Linda Agostini, I said I thought it was Linda Agostini.

TO THE CORONER: As to what I told Wilks, I was up at the C.I.B. very often with Mr. Wilks, and we discussed all kinds of things, even her mother and letters, and all that sort of thing. The final decision was that I never heard another word from them.

TO MR. BARRY: As to whether the final decision was that I could not identify the body as that of Linda Agostini, I was not sure. As to whether I understand the use of plain English words - - -

OBJECTION by Mr. Read:

OBJECTION disallowed.

I think I do understand the use of plain English words. I agree I was unable to identify the body as the body of Linda Agostini at that time. I say Linda Agostini had large feet - larger than mine, and I take a size 5. If I were told you were instructed that the size of the feet on the body were a small 4, I could not tell you anything about that. I did not measure the size of the feet. Mrs. Agostini, or Miss Platt, as she was, was not sensitive about her ears; she never displayed them to me, I, who was an intimate friend of hers did not see them. She used to refer to both a monkey and a pig, I am quite sure of that. I do not know whether she meant that as a fact. I thought she was fooling. She told me about her ears, that she had been bitten by a pig, and then, at a later stage, that when she was young the monkey had come down and bitten her ears. As far as I know, that was only one ear. I do not think the monkey and the pig had bitten the same ear. I had no idea whether she meant it but I thought she was fooling. As to what caused her to

speaking about her ears at all if I had not seen them, sometimes one says "Oh, look at my hair." I cannot say what caused this subject to be brought up. I agree, I claim to have seen her in the nude on plenty of occasions. I had never seen her ears exposed on those occasions. During the time she and I were living in close proximity I never saw her washing her hair in my presence. I saw her drying her hair up on the roof. On those occasions her ears were not visible. I do not know that she took great care to conceal her ears. I did not take much notice of them. This was the subject of these very strange jocular remarks. I thought it was only joking. I had never heard previously of any one having his or her ears bitten by a monkey. I do not know whether the expression, having your ear bitten, relates to something altogether different in ordinary language. I did not notice anything about her toenails. I did not notice anything peculiar about the left elbow. I did not notice anything about the length of the arms as compared with the rest of the body. If it were suggested I began to say that Linda Platt had a short body and long legs, I would say ~~that~~ I started to say that but it was quite a mistake on my part. I started to say Linda Platt had long legs and a short body but that was incorrect. I will agree Linda Platt's breasts were not small/. I did not observe that Linda Platt had been vaccinated. I did not make any observation about that at all.

TO MR. READ: Asked to describe the conditions under which I viewed that body on the three occasions at the Sydney University, it was a very dark room and they had to put on a light when we went in. The body was in a liquid bath and it was lifted up for us to view the face and the head. It was wet at the time. The hair was all wet. I saw the body lying in the formalin bath before the face was lifted up. I have told his Worship the body was wet, the face was wet and the hair was wet. There was, at that time, a gaping wound in the

M/ECL.

CRAWFORD.

skull, over the left eye. I agree, altogether it was a very nauseating sight. When I viewed the body on the 4th March, 1944, it was then laid out in a room at Police Headquarters with the hair dried and combed. There was a piece of something put over a hole in the skull, over the left eye. There were no scars. There was face powder on the face, the rest of the body was covered with a sheet and it was in a very bright room.

They are the circumstances under which I viewed the body on the 4th March 1944. Having viewed the body on that occasion, I say I am quite convinced that it is Linda Agostini.

TO MR. BARRY: As to whether a statement was made and signed by me in 1935, I do not remember signing any statement and I do not remember whether Mr. McRea or Mr. Wilks took any statement, but I have an idea there are dates to the effect of my going there. As to my having an impression that what I had to say was taken down in writing and signed by me, I did not sign anything, to my knowledge then. The first time I signed anything was the 29th February, the Tuesday prior to the 24th March. That was not before the fourth time I saw the body. I saw the body on the 4th March. That was the fourth time I saw it. I signed the statement on February 29th before I saw the body the fourth time. In the statement I signed on the 29th., I did not say that the body I saw at the University was the body of Linda Agostini. I have not a copy of that statement. The photograph you show me shows the condition of the body on the 4th March when I first identified it as Linda Agostini. **T**

EXHIBIT "D"..... Photograph showing condition of the body at the time Miss Crawford made her identification at the 4th March 1944 at the Sydney Police station.

TO MR. READ: After hearing my deposition read over to me, I wish to make an alteration. In the depositions, I said I had signed a statement on February 29th. That is not correct. I did not sign a statement on February 29th. I wish to correct

M/ECL.

CRAWFORD.

that.

TO MR. BARRY: I went in to Police headquarters on February 29th and gave them information. I made an oral statement. I went in by request of the police authorities.

TOMR. READ: I subsequently signed a statement at the headquarters on March 4th. I signed a typewritten statement on that date.

(Signed) G. CRAWFORD.

TAKEN AND SWORN BEFORE ME AT MELBOURNE THIS 24th DAY OF MARCH 1944

W. King
.....
c o r o n e r.

LESLIE SAMUEL WOODS on his oath saith:

My full name is Leslie Samuel Woods, and I am a duly qualified medical practitioner practising my profession and residing at Albury. In 1934 I was practising in Albury as a medical practitioner. At that time I was also acting Government Medical Officer for the Police District of Albury. I remember Saturday, the 1st of September, 1934. At about 9.30 a.m. on that day, in consequence of a message that I received, I proceeded along the Howlong road from Albury in company with two detectives, I think. I eventually arrived at a brick parapet culvert on the Albury-Howlong Road. I do not recall whether I saw somebody else there when I arrived. I do not think Mr. Griffiths was there when I arrived. When I got there I saw something in the culvert. I saw the body of a woman lying in the entrance to the culvert. The body as I saw it was lying on its side, as I recall without referring to my notes on the right side, curled up, and covered with some bagging. As far as I recall the bag was over the head. The legs were just in the culvert, in the drain. The body appeared to be charred and showed signs of exposure to fire. The photograph produced (Exhibit 1.) is an accurate photographic representation of the body as I first saw it on my arrival at the culvert that morning; that is an accurate version. I did not examine the body very closely before having it removed. I was able to see whether the person was dead or not. I say the person was dead. I was not there when the body was removed. Subsequently that morning, at about 11.0'clock, I made an external examination of the body of the deceased at the Hospital Morgue at Albury. The first thing to do was to remove the sacking or bag. As far as I recall I, in fact, removed the sacking. Looking at Exhibit 3., I think that is the bag which was removed from the head of the deceased

by me at the morgue. After I removed the bag there was a piece of towelling around the head. Looking at Exhibit 4., I think that is the towel which was removed from the head. There was no appearance of the bag having been tied or fastened around the head that I could see. There was nothing to show that the towel had been fastened in any way. As I ~~for~~ found the towel on the face it was doubly folded. As it lay on the face I cannot remember which portion of the towel was burnt away. There was a sign of clothing of some kind on the body; there was some clothing on the body, but it was difficult to say what it was. Looking at Exhibit 5, I think those are the portions of the material which I found on the body of the deceased when I examined it. I have no recollection of whether it was the back or the front of the pyjama coat which was on the body. I made a note at the time. The document I hold in my hand contains modified notes of my evidence. They are not in my hand writing, but they are marked and scored by my hand writing. This is not the note I actually made at the time. It is a typewritten document. I did not say that I could not say whether they were pyjamas or not, I did not mention the word pyjamas at all. I removed whatever clothing there remained on the body. As far as I recall I put that clothing to one side, and it was handed to the police. I cannot remember whether Constable Kelly was present at that time or not. There was more than one police officer present. Having removed the bag, the towel, and the clothing, the body was in a charred state, and, first of all, in the head there were multiple wounds. The position of the body as it was in the mortuary was that it was curled on its right side. It was still curled up when it was brought in. The thighs were bent up to the abdomen. The knees were bent up towards the abdomen. Rigor mortis was still present. The body was quite stiff. I made post mortem notes at the time.

I say that the body was quite stiff. The photograph produced (Exhibit 6) represents fairly the position of the body as I saw it as the ~~at~~ Abbury Morgue. The body, ~~was~~ generally, showed signs of being exposed to heat. Parts of the skin were dried and charred and black. That I concluded was evidence of exposure to fire. As to which parts were most damaged by fire, the left side of the body was mainly charred and dry; the skin was dry, and the feet were charred, and the left side of the back. The body was deeply burnt in the left side of the back towards the buttocks. The depth that the buttocks were burnt was almost down to the bone. The flesh had been destroyed and had been burnt away, almost down to the bone. The rectum was exposed. I should think that was as the result of the destruction of the surrounding flesh. As to the extent to which the lower limbs were burnt, the feet were badly burnt, the legs were charred and scarred. As to a description of what I discovered on the skull, on the left side of the skull there were eight linear wounds running along the left side of the skull, and on the forehead on the left side there was a gaping wound about an inch and a half across, so deep that it exposed portion of the brain. About an inch below the right eye was a small wound. Then there were many minor abrasions on the skull as well - on the head. The eight linear wounds were on the left side of the head over the temple. Each of those linear wounds was approximately an inch and a half long. As to whether I felt the bone underneath the area of those wounds, the bone was smashed and loose. Underneath that area the bones were loose and smashed. There was some blood from those wounds, not very much. The wound on the left frontal bone did not involve the eye. It was above the eye. That wound was about an inch and a half from side to side - both ways. It was about an inch and a half by an inch and a half. The bone had been driven in.

The brain was exposed through that hole. The wound beneath the right eye was a small puncture wound. I examined it closely at the time. I was able to form an opinion as to that wound; at the time I thought it might be a bullet wound. I found a wound on the cheek bone beneath the left eye; there was a wound beneath the left eye. That was a puncture wound, but not a very large one. The bone was broken. There were other superficial wounds on the head in addition to the ones I have described, there were multiple superficial wounds. At about 11 o'clock on that morning I conducted the more detailed post mortem examination. I dissected the skull. It revealed compound fractures of the skull on the left side beneath the linear wounds, which I have already described, on the temple, and in the forehead. The brain was injured on the frontal lobe. It was bruised and contused. I do not recall anything else besides it being bruised and contused. As to whether bruising indicates any laceration, it was crushed in the frontal lobe. That is something more than bruising. It was lacerated and torn. There had been bleeding of the brain at that site. As to whether I have anything else to say about the skull or the brain, only that the course of the wound under the right eye was traced as far as possible, but no definite track could be found suggesting a bullet. That was at my first examination. The heart and lungs appeared to be quite normal, no disease or injury. All the abdominal organs were normal except the gall bladder, which contained stones. I found nothing unusual about the rest of her body at all, internally. As far as I could see from her genital organs she had not born children. At the time of my examination she was not pregnant. I did not send any of the stomach content for analysis. At the time of my post mortem examination there was nothing that suggested poisoning, and I smelt nothing that suggested poisoning. I took no steps to have an analysis of the

stomach content. I did not deem it necessary. In my opinion the body would have been put in the bag before rigor mortis had set in. As to my reason for saying that, before rigor mortis sets in the body is flaccid and slack and can be bundled up; when a body was in the position she was when rigor mortis set in it would be almost impossible to get her into a bag. Four days later, on the 4th September, 1934, I made an X-ray examination of the head and neck of the deceased. That X-ray examination revealed something that caused me to believe there was a foreign body ~~in~~ in the neck. As a result of that I made a further examination of the body. As a result of my examination I found something on the left side of the neck; I found a bullet. The bullet produced is similar to the bullet that I found and removed from the neck of the deceased. I could not swear it is the bullet.

EXHIBIT 21.....BULLET FOR IDENTIFICATION.

I think Detective Elmond was present at the time of my examination. I think I handed the bullet to him. At the time of that examination I did not trace the course of the bullet from the point of entry right to where I found it. As a result of my examination of the body both before and after I made my post mortem examination I concluded that the cause of death was due to the severe head injuries involving laceration of the brain. As to ~~the~~ what would have to be used, in my opinion, to cause injuries of that nature ---- MR. FAZIO OBJECTED.

TO MR. READ: As to what degrees of violence in my opinion would be required to cause injuries to the skull of the nature that I discovered, heavy blows. In my opinion the injuries I found over the left eye and in the temporal region could not have been self inflicted. I can express an opinion as to how long prior to the 1st of September that death had occurred. My opinion is that it must have been more than 24 hours - up to three or four days.