

mouth to dissolve certain portions, or loosen the filling on the edges. When that took place, and the antagonising tooth struck the surface, it would be quite easy to dislodge it. By that, I mean the contact of the oral fluids in the early stages of the setting, before it had time to set properly. Once it^{has} set properly, as to whether the acid condition of the mouth will cause it to come out, I^{had} some ^{have} porcelains fillings in the mouth for 15 or 20 years and they are almost as good now as the day they were put in. As to whether it is my opinion that a porcelain filling which has been properly and successfully inserted in the mouth, is not likely to be caused to come out of its fitment by any acid condition of the mouth, I would say the answer to that is, had the filling been properly inserted and properly insulated for 24 to 48 hours, there would be no possibility of the oral fluids of the mouth or any acids taken through the mouth, such as tea drinking dislodging it or dissolving it. Listening to a further passage of Mr. O'Brien's evidence, concerning the possible effect of formalin on fillings, my answer to that is the same - if it did not happen with one, why should it happen with the other?

TO THE CORONER: I have spoken of an inclusion lacuna. As to whether that appears on the photograph Exhibit 20; the tooth in this instance is missing. There is another tooth moving into the space. Of course, it is very hard for me to determine from which side that photo has been taken. It would depend on light and shade. It would depend mostly on the way the light and shade was thrown. I hear you read portion of the evidence given by Dr. Magnus on page 66 - "As to whether I looked at the photograph produced (Exhibit 20) and see if I cannot see that very lacuna on that tooth, that tooth is missing;" I agree with that. I hear you read a further portion "There appears to be a shadow in that area; but I honestly could not suggest that it was a gap similar to this." I think he is referring to the light and shade when that photograph was taken.

On the other side there is a gap not quite so big. In the taking of the photograph, there is something on the cavity the same as that, but not quite so great. I also hear you read - "As to whether it bears any resemblance in my view to the inclusion lacuna that is shown on the cast (Exhibit "A") I do not think this is a lateral tooth. I think I am talking about a cuspid tooth on the photograph." It is very hard to tell here. It does not show enough of the tooth to determine whether that is a canine tooth. There is not sufficient to show that. It would be quite possible, if one notices the angle of the left upper lateral incisor, there is a shade starting from the gingival margin. There is a distinct angle from the gingival margin down towards the lip line and it is quite possible that the shadows are the cause of this, not because there is no tooth there, but, evidently from the light going across the mouth. I hear you read further from the evidence given by Dr. Magnus "Asked whether allyou can get me to agree to is that in the photograph there is a similar impression to what I see on the lateral incisor in the cast, I say yes." He appears to say the depression in the tooth, as shown in that photograph corresponds with that model. As to whether the lateral incisor is missing in the photograph, I cannot say that. The angle of the teeth may be caused through light and shade from a photographic point of view. Photographs are very deceptive. If it is there, it may be the same one as is on the model.

MR. READ: Looking at photograph, Exhibit 20, as to whether I said to His Worship that what appears to be that gap on the left hand side of the upper jaw is effected by the shade, I said it was quite possible it would be effected by the shade. In other words it is a shadow being thrown from the left to the right of the photograph. As to whether the light is on the right hand side, throwing the shadow to the left, I noticed on the right upper portion of the face the right seems greater than on the left. Taking the whole photograph, as to whether

it is my opinion that the light in that photograph is on the right or on the left hand side of the face, the light appears to come from the left hand side of the face, here.

TO MR. BARRY: If I were asked whether I was able to say, looking at that photograph, that the left upper lateral incisor had been removed, I would say no, I would not say that it had been taken out. Looking at the photograph you hand me, I recognise that as an enlargement of the mouth of Philomena Morgan. As to whether it is possible that that tooth next to the left central incisor is the left lateral incisor, I could not determine that because, as the photo shows here, there is not room for a full tooth. It is quite possible the tooth is moving up into position for the eruption of the canine. The tooth on the cadaver which bears the inclusion lacuna is the left upper lateral incisor. As to whether I see on that photograph, as Dr. Magnus did, a depression which is recognisable as an inclusion lacuna on the left upper lateral incisor, apparently it would be where I indicate, but that is very hard for me to determine. As to whether there is a shadow on that tooth which resembles the place where the inclusion lacuna is shown on the tooth in the cast, I should say, apparently, it is where I indicate. That is 11 o'clock just as it is in the cast, in my opinion. As to whether it is possible, in my opinion, that this tooth visible in photographs Exhibit 33, as the tooth first on the left of the left central incisor is the left lateral incisor, as it shows on the ~~photograph~~ enlargement, it is quite possible for it to be a left lateral.

..... EXHIBIT "H".....Enlargement of photograph
of mouth of Philomena Morgan.

(At this stage Mr. Barry tendered, as an exhibit, an enlargement of the photograph, Exhibit 20.)

..... EXHIBIT "J"..... Enlargement of photograph,
Exhibit 20.

I examine the two casts, Exhibit "A" and Exhibit 12; as to whether that is a cast of the mouth, of course, one is

✓
M/E L.

BELL

not quite so good a cast as the other. As to my being quite satisfied that that cast is a cast of the mouth of the corpse, I should say Exhibit "A" was a bad impression of the same subject of Exhibit 12.

..... EXHIBIT "K"..... (For identification) (Photograph of cast said to be of the mouth of the deceased.)

Looking at Exhibit "K", as to whether that is a photograph of a similar cast to the one I bear in my hand, marked Exhibit "A" it appears to me there is a great fac-simile but there is a missing portion here, where, apparently, the impression has been made. The teeth look practically the same size but the jagged edges on the ~~occlusal~~ occlusal surfaces do not show on this model. As to whether the photograph which I have in my hand is a photograph of a cast of the four front teeth in the cadaver, it does not appear absolutely correct with the cadaver.

..... EXHIBIT "L"..... (For identification) (Same as Ex.K only a darker print.)

Looking at the photograph you now produce, one seems a fac-simile of the other, only one is darker than the other. Looking at the photograph you now produce, that is also a photograph of a cast, similar to Exhibit "A", purporting to be a cast of the four front teeth of the deceased. I should say this was a photograph of that cast. There is a portion of the occlusal mesio surface of the left lateral missing. That is a fault in the casting.

??..... EXHIBIT "M"....., Photograph of cast of four front teeth of deceased.

I see photographs Exhibits "K" and "L". I see the way the light has fallen on the left upper lateral incisor. Taking the enlargement (Exhibit "H") and assisted by those photographs of the cast (Exhibits K and L) as to whether I have anything to say about the shadow that has fallen on the left side of the upper teeth, I should say that Exhibit K was a photograph of the cast of that mouth, but, owing to inexperience of casting the model, it has become faulty and distorted. Looking at the photograph you now produce, that is a photograph of the mouth of the body.

M/ECL.

BELL.

..... EXHIBIT "N"..... photograph of mouth of the body.

Looking at the photograph you now produce, I see what has been done there. I see that a photograph of the cast of the teeth has been placed within the mouth of the enlarged photograph of Ann Philomena Morgan.

..... EXHIBIT "O"..... Composite photograph of a cast placed in the mouth of the enlarged photograph of Ann Philomena Morgan,

As to whether that assists me to form any opinion of whether or not there is a left lateral incisor missing from the mouth of Philomena Morgan in the photograph Exhibit 20, I should say, according to this photograph, the cast has been placed in the mouth of Philomena and the cast appeared to be a fac-simile of that. Owing to the faulty workmanship, the cast has not gone down to the bottom of the mould. I see you have a pair of calipers. As to whether they are any use to me in enabling me to measure points, taking the inclusion lacuna in the photograph and comparing the measurements of the teeth of the model, I will do it if I possibly can. It is not possible because that is an enlarged scale.

TO MR. READ: Exhibit "A" is what I have been referring to as faulty and distorted. I said this was not a good cast. As to why the cast is faulty, it has not been taken correctly by an expert. It is distorted because it has not been taken correctly. We would call it distorted from our point of view.

TO MR. BARRY: There is not necessarily any sinister implication in the word "distorted".

(Signed) LEONARD BELL.

TAKEN AND SWORN BEFORE ME AT MELBOURNE THIS 28th DAY OF MARCH 1944.

W. J. ...
.....
CORONER.

M/ECL/

BELL.

Government Shorthand Writer's Office

Melbourne, 4 / 5 / 19 44

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing typewritten pages, numbered as under, are a correct transcript of the Shorthand Notes of Evidence of—

	<i>Page</i>
WARREN CHARLES LINKENBAGH ...	159.

HERBERT STANLEY THOMAS ...	162 - 163.
MICHAEL PATRICK O'RILEY ...	164.

ARTHUR CLIFFORD DE LA RUE ...	169 - 170.
HERBERT WILLIAM LA TROBE ...	171 - 179.

GILBERT JAMES HALSALL ...	190.
ALEXANDER JOHN WHITE ...	191.
JOHN JAMES MORGAN ...	192 - 202.

taken by me at Melbourne on the 28th day of March 19 44

at an Inquest upon the body of a woman whose body was found at Albury on
into a fire at 1st September, 1934.

B. J. Mac
Licensed Shorthand Writer.

Government Shorthand Writer's Office

M

Melbourne, 4 / 5 / 1944.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing typewritten pages, numbered as under, are a correct transcript of the Shorthand Notes of Evidence of—

	<i>Page</i>
LEONARD FRANK ALLMOND	160.
GEORGE BRUCE	161.


JAMES HECTOR ROGERS	165 - 168

JOSEPH VICTOR RAMUS	180.
WILLIAM EDWARD DAVIS	181 - 189.

LEONARD BELL	203 - 219.

taken by me at Melbourne on the 28th day of March 1944

at an Inquest { upon the body of a woman whose body was found at Albury on
into a fire at 1st September, 1934.



Licensed Shorthand Writer.

FIFTH DAY

RESUMED INQUISITION

held at

THE CITY MORGUE - MELBOURNE

on

WEDNESDAY, 29TH MARCH, 1944.

UPON THE BODY OF A WOMAN WHOSE BODY WAS FOUND AT ALBURY
ON 1ST SEPTEMBER, 1944.

Wednesday
29/4/29

BENJAMIN GRIFFITHS, on his oath saith:

My name is Benjamin Griffiths and I am a storeman residing at Railway Avenue, Blackheath, New South Wales. In about 1926 after my marriage to my wife I went to live with Mr. John Morgan, the witness who gave evidence yesterday. At that time he was living at the corner of Great North Road and Lyons Road West, Five Dock. At that time in 1926 during my stay there was living in the house my wife and Mr. Morgan and myself. The three of us were living in that house. I continued to live with Mr. Morgan until somewhere in August 1929. That date of 1926 may not be correct. It is possible it was early in 1927 that I went to live with Mr. Morgan. Whilst my wife and I were living in that house with Mr. Morgan I saw a ~~great~~ ~~girl~~ girl come to that house who was called Phil or ~~Phyllis~~ Phyllis. I could not say how many times exactly she came there whilst I was living there, but she made periodical visits. She mostly came on a week-end. I think she would be a little older than 15. I think she would be about 16 when I first saw her. I am not too clear what I knew her as, after what I heard yesterday, but I believe I knew her as Phyllis Morgan or Phyllis Routledge. She was commonly addressed as Phil. I think I saw Mrs. Routledge at Mr. Morgan's home between 1927 and 1929. I know I did. I would not be positive whether she came with her daughter. My recollection is that on many times the girl came without the mother and at other times the mother without the girl. Mr. Morgan is naturally very fond of any children and particularly fond of Phil. Since I left Mr. Morgan's home in 1929 I have not seen Phil that I can recollect. At that time she would be just about on 18 years of age. On the 19th

GRIFFITHS.

RP/EC/1.

220

January 1937 some detectives at Five Dock Police Station showed me a photograph. I had just come back from a trip away on Christmas holidays and I was approached in Five Dock Park by Detectives Carroll and Thompson. They showed me a photo and asked me did I know who it was. At first I think I was a bit doubtful and either Carroll or Thompson asked me did I ever live with Jack Morgan. When they said that I said, "Yes, that is the little girl we used to call Phil". After we had a talk they invited me to go to Five Dock Police Station and showed me what I believe to be the official photos of the "Pyjama Girl". They asked me would I care to express an opinion as to which one, if any, resembled Phyllis. I think I selected the centre photograph. I do not think Exhibit E is the Police Circular I was shown. A document similar to the one produced was shown to me and I said I thought I recognised the centre face there as being a likeness to Phyllis Morgan.

EXHIBIT NO.45.....Crime Circular dated 6/9/34.

I said that I believed the centre one of those photographs was very much like Phyllis Morgan as I knew her. I went to the Sydney University to see the body. The body was in a liquid bath. I viewed that body. I think that body was Philomena Morgan's. Since I came to Melbourne, yesterday afternoon after the adjournment of the Court I inspected the body of the deceased lying at this Morgue, and I believe that is the same body as I saw in Sydney in the formalin bath. I thought the body that was in the formalin bath was the body of the girl I knew as Phil. May I say that I think that body has changed quite a lot since then, there is discolouration and to me yesterday it appeared to be a little plumper than when I saw it in Sydney. I think you might use the word "disfigured";

GRIFFITHS.

✓
RP/EC/2.

RP

221

it seems that there is something different about it. It is discoloured. When I saw it the flesh was not discoloured. When I saw the body it was in the formalin bath and the head was lifted out and I was given quite a long time to study the body. I was not rushed in any way. I would say the hair was wet. I doubt if formalin was coming out of the hole in the skull when I saw the head because I think Detective Carroll asked would I like a better view and could he raise the head or assist me in any way, and my recollection is that the fluid was affecting my eyes, making them water, and either Thompson or Wilks told me I could stand back a bit and they went on with the job of raising the head so that I could get a better look at it. I believe that the body in the morgue here is the same body, but it looks different. The face appears to me to have gone through some process and it is more disfigured than when I saw it in Sydney in 1937. It is definitely of a much darker colour. Having seen the face of the body in the Morgue here, I think it is Phyllis's body. I doubt very much whether I could specialise on the face and mention any particular features. I would say there are plenty of girls I knew at that time that I could not pinpoint their features.

TO MR. BARRY: It was put to me that I said I saw the body in 1937 at the University and I thought it was Phyllis Morgan. It is the fact that I was positive it was Phyllis Morgan and I said quite definitely it was Phyllis Morgan. That definite identification was made in 1937. I think I signed a statement to the Police at Five Dock to that effect. This statement produced bears my handwriting at the bottom. The statement reads:

RP/EC/3.

GRIFFITHS.

"

Five Dock Police Station.
11th March, 1937.

"Benjamin Griffiths,

States. I am a Oxy-Welder by occupation and I reside at No.3 Heath Street Five Dock. In 1926 I married and I went with my wife to John Morgans home at the corner of Great North and Lyons Roads, Five Dock to live. Whilst residing there I met a girl who was introduced to me as Phyllis Morgan, I understood that girl to be John Morgans Grand Daughter. I knew her Mother as Mrs. Routledge. The girl at the time that I first met her would be about 16 years of age, she was a constant visitor to where I was staying for the next three years, up to 1929. During the period that I knew her I took particular notice of her as there were rumours about that she was John Morgans daughter, and I used to study her to see whether she showed any likeness to Morgan. The last time that I saw the girl would be about the middle of 1929. On the 19th January, 1937 I saw Detectives Carroll and Thompson at the Five Dock Police Station and they showed me a photo which was very like that of the girl that I knew as Phyllis Morgan. The same day I accompanied those Detectives to the Sydney University where I was shown the body of a girl. I identified that body to Detectives Carroll and Thompson, definitely as the body of the girl that I knew as Phyllis Morgan. I am still of that same opinion.

(Signed) B.C. GRIFFITHS.

(Witness). R.R. CARROLL.
Det. Const. 1/C. "

EXHIBIT "P".....Statement of Witness Griffiths made at Five Dock Police Station.

RP/EC/3.

GRIFFITHS.

I have no doubt whatever as to the correctness of the identification I made in 1937. I look at photograph Exhibit No.20. That photograph is very similar to Phyllis's photograph, but there is a faulty tooth there that I do not think she had. The photograph is identical to Phyllis Morgan's appearance as I recall it except for that tooth. I point out the discrepancy between the appearance depicted in that photograph and the appearance of Phyllis Morgan. I am referring to that gap (indicates on photograph). I believe that photograph was first produced to me by Detective-Sergeant Bowie at my own home in Five Dock. At that time I passed some remark about the tooth, either that or Detective Bowie drew my attention to them and I said I was not an expert on teeth and I thought that would be better left to the Police experts. I believe in about April 1939 I made a statutory declaration affirming my identification of the body. In about the year 1941 Doctor Palmer-Benbow called on me and showed me a photograph similar to Exhibit No.20. The discrepancy in the tooth was not on the photograph Dr. Benbow showed me. I wrote my name on one photograph, but I believe it was the one that I consider to be the right photograph without the tooth missing. I do not remember having much discussion with Mr. Morgan in 1937 about identifying the body until we met at the Five Dock Police Station to make the statements. We were together the night we made those statements. I have never heard Mr. Morgan say positively it was Phil. He has always said it was the dead ring of Phil, but he would never be what you would call conclusive. I say that the body now appears to me to be plumper than it was, that is more swollen. When I identified the body at the University in 1937 I had full opportunity to view the body. I made a close examination of it. With regard to

the suggestion made to me that the body was fished out of a formalin vat and so on, I say that did not impair in any way my opportunity to observe it. I was given every consideration and I really believe the head portion of the body was raised above the cloth that was over it, and it had been out for, say, a couple of minutes before I went back to the bath to view it. When I viewed it in the first case the body was actually in the bath. Then I think one of the Detectives said it was a very serious thing and I should take my time and not rush it. I said then, "that stuff gets in your eyes a bit". They agreed it affected your eyes. One of them asked could he raise the head or any part of the body out to give me a better view. I said, "Yes" and stood back from the bath it was in until that part was over. The body was not removed right out from the bath. The cloth I spoke of was covering the bath. To my recollection there was a lid and then a cloth and then the bath. I believe I ~~realized~~ realized the seriousness of the task and I gave the matter full consideration and it was after that that I came to that conclusion. I believe that Detective Wilks said that I had spent quite a lot of time and I ought to know what I was talking about and it was also a very good identification. The child was known to ^{me} be as either Phil Morgan or Phil Routledge. She definitely had a surname. I knew Mrs. Routledge the mother of Phil Morgan or Routledge.

TO MR. REID: I look at photograph Exhibit No.20. I say that is a good likeness of the girl I knew as Phil except for that tooth. I believe that tooth was first discussed by me with anybody when Detective Bowie came to get the photograph signed. This document produced bears my signature. I remember making a statement to Detective-

GRIFFITHS.

✓
RP/EC/6.

[Handwritten signature]
225

Inspector Bowie on the 22nd January, 1939. The statement reads:

"

3 Heath Street,
Five Dock, 22nd Jan. 1939.

"Benjamin Charles Griffiths states

I reside at the above address. Some years ago I was well acquainted with a woman named or now known as Mrs. Routledge. She was the step daughter of a man named James John Morgan in whose house I used to live. She had a daughter named Philomena, who was usually called Phyllis. I knew the daughter well up to the time she was seventeen or eighteen years of age. About two years ago I was requested by the police to visit the Sydney University and view the dead body of a woman which body I was informed was that of the victim of the Albury murder. On viewing the body I believed it to resemble the girl Philomena, who I knew at that time was missing. I informed the Police to that effect. On this date I was shown three Photos by Detective Inspector Bowie. I recognise those Photos as being of the girl Philomena. They are very good likenesses of the girl when she was about eighteen years of age. I notice that in the Photo marked (1) there are very definite spaces between some of the teeth. I did not take particular notice of the teeth of the dead woman I saw at the Sydney University. I have no doubt whatever that the Photos shown me today are those of the girl Philomena.

(Signed) B.C. GRIFFITHS.

Witness. LIONEL C. BOWIE.
Det. Insp. 3/c"

EXHIBIT NO.46.....Statement of Witness Griffiths made to
Detective-Inspector Bowie on 22/1/39.

RP/EC/7.

GRIFFITHS.

That statement was absolutely true. With regard to the passage "On this date I was shown three photos by Detective Inspector Bowie", I have no recollection of being shown the three photos produced. I have a recollection of one of them. When I viewed that body I was told that the head had been knocked about considerably and I was under the impression that the teeth were fitted in and, as that statement says, it was not Philomena's teeth I was talking about but the teeth in the body. In other words, the photos were good photographs of Philomena Morgan, but on the body I viewed I did not notice any gaps in the teeth.

TO THE CORONER: I would not be prepared to swear that these two photographs produced are photographs of Phil. They are like her in some respects, but in other respects I would say they would definitely not be her photo.

EXHIBIT No.47.....Photograph (for identification).

In my opinion photograph Exhibit No.47 is not a photograph of her.

EXHIBIT No.48.....Photograph(for identification).

With regard to Exhibit No.48, I would not commit myself one way or the other in regard to this photograph. That is probably an assumed pose. I have a good recollection of Phil in life. I would say she was more of a whisp of a girl, rather flat chested. I doubt if I could swear to her hair. I doubt if I could tell you the colour of my own daughter's hair. Her hair would be dark hair, ~~not~~ not black but dark hair. I could not say what colour eyes she had. I have no idea. When I knew her she mostly wore a beret pulled down over her ears. I said she stayed a week-end with us. Possibly that week-end would mean a Saturday night to a Sunday. If she was not wearing a

RP/EC/8.

GRIFFITHS.

beret all the time, her hair was down over her ears and I did not see her ears. Photograph No.48 seems to show the hair a bit short compared with what she used to wear it. Usually she wore her hair covering her ears. She was not a tall girl. At the age I knew her she would be approximately the same height as I am, possibly a bit smaller. I think my height is 5 feet 4", but I will not swear to it. She was approximately 18 when I knew her. I would say that ~~type~~^{height} is just ordinary for a woman. I have explained that I think this body is the same body but it looks different to me now. I have no doubt that the body here is that of Philomena Morgan; I have no doubt whatever.

(SIGNED) B.C. GRIFFITHS.

TAKEN AND SWORN BEFORE ME AT MELBOURNE THIS 29th DAY OF MARCH, 1944.


.....
CORONER.

RP/EC/9.

GRIFFITHS.

MABEL L- L-STRANGE BLACKET, on her oath saith:

My name is Mabel L-Strange Blacket and I reside at Wakatu Flats, 102 Burton Street, Darlinghurst. I realise it has been requested that I be brought to Melbourne to tell the Coroner something about this inquest. I never knew Mrs. Agostini and I have never seen her. As to whether I knew a girl named Phyllis or Philomena Morgan, I did not know her by any name, but she came to my office. I never knew a girl named Philomena Morgan, or Philomena with some other surname. I never knew a girl as Philomena Morgan, who told me her name was Philomena Morgan. I had an office in Pitt Street, an employment agency; I supplied people for work. I advertised a position for Henty on the 7th August 1934. When I got to my office in the morning, there was a ~~girl~~^{girl} standing there, waiting. She was in a very agitated state of mind, as she said "Are you Miss Blacket?" I said "Yes, but please let me open my office door first and get in and you can tell me whatever is the matter. You are in a terrible state." I opened the office and the girl came in. She said "You advertised a job at Henty. I want to go." I said "But that is a housemaid's job and you don't look to me like a housemaid." She said "No, I am not a housemaid but I want you to send me to that job." I said "Do you know I am responsible for fares and I must cover myself and you must tell me who you are and why you want to go, on account of me being able to cover my expenses." She said "No, I will tell you nothing." I said "Well, without a reference or without your name, I cannot help you." I said "Won't you sit down and tell me what your trouble is." She sat down at my desk and she cried bitterly. I said "It is no good crying, tell me what is the trouble and I might be able to help you." I suppose, really, that girl was with me an hour and three-quarters, if not longer, and I could get nothing out of her. At last, she stood. She walked to my outer door and said to me "Miss Blacket, you will always

regret that you didn't send me." She never came back again. I ~~have~~^{had} never seen the girl before. I could not get her confidence at all. Probably, if I had got her confidence, I could have helped her. As to whether it is a fact she first of all said she wanted a job at Albury, "She said "I want to get to Albury". She said she wanted to get to Albury, and I said "The job is at Henty." She said "As long as I get near Albury, I will get there; if I have to walk, I will go." She came in and said "You are advertising a job at Henty." She did not say "Have you any jobs at Albury." She said she wanted to go to Albury and I tried to show her that Henty was not Albury, and I did not want to pay fares for her to go to Henty merely because she wanted to get to Albury. Going to Henty would help her to get to Albury. She did not say to me "Have you any jobs at Albury; I see you are advertising one at Henty." I told the police she wanted to go to Albury. I do not know whether she went away. She did not come back later in the day and say "Have any jobs turned up at Albury." I definitely only had one interview with that girl. On the 7th August 1934 I advertised the job. That may have been the only job I advertised for Henty. I do so many jobs at Henty, but I cannot remember the hotel at Henty that I used to do. This advertisement related to a hotel at Henty. I have been carrying on an employment agency for a number of years. Off and on, I have been in employment agencies for 12 or 15 years. I had quite a good connection, particularly a country clientele. In the course of a ~~man~~^{day}, I agree I see dozens and dozens of girls. I remember this girl. As to why I say 1934 and as to whether I advertised positions in 1931 and 1932 for Henty, I cannot tell you that; I may have, but this 7th August stays in my mind because of the sorrow of this girl. The girl did not come back to my office for a second time. It was 1934.

As to how I fix the year, all cuttings in my office have to be kept. When the Albury murder was first mentioned, my mind flew back, I am very observant, and I had an intuition. The 7th August, I will always remember. I recollect that because I looked up the advertisement. That is how I remember it was 1934. The first photograph I saw was exhibit No.7, which you now hand me. From that photograph, I definitely recognised the girl who had visited me and wanted to go to Albury. As to how long it was after the body was found that I saw that photograph, I should say within a week ^{or} ~~of~~ ten days. I did not see the photo in the paper. The police brought it to my office. I then told them that was a woman who had been applying to me. I was taken to the University to see the body shortly afterwards, - between 5 and 6 weeks after. When I was taken there, I decided it was definitely the body of the girl who came to my office. I think Dr. Benbow came to see me about 1940. He showed me a photograph. As to whether the photograph you hand me (Exhibit 20) is a copy of the photograph he showed me. It was a photograph like that. He showed me a photograph like this, but there was something different. There were no gaps in the teeth of the girl who came to me. He showed me this photograph (Ex.20). That is similar to the photograph he showed me. There is a difference between that photograph and the girl I saw. There is a difference on the photograph. This girl who came to see me had good teeth and did not appear to have a gap as appears in Exhibit 20. As to whether I paid particular attention to her hair, this girl had a hat which came well over her face and what hair I did see I would call a, light brown hair. It was not a beret. This girl who came to me had blue, or blue-grey eyes - more blue. I noticed that, I was with her so long, I could take in every detail of the girl. Asked to describe any other girl who came to see me that day, no others came in that

distressed. This girl had a very nice, full mouth. I would say she was a pretty girl, a nice girl. I did not notice her ears. The hat came down over her face and the hair was down to where I indicate. Looking at the photograph (Exhibit 48) I would say her hair was longer than this when I saw her. I am definitely sure of that. I could not see her ears. One side of her hair would come down. As to whether I think that is a fair side-faced portrait of the girl I saw, I would not say it was a good picture. Asked whether it is her, I would say she has the same retruse nose. As to whether it was a retruse nose this girl had, I would not call it a long nose. I think retrouse means nice. I do not think Exhibit 47 is a true indication of the girl who came. It is very hard to say. It is hard because it is a very bad photograph. Holding that beside Exhibit 20, and asked to tell you what differences there are in the two photos, I would say the eyes are looking down in one, and the eyes are looking up in the other. That would give a very different contour to the face. She had her mouth opened in one and shut in the other. That makes another different contour. One girl is fuller in the face than the other. It would surprise me to know those photographs were taken on the same day, at the same time, at the same place, of the same girl. If I had been shown either of the photographs, (Exhibits 47 and 48) I could have remembered the girl from one of those photographs. The one I remember her by is that side on, bright, smiling face. She was not unhappy all the time she was with me. I could give a cheery word and say something to try and cheer her. You do not understand two women together. She looked like that serious photograph (Exhibit 47) in her serious moments. That is not a fair likeness of her, she was prettier than that. Since I have come to Melbourne, I have seen the body lying dead at the City Morgue. I agree, I think that is the same girl that is represented in photograph Exhibit 20. I

never knew her name. I only saw her on one occasion. As to whether, from the time I saw it in the formalin bath in 1934, I saw any change, it is very discoloured, and it is disfigured, I suppose, from being pulled about, but I can see the same contour, and I can still see the width of the eyes. She had big eyes. I definitely say that girl is the girl who came to me. I should say that the corpse lying dead at the morgue has large eyes. I am speaking, probably of 1934. I cannot see much of the eyes now to give an opinion. I met Mrs. Routledge in ~~1931~~ 1941. No one brought her to my office. I met her in my office. When she came to me I did not know who she was. I made an affidavit in support of an application for Writ of ~~scertiorari~~ directed towards the Albury Coroner to re-open the inquest. Paragraph 13 of that Affidavit, which you read, is correct, except that she told me what her name was afterwards. Before she told me what her name was, I recognised the likeness between this girl who called in 1934 and the woman who called in 1941. She was grey haired at the time. That was before I knew who she was or whether she had come to look for a job. I knew that by her manner of speaking and her mannerisms. I hear you read another paragraph - "Some time after, Dr. Benbow showed me a hat. I recognised it at once as exactly similar to the one worn by the young lady who had come to see me as aforesaid. I arranged it the way she wore it. I am positive about this hat." That is correct. It was a fawn hat. There was nothing unusual about it. It was a felty or furry thing. I recognised that hat, brought to me by ~~Dr. Benbow~~ as exactly similar to the one worn by the girl seeking the job at Albury. As to whether there is anything else I would like to tell His Worship concerning anything which might assist at this inquiry, I suppose, if I was to say I just know it is her, would that help? I know it is her.

M/ECL.

BLACKET.

MR. MONAHAN: It is safe to say I have had a life time of interviewing women. In the course of my business, I see all sorts and sizes, day in and day out. I have cultivated a memory for the faces of the women who come to me. It was my business to do that. They would come under any name, and I had to remember them. It was my job. I had to be sure before I would recommend a girl to a position. I had to be sure it was not one who had already let me down. Names were not so important to me as faces. Over and above faces, I have ability to recognise and note details in matters of dress, such as hats. We can all do that; some in a catty and some in a very nice way. I can notice such ~~that~~ details. I have also cultivated the habit of remembering the circumstances surrounding my different clients. It was the circumstances which concerned this girl's visit which made me feel uneasy as soon as I read of a girl at Albury. This girl was desperate to get to Albury. For that reason, too, she wanted a job at Henty to get her that far on her way. That is what brought me into this case. Looking at the hat you produce, I think, with some pins, I can put that in the shape the girl wore it. That resembles the hat the girl was wearing that day. It was a fawn hat, although this looks as though it has been in water. I demonstrate how she wore it. She had it up on the right hand side and pulled down on the left. I have a good mental picture of the hat. That hat appears to resemble the general shape and material of the hat worn by the girl.

XXX..... EXHIBIT "Q".....(For identification)
Woman's hat.

discovery
As a result of the Albury ~~message~~ ^{discovery} I sent a message and some police interviewed me. As to the first one of the New South Wales police who interviewed me, two detectives came to my house on a Saturday afternoon. I think that murder must have come out on the placards on the Saturday. Going home, I had a hunch it was this girl. I thought "I cannot go home

until I ring the police, even though they may think I am mad." I rang the Darlinghurst Police station and they were inclined to laugh at me. They said "We have not got any statement ourselves." I said "Perhaps I am cuckoo, but I do not think so; would you mind coming to the house and I ~~would~~^{will} give you a statement." After a little hesitation, the upshot of it was that two detectives did come. I cannot remember those two detectives. I do not think it was Detective Wilks, because he came into the picture later when he came to see me about those photographs. I gave those two detectives a written statement. It was along the lines of what I have told His Worship about this distressed girl who had been in my office. Her visit to me had only been three weeks before the discovery of the body. I gave them a detailed statement. That interview at my home was on a Saturday afternoon. On the following Monday morning, at the request of the police, I went down to the Criminal Investigation Branch. I had to give the statement again in a room where plenty of typewriters were clicking at me. I gave the statement as I gave previously. That statement is in Sydney. That was on the Monday. On the Tuesday, at the request of the police, I again went to the C.I.B. and interviewed Superintendent Prior. At that time, he had my written statement I had made the day before. As to whether he sent for some detective who was handling this case in those days, he sent for Det. Serg. McRea. In the presence of McRea, Superintendent Prior did not read my statement out, he looked at it; he read it silently. I could see he should not have said it, but he said "These statements are identical." Upon thinking, I remember he said "These descriptions are identical." McRae had brought something into the room with him. I grant he had brought in the official description of the body. Prior observed to McRae "These descriptions are identical." Next day, the police sent a car for me and took me to the Branch again and showed me a number of photographs. He said they were recent victims.

I perused those photographs and I was asked if I could recognise any of them. I was not able to do so. The girl I saw was not amongst those photographs. Subsequently to that, they took me to the University. I do not think that was on the same day, as far as I remember. They came up in the afternoon and got me again to go to the University. I think it must have been the next day. I then saw the same body which I saw in Melbourne on Monday. I have no doubt concerning whether or not it was the distressed girl who was trying to get to Albury on the 7th. I have no doubt it was the same girl shown in photograph Exhibit 20, at which I have looked.

TO MR. READ: Looking at the hat, (Exhibit Q) that is the hat I was describing to His Worship as ^{the} a fawn coloured hat which I remember this girl wearing that day. As to whether I recognise from that hat in that condition and in that shape, that it was a hat which the girl was wearing some years before, this girl was wearing a fawn hat. I observed details of clothes and this is the same ^{texture.} ~~hat~~. I told him she wore it up like that, and who is to prove I am wrong. As to whether that piece of material is what I saw and as to whether I am able to identify it as the hat ^{the} a girl was wearing, it was a fawn hat and turned up at the side. I should say it is of the same texture. This hat looks as though it had been submerged in water. As to why I think it has been submerged in water, water will make felt hats mouldy. This hat has little spots all over it. It is spotted and mouldy, like we get on our clothes. I feel confident in my own mind that piece of material is the hat that the girl was wearing who came to see me about a job at Henty in 1934. I am confident about it.

TO MR. BARRY: It is the material I am going by.

TO MR. READ: As to whether I said, when I read on the Saturday in Sydney of the finding of the girl's body in the culvert near Albury, that I knew at once it was the girl who had been to see me, I said I had an intuition at once "That is the girl who