

that Mrs. Routledge had had taken but of which she had never seen any sort of print or had any kind of proof made. When I visited Howard Harris in 1941 I had this picture Exhibit 20 in my possession. That date of 1941 is subject to qualification. It would not be much earlier, but it might be a little earlier because Exhibit 20 was actually taken in 1927 but it does not come into prominence until 1937. It comes into more prominence ~~when I came on to the job~~ ^{acquired it from Mrs Routledge} when I ~~came on to the job~~ in about 1941. I am asking Howard Harris "Can I get a ^{print} ~~print~~ from the negative". Incidentally, that is a trade name; I think it is Mr. Wiley who owns the business today. He looked up his ledger and took me to the box in which these negatives would be kept, according to his ledger list, and he immediately said, "This is strange, there are four negatives missing". Those were the four poses, - a side-face, this full-face of Exhibit 20, another semi-side-face which you see in Court, and another face which, if I remember rightly, is a three-quarter face too. Howard Harris searched and could not find them. He said, "It is a very strange thing, they have disappeared". So I was not able to get a negative. Then after the probate action I made another trip to Howard Harris to see if I could possibly find the negatives. Howard Harris was in a good deal of turmoil because the police had been there searching and searching and making a lot of trouble for him, and I am afraid I was the innocent cause because a small version of the picture Mr. Read has just shown me with the tooth restored was published and it caused a good deal of perturbation because the police thought that ~~police thought that~~ possibly there was a ^{duplicate} negative of that picture at Howard Harris's that they did not have and it would have been very awkward. So there were searches of

Howard Harris's and Howard Harris was not pleased to see me. Now, we get to the pictures themselves. This Exhibit 20 is not from the police negative at all; it is from a negative made by an outside photographer. That is not from the original negative at all, that is from a copy negative made, funnily enough, by a friend of mine and it has identifying marks on it which shows that to be so. A close inspection of the daylight proofs up at the C.I.B. here shows they are not even the original daylight proofs. They were all off bits and pieces as regards size, they have been finger-marked and finger-marked ad infinitum and very lately identifying numbers have been written on them. I wrote a letter to the Crown Solicitor, New South Wales, stigmatising this thing as a plain fraud and the Crown Solicitor in reply said that he had been shown prints - he meant proofs, not prints - by the police which had marks on the back which purported, the police said, to show that they came from Howard Harris. The Crown Solicitor was merely repeating what the police told him. I have had a look at those marks. They are certainly numbers and they have been pencilled in at a date going back only a few months. They are over-riding all the original finger-prints on those proofs. Those proofs were made by the police in their own Department. It is typical police work, odds and ends and pieces of paper, whereas I have two daylight prints from Howard Harris made in the ordinary photographer's fashion, all on standard size paper. One is of Mrs. Routledge and her child Bobby. The value of this is that it shows the kind of work Howard Harris does, his standard size paper and also the fact that he puts no ~~marking~~ ^{marking on} a daylight proof. One is of Mrs. Routledge and her daughter and her son Bobby, and the other is of another girl called Routledge

who is no relative at all but I ran her to earth because I just wanted to know. They are on the standard size that he uses for the purpose and there is no marking of any kind, whereas these four daylight proofs at the C.I.B. up here belong to the New South Wales Police. You will understand this has nothing to do with the Victorian Police. This is a print of Mrs Routledge, nothing to do with the case, but because the name was Routledge it was in the same box as the others. I have kept this because it is a specimen of Howard Harris's work showing that he puts no marks at all on the proofs that he issues and it is also a specimen of the size of paper which he uses, whereas the four prints which purport to be daylight proofs from Howard Harris are all different sizes and they should not be. The marking is only a letter with a number which has been pencilled in recently, certainly not in 1937. As to the intrinsic evidence of the thing itself, that picture Exhibit 20 is a copy of a daylight proof which was brought by Detective-Sergeant Wilks to a photographer whom I know quite well. I did not know him until about a year ago. I know him quite well. His name is Mr. Steve Dunlevie of the "Sun" in Sydney. He is one of the best known newspaper photographers in the country. Detective-Sergeant Wilks brought a daylight proof to him and asked him to copy it. Mr. Dunlevie copied this proof for Detective-Sergeant Wilks. There was no reason why he should not. Detective-Sergeant Wilks was very excited and very interested. He said, "We have got the girl, we have got the girl". My friend copied this picture and gave Detective-Sergeant Wilks some prints and also the negative. The official print of Exhibit 20 furnished Mrs. Routledge by the police and from which

all of the pictures, ^{I know} ~~I think~~ ^{think}, have ~~emanated~~ emanated, comes from my friend's negative and not from any other negative and that is very easily proved. The daylight proof which my friend copied was not the original daylight proof from Howard Harris but a daylight proof struck off the film from Howard Harris after the film had been retouched. I am not designating who retouched it because I did not see him do it. Asked what evidence I have that any film of Howard Harris's was retouched by anybody, I am pointing out that the evidence is that in the first place all the negatives disappeared from Howard Harris. I think the evidence of that is that Howard Harris has never been able to produce any picture in spite of lawyers' representations on behalf of Mrs. Routledge to him and Howard Harris beginning to object ^{to questioning} ~~even~~ about it. I think the date of my first visit to Howard Harris would be about 1941. I was not by myself examining negatives there. If it is sworn that I was examining negatives there and that the negatives have never been seen from the day I was there, I would say that is just a lie, a plain lie. This has been done before I ever knew of the pictures. Asked to state any reason I can suggest by which it can be suggested that any negative in the possession of Howard Harris or Philomena Morgan was ever altered, I say that if you care to take a look at a very good example of Exhibit 20 you can see ~~xxx~~ definitely that the tooth has been retouched. You will see evidence of the actual retouching. In the daylight proof, if you are used to photography and look carefully with a lens, it is a self-evident proposition. It is not a question of what I can show you; it is what you can see for yourself. It is not something I can really show you. If you look carefully at that with the lens you will notice that those

teeth have been shaved, they have been altered. There is no tooth that will show photographically like that. The edges of the teeth and the type of the edges of the teeth on Exhibit 20 show that that has been retouched. I think you will see it better on the daylight proof. It also has to be remembered that this is not anywhere near the original; it is well removed. I make the statement that the police have no original negative at all; they have a copy negative, and a copy negative should not be the official negative for this picture. If it is pointed out that the police have admitted they have no negative, that they have not been able to get an original negative and were only able to get those proofs from Howard Harris, I say the police show evidence that they did have the negatives. Coming back to this photograph (Exhibit "B" of Exhibit "UU") again, I saw Mr. Deane at Mr. Hall's about having this picture made as a souvenir for Mrs. Routledge. It was not made for the purpose of trying to prove my diagnosis in connection with this case. It has nothing to do with it; it has all been retouched. I did not show this photograph that I ~~have~~^{had} prepared as a souvenir for Mrs. Routledge to a great number of people. I showed it to Mrs. Collins and she recognised it instantly. I had only one of these coloured ones done. I gave it to Mrs. Routledge and I took it back again. I cannot say when I gave it to her. This photograph would be done in 1941 sometime. I cannot give you the exact date that I gave it to Mrs. Routledge as a souvenir. It was not very long in her possession before I recovered it from her. I wanted it to show to Mrs. Collins. I cannot say whether it was in Mrs. Routledge's possession for a week. I do not know whether she had it in her possession for a week. I am sure I left that photograph with Mrs. Routledge

and took it back. I say I had it specially coloured for Mrs. Routledge. It would be completely wrong to suggest that I had that photograph specially prepared to look like the body of the deceased to use in the pursuance of my diagnosis. In regard to the teeth in this made-up portrait I told Mr. Deane "Make as nice a picture as you possibly can for Mrs. Routledge; I wish to give it to her". That would epitomise my conversation. That is all I said. That picture had no other significance at that time. The reason I wanted that souvenir for Mrs. Routledge was that she had lost her daughter, she had been up to the University and she had identified her. I thought at the time the case would go through now that the mother had identified the daughter, and I had this picture made for her as a souvenir. It is of her daughter; she was very upset; she was very pleased to see that picture. When I said, "I thought at the time the case would go through" I meant that I had spent a lot of time discovering the facts of the crime feeling that when I got the facts of the crime I would get the identity automatically. I found that they would pay no attention to the facts of the crime. When I got the identity I thought that at least they would pay attention to the identity. I found there was bigger resistance than ever. That is what I meant by "The case would go through". Mrs. Routledge had identified the daughter and I thought "Now, there will be no opposition", but there was more than ever. I have tried to explain not once but many times that I had that photograph made as a souvenir for Mrs. Routledge without the slightest regard to the cadaver at all. It most certainly had no relation to the case whatever. I do not remember for what period of time I left it with her, but I do know that I took it back from her. It has not been used by me a great deal

in trying to pursue my diagnosis of this crime. I showed it to Mrs. Collins. I did not show it to anybody else. It has been shown in Court. To my knowledge, it has been shown only in Court and to Mrs. Collins. If I have shown it to other people besides Mrs. Collins and Mrs. Routledge, it has been accidentally; it has been in my papers and I have not noted it one way or the other. I know a girl named Marjory Jean Farr. I might have shown it to her in my papers. I did not have more than one interview with her that I am aware of. Now that you bring to my mind Marjory Farr, I have had that photograph in my papers with others. I may have shown that photograph to her; I probably did. When I was so insistent a minute ago that I had not shown it to anybody except Mrs. Collins and Mrs. Routledge, if you had mentioned Marjory Farr I might have remembered. I do not know now, but I think I probably had it with me at the time. I showed Exhibit "C" of Exhibit "UU" to Marjory Farr. I showed her both these ones (Exhibits "B" and "C" of Exhibit "UU"). Marjory Farr said she never had a gap in the teeth and she knew her very well. She may or may not have said to me "That photograph (Exhibit "C") is a good likeness of her", that is the photograph with the gap in the teeth. I could not say. I know she repudiated that gap. She said she never had such a gap as that. I do not think I showed her the coloured photograph and said "Now, is not this one more like her?" I may have. Marjory Farr did not say "No, she never had any teeth like this", meaning like the teeth in the coloured photograph Exhibit "BE". I do not think there could have been any confusion over that. She did not say to me straight out that Philomena Morgan had a gap in her teeth. I do not remember that. Exhibit "B" is the same as this (Exhibit "C"); one

is coloured and one is not. It is correct that one has teeth with a gap in and the other has not, but this gap is repudiated by Marjory Farr. I did not try and press Marjory Farr to identify the coloured photograph as being the photograph of Philomena Morgan. They are both the same picture. I do not think I said to her "There is a reward of £500 for identification". I do not see why I should have. I say I do not think I said that. When I was interviewing people ~~that~~^{whom} I was trying to get to identify these photographs I had prepared, it was not my practice to indicate to them that there was a reward for identification. I am not aware that I mentioned about the rewards to anyone. People would know those things better than I would. Marjory Farr specially knew. If it is sworn that I said to Marjory Farr "You know there is a reward for the identification of the body of the Pyjama Girl", I would say it is absurd because it would be carrying coals to Newcastle in the case of Marjory Farr. I would say I was not interested enough to say that. It would be carrying coals to Newcastle anyway.

TO THE CORONER: I am unable to say whether I did or did not.

TO MR. READ: I would not say that I said to her "I myself know that the photograph with the full set of teeth is Phyllis Morgan". I did not say that. I did not say anything like it because they are both obviously Philomena Morgan from the same picture. I did not say to her "You could do with some money at present". That is quite out of the picture. I did not say anything about money, not even in connection with the reward, but it sounds like Marjory Farr. By that I mean just what I have said; that sounds like Marjory Farr stating it; she is putting words into my mouth. I do not doubt that she is going to swear it. I cannot name any other people whom I showed that coloured photograph to unless you can find out for me because it is

of no importance to me and it has gone clean out of my head. If it is suggested that it was a matter of great importance to me trying to show that that girl with teeth identical with the teeth of the body was Philomena Morgan, I suggest that if the only difference in the teeth in this photograph and the cadaver's is the corner of that tooth then there is no question that the cadaver is Philomena Morgan. When I saw Mr. Deane and asked him to prepare this coloured picture I told him to pluck the eyebrows or make the eyebrows any way he liked. I told him "Pluck the eyebrows" merely because it improves the whole picture. I do not know that the body has plucked eyebrows. The eyebrows are so singed that I have never believed that they were plucked. If it is suggested that the eyebrows of the deceased certainly look as if they were very thin or plucked, I would not say one way or another because the eyebrows have disappeared. I do not know that the eyebrows on the body look as if they were small, narrow eyebrows; they have been so mutilated by fire. I did not say that when I viewed the body here there were no eyebrows on it. All I would say is there are traces of eyebrows. Asked what reason there was to alter the girl's eyebrows when making this beautiful picture as a souvenir for the mother, I say I think, as a matter of fact, that Deane did that of his own accord. I do not remember instructing him. I am unable to say whether I had any conversation with Mr. Deane about altering the eyebrows. I have no memory; it is not of sufficient importance. I am unable to say what conversation I had with Mr. Deane about altering these eyebrows other than I said to Mr. Deane "Make this picture as pretty as possible for the mother and undo that ~~xx~~ unsightly gap in the picture here". Asked to look at the two photographs and see if the eyebrows are put back in even approximately the same position, I say there is no

relationship between these two pictures. I am not interested in what he did with this picture except to make a pretty picture for the mother. Asked to look at Exhibits "B" and "C" of my affidavit sworn in support of the application for Letters of Administration and see whether the eyebrows in Exhibit "B" are in even the same approximate position with the eyebrows in photograph Exhibit "C", I say the eyebrows have been put in by the artist and that is his affair.

TO THE CORONER: I should say they are in approximately the same position; one is narrow and one is broad.

TO MR. READ: I am unable to say whether I had any conversation with Mr. Deane about "I suggest that you pluck the eyebrows"; I do not know at all. That is as far as I will go. I am quite unable to say whether I said to Mr. Deane "Pluck the eyebrows when making up this picture". If he plucked them, it was all the same to me so long as he made it nice and pretty for the mother. I have no distinct recollection whether I said to Mr. Deane "Pluck the eyebrows". I will not swear I did not say it. I am unable to answer because I have no distinct recollection. If I did tell him to pluck the eyebrows, I would not consider it of any significance at all except it would look better in the photograph. The other photograph was of a young girl with heavy eyebrows. This is an art picture and the custom is to have thin eyebrows. I have never compared the eyebrows on that photograph, the line of the eyebrows, the angle and the arch and everything, with the photograph of the body of the deceased taken at the Albury morgue. Looking at them now, I should not say one way or the other whether the eyebrows on the touched-up photograph correspond identically with the outline of the eyebrows on the body of the deceased. I fancy those on the corpse are pencilled in. I do not recognize those as the eyebrows on the corpse. The corpse

has not got eyebrows like that. I do not believe that Mr. Deane had a copy of that photograph of the deceased at the Albury morgue. If we had done our work upon the cadaver at that time then he would have a photograph of the body of the deceased. He may or may not have had a photograph of the teeth. I do not know whether or not Mr. Deane had any photograph of the body of the deceased when he prepared that portrait for me. If we had done our work on the cadaver, he had it; if we had not, he did not. We had this photograph of Philomena Morgan and I told him to go ahead and make this tooth the way it ought to be, but that still does not mean that we had been up to the University; I told him "the way it ought to be" or "the way in my opinion it ought to be". When I indicated the way it ought to be, I may or may not have shown to him a photograph of the teeth of the deceased. If we had been to the University, we did have such a photograph. It is correct that having that beautiful photograph prepared, altering the eyebrows and altering the teeth, I then attached it as an exhibit to my affidavit in my application to the Supreme Court. That was because I showed it to Lucy Collins. With regard to the passage in my affidavit reading "The said photograph had previously been shown by me to the said Jeanette Constance Routledge who informed me that it was a true photograph of her daughter Anna Philomena Morgan", I say considering it came off the picture ^{Exhibit 20} it must be a true photograph. I did swear that passage in my affidavit. I did not think it was necessary to say anything in the affidavit about having had it prepared as a souvenir for the mother. It is correct that the mother having said it was a good photograph of her I then showed it to Lucy Collins. I also showed Lucy Collins the other one as well. I apparently showed the coloured photograph to Marjory Farr. I have not the slightest idea offhand

of any others that I showed it to. I remember the episode of Marjory Farr now. I had a folder like this and I had several pictures. I showed Marjory Farr the one of Philomena. She said "Have you not got some others". I showed her the lot and I happened to have the coloured one. This conversation now comes back to me. It has come back to me since you have mentioned the matter. I caused this photograph to be reproduced in the "Telegraph" on the 10th November, 1941. It fluttered the dovecotes quite a lot, as I discovered when I went to Howard Harris. I had a few small prints of the photograph which I had prepared as a souvenir for Mrs. Routledge and I gave one to the Sydney "Daily Telegraph". I think the "Telegraph" was the only paper I gave it to. The other papers copied it once or twice, but I had nothing to do with that. Asked if I thought by so doing I was helping in any way to establish the identity of Philomena Morgan when I was putting in different eyebrows altogether, I say it was not published to identify Anne Philomena Morgan; it was put in because I wished to see what would happen, and I went to Howard Harris and I found out exactly what I thought would happen did happen. The police went rushing up to try and find a film they may have overlooked. That is my serious answer to your question of why I published this in the Sydney Daily Telegraph. They wanted a picture of Philomena Morgan and I gave them one with the teeth restored. If it is suggested the one I was putting around was one with eyebrows and teeth similar to the corpse's, I say No, because there were numbers of other pictures of Philomena Morgan published with the gap in the teeth. Her usual standard picture was published over and over again. I remember my evidence regarding the lines I have drawn on diagrams of the faces. In two or three parts of my evidence I said that I had drawn the lines to the orbital ridge, approximately.

The orbital ridge is a recognized anatomical landmark. It is the ridge on the brow here (indicating). What I describe anatomically as the orbital ridge is along the line of the eyebrows; there is a bony ridge here. I do not suggest that eyebrows always follow the course of the bone; I do not say that. To define it a little more precisely, the supra-orbital ridge is the bony ridge here (indicating) of the actual skull. I have always called it the supra-orbital ridge. It is the supra-orbital ridge of the frontal bone here (indicating). Asked what precisely is the supra-orbital ridge to which I make these measurements, I say I have said before that to make any measurements at all you have simply got to look at some point, and the supra-orbital ridge is a point that you can see. You cannot make very accurate measurements to it.

W
TO THE CORONER: The ridge is above the ^{eye}~~orb~~ and it is a bony ridge. The bone is slightly thickened there. In aboriginals it is very thickened. "Supra" means above, ^{ey}~~orb~~ means ^{eye}~~orb~~; it is a ridge above the ^{eye}~~orb~~.

TO MR. READ: I have drawn my lines on the diagrams to what appears to be as nearly as possible the supra-orbital ridge.

TO MR. BARRY: Early in Mr. Read's questioning of me he asked me about some other crime in respect of which I had associated myself with the police for the purpose of enabling it to be solved. Asked if my hypothesis in that crime was found to be correct, I say I said the woman was dead and they admitted it. I did not find the body, neither did they, and that is the whole story, but I was accused of having caused them a big expense. That, of course, is not so. I said the woman was dead before I knew anything about it at all, and it turned out to be correct. Before I had actual evidence of the death I deduced she was dead. I found a man burning material and from that it was obvious

what had happened. I described various things and they all turned out to be correct. With regard to my assumption that the marking on the towel is in ink, it was common knowledge at the C.I.B. that it was marking ink. Mr. McRae boasted that he had come down here to Melbourne, that the towel had been marked with marking ink and that it had been brought up by infra-red rays, that it had been submitted to tests here in Melbourne. I only know from current literature, police literature and the rest of it, that a check had been made of the Laundry Association here for marks. There was nothing I could observe to cause me to doubt McRae's assertion that it was marking ink and that it had been brought up by infra-red rays. I could see it was ink because it had been rubbed a great deal. Pencil would have been rubbed off. I only know two mediums - pencil or ink, and it looked like ink. I would not bother my head about the kind of ink. I said I found muscle tissue under the nails of the body. On the subject of these lines and the use I make of them, I would like to demonstrate again with a view to removing misconceptions that I feel may have arisen. Mr. Read took exception to my lines, considering they were worthless. He based his observation on having made a templet and finding that templet did not coincide exactly with lines on the other pictures. I explained that shrinkage of paper and other things would cause that discrepancy. I do not think that Mr. Read can understand the operation of these lines. I mentioned the axiom that nature never reproduces a design. I have a face of Anne Philomena Morgan. I go to the cadaver, take the cadaver out of the coffin, seat it in the chair, stand behind it and pose the head as nearly as possible in the same position as Anne Philomena Morgan's face. Mr. Deane, expert photographer, thoroughly

conversant with focal length of lenses etcetera, with a studio camera taking either a five by seven plate or a half plate, whatever it is, made the pictures then. We come back to the studio and Mr. Deane with very great care puts the pictures up to the same scale. First of all, the cadaver is put up easily enough because I have a cast of the cadaver's teeth. He put the cadaver up to its own life scale. Then he puts Anne Philomena Morgan up to this scale, that is to the cadaver's. We are not at liberty to assume it is the same person until we have done our measuring. If after I have measured it I find that the axiom is working, that in other words the design is the same, then of course it is the same person and it would be up to its own life scale. I noticed at once that there is a slight discrepancy in the tilt of the cadaver's head, the rotation of the cadaver's head and the inclination of the cadaver's head. The question of how to measure these pictures so as to get an idea of their correct size became a bit of trouble. Then I realised that if I found the centre on a plane which was taken in such a way as to minimise all these discrepancies, and that if I found ~~the~~ a centre peculiar to each face, not a centre on this face put over the other face, but a centre peculiar to each face, and then drew lines of equal length to anatomical points that I could see with my eye fairly clearly, fairly clearly on Anne Philomena Morgan and very clearly in the face of the cadaver, and then if a reasonable number of these lines the same length reached approximately even the same anatomical point on the two pictures, then I would have established that these two people must be the same, and for good measure I ~~found~~^{find} myself a face that in general design looks rather like Anne Philomena Morgan's face, pose it in the same position, bring it up to its own life-size, and I

try these lines out on that face and they immediately exemplify the truth of the axiom by failing to touch it anywhere. That was just a demonstration. These lines, although they did make the same angle with the base line above the base line, cannot possibly do the same thing below the base line because you have passed the centre. Then you might ask, how is it that lines still reach a fixed point like the teeth and these little nicks in the teeth, which are very very tiny points (you can put a needle right in the centre) yet a line from the centre of the cadaver's face to one of those nicks is exactly the same length as from the centre of Anne Philomena Morgan's face to one of the shadows, and yet I am measuring from a centre which is different in relation to the nostril on the cadaver and in relation to the nostril on Philomena and also at a different angle to the base line in the cadaver and the base line in Philomena. You may ask, how do they reach the same anatomical point? It is simply, I take it, due to taking centres, because they go around this way, and despite the slight difference in rotation or ~~in~~^{on} inclination as it is going around ~~in~~^{on} the centre it will meet its proper anatomical point if the people are the same person. And it has done that. Then I made a special set to show that they do in fact coincide. If you care to take Anne Philomena Morgan and draw those lines to those places and make a templet and transfer it to the cadaver, that is an easy way; anybody could do that. But I was not interested in doing it that way. I did each picture independently, and I can assure you that I have drawn the base line and put the lines in before I found they were the same angle. They were done by eye and accurately enough to the same anatomical point. That is an approximate point always because I defy anybody to take a face or any part of

a body and make a really accurate measurement from it because there is too big an area. You cannot plot a point to start from. In the face there the one really accurate point is the teeth, these two little nicks. You can see them and you can use them; they are not quite so accurate in the case of Anne Philomena Morgan because they are only shadows. I have made a special set for you. I found an old picture of Anne Philomena Morgan with the lines on it, also an old picture of my test face with the lines on. I found another picture of the cadaver and I made the lines. This time I have made a templet and if it does not superimpose on all these lines with dead exactitude above the base line and when moved below the base line to compensate for the tilt, then it is only because of the limitations of my own poor draftsmanship, and there is no other reason. I will put them in the shadow box and show them. I would also point out that this extreme degree of accuracy is not needed; it is not desirable. If I were to say I could reach the same anatomical point with dead exactitude you would be quite entitled to scoff at that because it cannot be done. One can only measure with approximate limitations. They are sufficiently accurate to designate the ^{persons} people are the same. These are two life-size pictures. For the moment we will say Anne Philomena Morgan is only life-size to the other and not necessarily to herself. If these lines are not coinciding it is only because the paper is not lying perfectly flat. (At this stage witness demonstrated with photographs of Anne Philomena Morgan, the cadaver, a test face and templet).

EXHIBIT "H2" Photographs of Anne Philomena Morgan, cadaver, test face, and templet.

With regard to this line No. 1 from what I describe as the hair-line of Anne Philomena Morgan, not the anatomical

107

MP

hair-line, down to the line of the chin as well as one can see, I then draw a line of the same length as this on the edge of the skull and I find that this transverse line through the eye here and the transverse line here are the same length. Although this face is tilted forward a good deal more than this face, one remembers that the nose sticks out on the plane of the face and so the nose makes a very long shift and the ear comes up, but it does not make much difference on the plane of the face. On the flat plane of photography and remembering the rounded chin you can come up a shade and it will not really alter the contour so that there is very little change in that particular plane, so that if that line is anything like equal to this line, if it were within even half a millimetre, it would still show that these two faces are approximately the same length within the limits of where you have been able to measure. I have been able to get pretty well up on the skull, I have got more than three-quarters of the face. With regard to these lines drawn across here I point out that due to inaccurate work here this line No. 4 does not quite reach the point intended. This line is about half a millimetre off the centre of the teeth. The other lines up the face, No. 2 and No. 3, are drawn in without any ^{great} regard except visual location. I have not made them the same distance apart. I do not expect that face to be dead accurate with this face; it is only an accident that that face has approximately the same turn. But that is not a subject for criticism. With regard to the photograph of Miss X, Exhibit No. 64, this was demonstrated to you and the statement was made definitely that that coincided with a transparency which I had. I stated it did not; I am afraid I stated it with a little heat. The best method to demonstrate that is the way I

have now. It is easy to put two transparencies together, if one is not used to looking at transparencies, and make it appear as if the edges are coinciding when in reality they are not coinciding at all. This is an early Albury picture of the Pyjama Girl. The whole purpose of this picture was to show the square side of the head on the right hand side. It is characteristic, it is very remarkable, and it is very definite. That is instantly noticeable in this photograph of Philomena Morgan, absolutely square. This girl on the other hand has a dent in her head; it is an utterly different shape. In putting the two together, see how square Anne Philomena Morgan is underneath. We will put this girl across. What a nice dent in Anne Philomena Morgan apparently, but it is all deception, it is not there at all. Furthermore, there is no coincidence here in the pupils. Nothing else is coming anywhere. The width from centre to centre of these pupils does not agree with Anne Philomena Morgan's; they are about five millimetres out in length. That was supposed to have coincided. The girl does have a somewhat similar line of cheek, but there is a gap of about two millimetres; it shows very readily when you do it this way (indicating). Actually this has been put to scale on this line; one can do that, but everything else is wrong. I said you can put everything up to scale on one line. This is worthless from the point of view of what I have been talking about, and I cannot agree that that has the slightest bearing on my lines.

EXHIBIT "J2" Templet of face of Pyjama Girl.

(Page 524 follows).

Wed. 12th Jan
Incomplete

Those do ^{coincide} gibe. There is the straight line of the face.

If they do not ^{coincide} gibe it is only because my hand was shaking when the sketching was being done. There is the line of the cheek, there is the line of the side of the face and there is the horizontal line of the eye (indicating).

They do ^{coincide} gibe. There is swelling in the cadaver and there is a little excrescence there (indicating). It is in that picture. This dead square part, where the other girl has

a ^{deep} fine angle, is quite different. This is the hand and it was put forward with the idea that the template of my hand would go on anyone's hand, but it has not gone on this hand at all. This hand needs to be reprinted in order to show the upper edge clearly. The upper edge is a good 2 millimetres or more above my line.

..... EXHIBIT K2.....Template of photograph of hand of Philomena Morgan.

I have in my hand Exhibits J2 and K2. I only have a single line there (indicating). I am curious to see whether these will superimpose without any extraneous ^{bumps} lines and angles. (The witness demonstrated). It is quite a different story. It is true that not only here there is sketched the

slight swelling that was on the other picture, but here is the whole round of the face, there is the line through the eye and here is the whole ^{side} square of the face. (indicating).

This upper one is a sketch of Anna Philomena Morgan and the lower one is the right hand side of the face of the cadaver, and they are perfect. In the case of the hand, this template is supposed to be the same size and I would say it is close enough. Instead of the template coming right up to the

edge of the hand ^{of policeman}, the way it does in my own ^{if} if a print of the ^{policeman's hand} is made with a clear edge, I fancy it will be found it is about 3 millimetres outside the template. As far as this part is concerned (indicating) I can see with my naked eye it is getting on for four millimetres. That does not fit, it only pretends to fit. These transparencies (Exhibit 60)

[Handwritten mark]

[Handwritten signature]

were produced when the question of lenses came up and they are of the same man. Mr. Read wished to prove something concerning focal length of lenses. I take it this was produced for the purpose of showing that actually, with different focal length lenses, one could put the subject in apposition for a short point but one could not do it all round. It does not coincide universally. One can take a small area of the glass and one can get it approximately together, but not all around. I now have it in apposition, as well as my eyesight can do it, from about there to there (indicating). It loses it here and here and up above. (indicating). I have now turned the transparencies around and the same thing applies - it does not make any difference. If it were put to me that the suggestion seemed to be that one could take the left lens, superimpose^{it} with ex-actitude and yet one did not get any anatomical correspondence and accordingly any lines drawn to anatomical points would be useless, I would say I could take an inkpot and make it to the same scale as that lens. The small part of that lens coincides but nothing else. It goes to prove my theory. This was done in relation to lenses. (eye glass lenses).

TO THE CORONER: I agree it was done to show the different focal lengths; to show, with different focal lengths, one has distortion. However, that does not necessarily follow.

TO MR BARRY: If I have a 6" lens and a 3" lens, I can get exactly the same size on the plate with the 3" lens, providing I have double the extension with the camera. If one has two lenses of different focal lengths, providing one is careful to keep the camera at a certain distance, there is no aberration in the picture. It can still be made to coincide perfectly. I said to Mr. Dene "Your camera is a studio camera and you do not know the camera at Howard Harris's." He said "I do not think it will be very different to my own because his is not a large camera."

Jones camera
I think it was a "Sanderson" with swing back and rising
and falling front, and everything. He said "I have
taken special precautions so there will be no theoretical
difference, *due to focal length of lens my camera & H. Harris' camera* certainly no difference we can determine,
because I have kept the camera well away from the subject".
The fact I am able to put together so accurately the line
on the face of Anna Philomena Morgan with the other, shows
there was no difference. In connection with Exhibit 61,
the pictures have been taken with the lense focussed on the
feet. Much the same result is obtained with an ordinary
Brownie when someone takes a photograph of a person lying
on the grass, - the foreground comes out fairly well but
the rest is all distorted. I understood the camera used
to take these photographs had a 6" lens. (Mr. Hobley
pointed out that one photograph was taken with a 5 1/4" lens
and the other photograph was taken with a 16" lens.) There
is a very great discrepancy there. That is something which
could not have occurred in my case, even with the wildest
manipulations. Sixteen inches is a very long focal length.
It could be used in some cases as a telephoto. In this
picture the camera is focussed where I indicate. I asked
the question "Where were the cameras, were they in the
same position." The back of the camera was ~~h~~, but the thing
that matters is the lens, and the smaller focal length had
to be advanced a very great deal in order to get the image
the same size. These two images coincide but, of course,
the distortion goes on just the same. This is a very fine
demonstration of what would have wrecked me if we had not
taken precautions. No one points a camera at a man's foot
and slides the body back into infinity. This comes into the
category of a trick performance to show something about
focal length lenses. Since being in the box last week,
I have not looked up anything, I have not seen a book or
spoken to anyone on photography. All of those dangers with
lenses - wide angle lenses, narrow angle lenses, short focals,
long focals, soft lenses and hard lenses - have absolutely

no bearing at all on the pictures of Anna Philomena Morgan and the cadaver. The photograph of Anna Philomena Morgan was taken at a studio and the photograph of the cadaver was taken with a proper camera, having a very good focal length lens, and at a distance, so there would be no discrepancy *due to* in the focal length *of the lenses possibly being different in each* of the pictures, and the result justified that. Asked to deal with the question of the spots which are shown on some of the photographs of Linda Agostini, (Exhibits 16, 17, 18 and 19) I would ask whether I might know if the negatives of these pictures came from New South Wales or if they were made in Victoria? (Mr. Read indicated they were made in New South Wales, the police procured them from the studio.) The instrument I have in my hand is not a pair of opera glasses. *It is a* They ~~are~~ very carefully made low-power microscope on a prism binocular base. If I took the supplementary lenses off, one might use them as a pair of opera glasses. They are opera glass size. This is a scientific instrument and not a toy. There are three spots on the arm shown on Exhibits 16, 17 and 18. There are three spots on the cadaver's arm and these spots purport to be spots from the cadaver's arm. As regards the spots on Linda Agostini's arm, in exhibits 16, 17 and 18, they have been put in by photography - they do not belong there - they bear their own inherent evidence. I have drawn, as nearly as possible parallel with the spots, the axis of the three spots in line. The axis in photograph 18 is down where I indicate. Photograph No. 17, for practical purposes, is the same pose. All these pictures were made within a few minutes; one can see that. Even her hair has not changed; nothing has changed. It shows that the pose has not been altered at all. This ornament is the same angle and the beads are not uncovered any more or hidden any more. The evidence is they were all taken on the one occasion, one after the other. The axis of these spots is altogether different, with not a sufficient

change in the pose to warrant it (At this stage witness demonstrated on himself). If you imagine three spots on my arm - I am the subject having my photograph taken - I put a straight edge through the three spots. Whether I turn in the manner I indicate or whether the camera goes over to where I point makes no difference, and the axis does not change, as can be seen. There is the axis (indicating). You can go right around me and it will not alter it. The only thing to alter it will be the raising of my arm. In this photograph the spots have lifted themselves - they have gone up higher than the other one. There are three different axes for three different poses, when there should be only one axis. In the three pictures, the spots bear their own internal evidence - they are different in shape, size, and distribution and, above all, the centre spot wanders. If I drew the axis of any two spots, it would be found that axis was quite different to the axis of the three of them, yet they are supposed to be in line. They had to be put into each picture individually and there is a margin of error there. Looking at the negatives produced, I should say they are copy negatives. I should not think they are the original negatives.

..... EXHIBIT 70..... Negatives of photos, Exhibits 16,17,18 and 19.

These are two daylight proofs set up alongside one another and photographed. That is not a studio picture; that is not the way they do them in studios.

TO MR. READ: They have also been retouched, for other reasons.

TO MR. BARRY: Looking at exhibits 42 and 43, I say the daylight proofs are very interesting from the point of view that there is no mole showing on the face of Linda Agostini. In the light of my examination, exhibits 42 and 43 do not reveal any mole. As to whether there is anything about them which assists me to determine whether or not the subject had any spots on her arms, one cannot see them in those

proofs because the arms cannot be seen. These are worthless from the point of view of looking for spots on the arm, but they are not worthless from the point of view ^{of} looking for the mole on the face. There is nothing else I want to say concerning the spots on the arm except that they bear their own internal evidence that they have no right on the photograph of Linda Agostini's arm. I aver these are not original negatives, they are copy negatives. (Exhibit 70). In my opinion they are a photograph of prints from the original negatives. If it were suggested, if one desired to put spots on the arm, the way of doing it would be to put it on the paper on which is the developed representation from the original negative, I would say one would put it on the paper and then make a negative.

TO THE CORONER: The spots have no right on those pictures. Linda Agostini could not have had spots like that and have photographs like this. From an examination of those spots, it is my firm conviction that they have no right to be on her arm in those photographs.

TO MR. BARRY: Comparing the three photographs I find the spots in different axes of distribution. The axis should not have altered because the poses did not warrant it. I agree that suggests to me that the three spots shown on the left arm in each of the exhibits 16, 17 and 18 have come into existence during the re-photographing of a photograph taken from an original negative. Those spots do not belong, they are purely artificial, - something introduced. Examination under a lens shows they differ in size, shape and position. The centre spot alters and the whole three spots are decidedly higher in the side picture than in the other pictures. I have an enlargement which does not show them at all. These spots should be nice and clear on the enlargement but they are not ^{there} clear at all. I obtained that enlargement from a newspaper in Sydney. Apparently, all these pictures were made in 1931;