

TOMR. BARRY: As to whether I regarded the breasts as within my province and that I was not intruding on the province of the post mortem there, it was only to state that it would modify their shape. Anatomy is the normal structure of the human body; that is all I came along to discuss. In the case of certain structures, I attempted to explain certain variations of the normal/ I cannot name offhand any specific reference that brown eyes may appear blue after death. I have not looked pretty thoroughly for it. As to whether I appreciate the importance of the question of the colour of the eyes, it is an important feature in any subject. I have made certain observations of animal material, not only sheep. That has been done for the purpose of observing what the effect of an opaque material would be anterior to a ~~dark~~ dark substance. An opaque medium would turn grey to a bluey colour. I should say, speaking now from the structure of the eye, that irrespective of what would be the colour of the iris - red, blue, grey, purple, any colour at all - that when one observed it through an opaque cornea it would still appear blue, providing it were a dark colour. I pledge myself to that. I am skilled in the study of the eye only from an anatomical point of view. I cannot quote any reference which makes the statement that one of the remarkable things is that people who die with brown eyes may be found after death to have the appearance of blue eyes. I cannot point to a single statement in any text book on forensic medicine to that effect. I should say it is a fact that the practice for years in institutions like the Morgue has been to issue descriptions - "Found the body of an unknown man, so many teeth missing, blue eyes, and drooping moustache." That could be an unscientific practice. As to not knowing anyone else to suggest it as an unscientific practice, the pathologist may pay careful attention to the condition of the cornea when he looks at the colour of the eyes. As to agreeing that to anyone who has not got the advantage of my skill in the matter that the iris

of the eye in this body looks blue, I maintain that you cannot see the iris. I maintain that I cannot see it. I would agree with the statement that the blue colour of the iris of the eye of man and other animals is not due to any blue pigment but to a reflection from fine particles in the translucent to turbid tissue of the iris overlying the dark black colour of the eye. I agree that the only pigment which occurs in the human eye is a brown one. I agree that it gives a colour varying from turby yellow to very dark brown, almost black according to the quantity present. I agree that with a very little of it present it gives in combination with the blue appearance of the unpigmented iris a green tint. I know that from the very beginning and from the discovery of this body the victim is described on the police circulars as having blue-grey eyes. As to agreeing that those whose duty it was to observe the colour of the eye in September 1934 were in a better position to observe it than I was, in the first place they had only one eye to examine; and, in the second, it is quite possible that error may have arisen because of changes in the cornea. I would not agree that the people whose duty it was to examine and observe it in September 1934 were necessarily in a better position to determine the colour of the eye than I was when I came to the matter in March 1944. As to regarding myself as being here to explain away all the difficulties that lie in the way of the police in identifying this body as Linda Agostini, I am here to give the facts as I found them. I examined the eye very carefully. I did receive a sense impression that the eye was blue-grey, which I dismissed immediately. It would not necessarily be true. As to whether I did receive an impression and dismissed it, you look at the eye and it looks ~~not~~ blue. You can look at it from a distance of two feet and say it looks to be a dark blue-black eye, but one does not naturally conclude that the eye was blue black in colour during life. I cannot help what

they described the eye as being in 1934. I think something can be conceded to the people who made the observation in 1934. I do not know if it is quite a common thing to look at the eyes of ^{dead} people for the purpose of determining their colour. I would not express an opinion on that. I saw no blue ring in the eye of the body. I say that the inner region beneath the cornea was a dull almost glazed blue-black or slatey black in colour. I affirm that I could see no grey colour whatsoever anywhere in that eye. If anything, I would describe it as a deep blue black. I class a slatey black almost in the same class as a very dull dark blue black. It is not a brown. As to whether I would expect to find pigment in any marked degree in that eye in order to say that it was a brown eye in life, you should expect to find the stroma layer of the iris deeply impregnated with melanin pigment. In a blue eye the pigment is located to the posterior layer of the iris; in the brown eye the pigment is located within the stroma. That is, in general, the central layer of the iris. There is a distinct difference between the two. The depth of brown depends upon how much pigment there is in the stroma of the eye. I made the observation first that the eye in the body was brown on the night of March 23rd. I said then "My impression is that this eye is a brown eye." That was on the night of the 23rd. As to that being after Miss Dunn had given evidence, I do not know who had given evidence at that stage, but you could confirm it. As to hearing one of the ladies say that Linda Agostini had brown eyes, I heard many ladies give evidence. Asked whether before I formed the view that it was a brown eye and not a blue eye in the body evidence had been given here to the effect that Linda Agostini had brown eyes, I say that I would like to have that point checked first. My impression is that at that time Mr. O'Brien, the dentist, stated that the eyes were blue, and another witness had stated that the eyes were brown; that is to the best of my knowledge. The first time that I directed my attention as to whether the eye described as

being blue in the body was in fact a brown eye was after I had heard one witness give evidence that Linda Agostini had brown eyes. I do not know which witness that was. I believe it was a woman. I do not know if it was a woman who claimed to know her well; I cannot remember whether she claimed to know her well or not. As to remembering that Mr. O'Brien said that he had a hazy idea that they were blue eyes but that a female witness had gone in and stated quite definitely that Linda Agostini had smiling brown eyes, I cannot recall those words. I was in Court most of the first day to my knowledge. As to remembering the following words which appear in Miss Dunn's evidence on page 49 of the transcript - "I remember Mrs. Agostini perfectly well and she was brown eyed in life. There is no doubt about that at all." - I do not remember those exact words. I remember that as the substance of the testimony. That did not pose a problem for me to which I then had to direct my attention. At that stage I was not interested in who it was, and I was not interested in any way in identification. I do not recall that the dentist did not claim any clear recollection of her features but that the other witness was a witness who had worked beside her. As to recalling that Miss Dunn claimed to know Linda Agostini extremely well, I have only a hazy recollection of what the witness had to say. I do know that one witness described the eye as blue and the other witness described the eye as brown. I can remember that quite clearly. I could not even say whether that was in regard to the eye in the body or the eyes of Linda Agostini in life. All I can remember is that one witness said that the eyes of Linda Agostini - I do not know whether that referred to the body or to the subject - were brown, and another said they were blue. I came to the conclusion that this was the body of Linda Agostini when I had completed my investigation. That was towards the end of that week of which Tuesday was March 28th. I made my final measurements on the afternoon

of Tuesday, March 28th. The week ending the 1st. April was the first week I was in a position to give the police an assurance as to how I could speak as to the identity. I had elicited all the facts I possibly could and those facts led me to a certain conclusion. I agree that part of the facts was the evidence I heard of various witnesses who said that this was Linda Agostini, from the point of view of establishing a comparison. I have already admitted that. It was not my purpose to exercise a ~~xxx~~ selection as to which evidence I would accept and which I would not; my purpose throughout this investigation was to conduct an anatomical examination of the body and to place the facts which I obtained at the disposal of the police. As to thinking under those circumstances the proper course for me to take was to say "No, I will not express any opinion as to the identity of the body here. I have reached scientific conclusions and I will leave it to the Coroner", I think on the facts I was justified in establishing a belief that identity could be based ^{on the facts} which I had elicited. They were merely put forward for the benefit of the Coroner. I have not made the statement that in my opinion the body is the body of Linda Agostini. I have dealt with the facts as I elicited them, and they have led me to a belief; but I am unable to positively identify that body as the body of Linda Agostini. I agree that the only thing anyone can be positive about is non-identity. As to saying that I have not expressed here today an opinion that that body is the body of Linda Agostini, the facts as I have them have led me to a belief; it is a belief. It is an opinion, yes. In my opinion that is the body of Linda Agostini. I agree that in my examination in chief I finished up by giving evidence to that effect. As to whether Mr. Read had sat down, and I ran on, and he then got up and stood up while I concluded my evidence, I was giving my evidence, I do not know what Mr. Read did. I forget the exact date when I handed in my report to the police - "Now, having completed my examination I am in a position to give

evidence" - but Mr. Davis would furnish you with that. I put in a report. I put in a statement. I cannot remember off hand how many pages the report contained; I suppose the statement would run into four, perhaps five, typewritten pages. I gave a copy of it. I have not a copy in my pocket. I can get one, yes. (At this stage the witness left the witness box and obtained a copy of his statement.)

This is my copy. It is typed in my Department. It was typed from my manuscript. I cannot remember the exact date when I handed it in, but I did hand it to Mr. Davis. That was probably round about Thursday of last week - that is only a recollection. I did not at any ~~stage~~ stage put in a brief report to the police - "I am now in a position to give evidence." I did not regard myself as a likely witness right from the very beginning. My impression as regards the giving of evidence was in the initial stages. I was approached to carry out an anatomical examination of the body. Sub-Inspector Hobley approached me and requested that this problem should be covered from every possible angle, and he asked me if I was prepared to assist on the anatomical side. I said that I was prepared. I know Sub-Inspector Hobley personally now. I did not previously. I said that I would be prepared to act in that capacity if the permission of the University authorities could be obtained. I did not say to Sub-Inspector Hobley "Look, there is such a thing as professional loyalty. You have already had a professor of anatomy in Sydney, why not approach him." I knew that I was going to be a witness in this case immediately following the detection of the three pigmented areas on the outer aspect of the left arm. That was on a Tuesday; that would be approximately March 21st. Sub-Inspector Hobley approached me on a Friday, I think that was March 19th. and I stated that before I would agree to consider an anatomical examination I would have to view the body to see if such an examination were possible. I had no idea of the state of the corpse. Immediately I went down and observed the spots


with Mr. Hobley he informed me that he would like me to give evidence in connection with it. The position is not that right through this inquest I have attended here on the basis that I was the man who was going to give the scientific medical testimony that would refute Dr. Benbow's evidence. As to it being just a coincidence that I happened to disagree with Dr. Benbow on practically everything he said, I disagreed for the reasons which I have put forward. I do disagree with Dr. Benbow on practically every important ~~max~~ proposition he has advanced. As to it being just coincidence and an honest approach on my part that causes me to disagree in that fashion, it is quite an honest approach. In my experience bodies that have been kept for any length of time do not develop spots that look like freckles. I am not prepared to say they do not. In my experience I am prepared to say that they do not develop spots that develop like freckles; they do not develop spots which appear like freckles. A freckle is a pigmented area in the epidermal layer of the skin due to the elaboration of pigment in the basal layers of the epidermis. The presence of oxidase in the cells causes the elaboration of the pigment. I do not know what causes the ~~adkf~~ oxidase in the cells. That oxidase itself is not related to the adrenal gland; but the substance which the oxidase acts upon is in some way related to the adrenal glands. I was unable to detect any freckles on the ventral surface of the trunk. I was unable to detect them elsewhere. I would not agree that the spots on the arm are not brownish like freckles but reddish coloured spots. No section has been made of them to my knowledge. No histological examination has been made of them to my knowledge. I agree that they are definitely obvious spots. They are very characteristic. They should not necessarily have been apparent to any proper examination. When asked why, I say that there I would have to interpret the mind of the individual who carried out the other examination. If you suggest to me that they were not

there in 1934 but that they had developed since by reason of the conditions under which the body has been kept, I would maintain that they were present in 1934. As to whether they should have been apparent in 1934 to any person of ordinary acute observation who was searching for marks on the body, there is a photograph of the body taken in 1934 which shows the three spots. That is the photograph of the body in the Albury Morgue. Freckles need not necessarily be irregular, they can be quite circumscribed. I would not agree with your suggestion that they need not be irregular but that they are for the most part. I say that the marks are to be observed in Exhibit 80. I do not agree with your suggestion that those marks are really petechial haemorrhages. I believe there is a way of deciding one way or the other. I examined those spots under a lens and the pigmented tissue is definitely present in the epidermis. There are no blood vessels in the epidermis, the skin, therefore, in my opinion, there can be no petechial haemorrhages in that situation. As to whether the only way of telling what they are is by sectioning them and examining them histologically I think one can give an opinion on them before they are examined histologically. I have given an opinion. It is the septum nasi and the two wings, or alae, which gives the shape to the tip of the nose. It is not the septum nasi which indicates the length of the nose; the length is taken from the nasion to the pro-nasion. The septum nasi is at right angles to the plane of the face usually; in many cases there is a slight deviation. What we have here is not a retrousse nose, it is a deflection of the septum of the cartilage ~~which~~ which very often throws it over to one side and tends to block the nasal passage on one side. That is a condition that sometimes requires surgical correction. If you say that the length of the nose would be proportionate to the length of the septum nasi, I say that by length you are referring to what anatomically we do not call length.

Anatomically we call it the depth of the nose. There are three points used in connection with establishing measurements of the nose. There are more, but in connection with this question there are three, the nasion, up at the base; there is the pro-nasion at the tip; and the sub-nasion at the bottom. The height of the nose is the ^{distance} ~~point~~ between the sub-nasion and the nasion; the length is the distance from the nasion to the pro-nasion; and the depth is from the pro-nasion back to the sub-nasion. I agree there is a right angled triangle there. the base of the right angled triangle is the septum nasi. Under the present conditions it is not possible to determine with reasonable accuracy whether the person had a long nose or a short nose. On the photograph of the body produced (Exhibit 82) there is no injury to the septum nasi so far as I can detect. I have made an examination of the body and I am prepared to offer my opinion that there is no injury to the septum nasi, but there is displacement of it. If the nasal bones are fractured there is some distortion, because the nasal septum is attached to the nasal bones. It is part of the nasal cavity, and its position must be modified. You can, within reason, maintain the shape of the nose; but you can push the nose, for instance, right back underneath the base of the skull. I can only say see the lower margin of the septum nasi in this photograph. Looking at the photograph I cannot see the entire septum nasi, I can only see its lower margin, and it does not appear to be injured, or impaired in any way at all. The lower margin of the septum nasi is not displaced. A post mortem examination may disclose some displacement of the septum nasi. I have not seen any. Comparing exhibit H and Exhibit N, I do not agree that there is a striking resemblance between the nose of the cadaver and the nose of Philomena Morgan, as shown in those two photographs. I do not regard photographs as of any use at all from the anatomical point of view for estimating length. As to the point of my observation that

Philomena Morgan had a long neck and that I was able to tell that from a photograph, that was merely an impression. The neck of Philomena Morgan appeared to be long in comparison with other structures. It was a non-metrical comparison. It was not entirely a worthless comparison. Its value lies in the fact that one can say that Philomena Morgan had a long neck; but I would not say how long or how broad it was, or what its length would be in comparison to the height of the head or to the breadth of the head. As to my position being that photographs have some value, not from the point of view of making measurements. When you ask me from the point of view of making measurements, my answer to that question is no. I have seen ~~Dr. Benbow~~ the lines which Dr. Benbow has drawn on the photograph of Philomena Morgan and the photograph of the corpse. I have heard him explain that the lines were drawn from a selected point and then when superimposed it was found that they coincided. I have seen him demonstrate that the lines above his base line which appear on the photograph of Philomena Morgan and the lines above the base line which appear on the photograph of the corpse do coincide. As to explaining why it happens that the lines ^{similarly} drawn/on the photograph of the comparison subject do not coincide, there is one reason, it comes back to the point, again - we are discussing this on an impossible premise, we are now comparing photographs in entirely different planes of presentation - the base line in the comparison subject is nowhere near the nasal spine. That point is located far too high. I agree that substantially what I would say when Dr. Benbow says he has selected approximately identical points on the photograph of Philomena Morgan and the photograph of the corpse is that he has done nothing of the sort. As to the reason being that these lines coincide because they are all wrong, shall we say by chance. I do not know how many lines coincided by chance. Admitting that every line corresponds to the minutest degree, it still means absolutely nothing.

We are discussing the whole of this case now on an impossible premise. If that happens with the photograph of the corpse and the photograph of Philomena Morgan and it does not happen with any other figure, it means absolutely nothing.

 (Page 797 follows).

GOVERNMENT SHORTHAND WRITER'S OFFICE

Melbourne,.....4...../.....5...../19.44

WE, the undersigned Licensed Shorthand Writers, certify that the foregoing typewritten pages, numbered as under, are a correct transcript of the Shorthand Notes of Depositions of—

| | | Page | P |
|-------------------|-----|----------------|---|
| LOUIS BAILLOT | ... | 728 - 733/38. | |
| | --- | | |
| SYDNEY SUNDERLAND | ... | 752 - 784/786. | |
| | --- | | |

R. J. La u

Licensed Shorthand Writer.

| | | |
|--------------------|-----|-------------|
| SYDNEY SUN DERLAND | ... | 739 - 751T. |
| | --- | |
| SYDNEY SUN DERLAND | ... | 787 - 796A. |
| | --- | |

Geo. E. Clarke

Licensed Shorthand Writer.

Licensed Shorthand Writer.

taker at Melbourne on the 18th day of April 19 44

at an Inquest { upon the body of a woman found near Albury on 1/9/34.
 { into a fire at

agree. "The deceased is now further described by the University Authorities as being from 22 to 27 years of age" - I do not necessarily agree with that; I would say between 25 and 30. I am in definite disagreement with that part of the statement which suggests she might be 22, 23 or 24 years. I contradict it quite definitely. "Height not more than 5 ft. 1 in." - I would be prepared to agree with that. "Slim to medium build" - For reasons which I have already expressed I would not agree with that statement. "Body well formed" - I would agree with that statement. "Body well-proportioned" - I would not agree with that statement. "Light brown hair" - I agree. "which has been peroxidized or bleached" - I agree. "Blue-grey eyes" - I would not agree with that statement. "plucked eyebrows" - I would not express an opinion upon that. "Finger-nails well manicured to a point and bearing traces of Cutex tinting" - I would merely say that the nails were well kept. "Very large hands" - I agree with that. "Small superficial scar on the back of right basal phalanx of right middle finger" - I was unable to locate that. "No operation scars or birthmarks" - I would agree with that statement. "Believed to be of English or European rather than Australian extraction" - I would only be prepared to say, a white female. It could be a white person from America or it could be Scottish, Irish - I am unable to say. "The ears are peculiar, part of the edge or helix being imperfect and there is very little, if any, lobe present, the whole giving a very distinctive and unpleasant shape" - I would agree with that. I do not know that the hair has been peroxidized. I said that it may perhaps be peroxidized. I did say that I agreed with the statement "Light brown hair which has been peroxidized or bleached". I agree with that statement because it is much paler than the pubic hair with which I compared it. That gives the impression that

its color has been changed. I did not take a strand of the hair and test it. I agree that the effect of peroxide on the hair is to bleach it, and as the hair grows out you get the dark part of the hair down near the roots. It did not occur to me that it would be a good idea and that it would not interfere unduly with the post mortem examination if I plucked one hair out of the head and examined it. In addition to comparing the color of the hair with the color of the pubic hair, I noted that the color of the hair of the head is not consistent. Some parts of it are definitely light brown in color, others give the appearance that they have been bleached. I am just going on a general impression on that point. If it is suggested that it is a general impression on a matter that is a subject of easy scientific determination, I say I did not regard it as being important, because from the observation of the hair of the head and the pubic hair, in my opinion, the natural color of the hair was light brown. I examined the hair down near the roots; I examined that hair very carefully. It is dark at the roots. I did not take a hair out; I examined the hair by visual examination. You can examine the hair right down on the scalp without taking it out. Formalin has an effect on hair, but not a great effect on the color. I know that because the pigment in the hair is a melanin pigment and formalin does not affect melanin. I am sure of that; that is to say, it has no marked effect on it. If it is suggested that it might have an effect on hair which has been ~~immersed~~ immersed in formalin for 10 years and then taken out and exposed to light, I say it would have no marked effect on the melanin which is contained in the medulla of the hair. Asked whether formalin would have an effect on the color of peroxidized hair, I say if it is a bleached hair it has no color. If it is peroxidized it has been bleached. Peroxide does remove

some of the melanin. What melanin is left would still remain even if the hair was placed in formalin. The effect of peroxide on hair is to damage the hair structure. I know something about the effect of formalin on peroxidized hair. I agree I have never thought about it until you directed the question to me. I do not altogether agree that a scientific witness is not justified in making statements unless he has made experiments to determine it. I agree that the determination of the effect of formalin upon hair which has been peroxidized is a matter which could be subjected to experiment. If it is suggested that no scientist is justified in making an assertion as to what the effect is unless he has made an experiment, I say that you can examine the proposition on fundamental principles. Dr. Benbow is entitled to examine any proposition on fundamental principles. If it is put that all his fundamental principles are wrong and mine are right, I say that in my opinion those that he has put forward to date are wrong. I have never examined peroxidized hair under a microscope. I used the expression "simian type". That related to the helix. That is to be found in one textbook by a noted authority on anthropology - Topinard. In respect of simian ears he describes just the type of ear shown in the body, the flattened helix, and refers to that as being simian in type. Topinard is the author of the book. It is a textbook on anthropology. It may not be called "a textbook on anthropology", it may just have across the cover "Anthropology". It is not a recent publication, but it is a standard work. It should be in the University library. I have my own copy. The simian appearance of the ear that I describe is a flattening of the ~~post~~ postero-superior portion of the helix where it is actually rolled over. This cadaver has in fact what looks like a piece out of the ear. To my recollection that notching is not associated in the

expression "Simian appearance"; it is the flattened appearance. I would not say that a notching of that kind is a familial defect; it is a developmental defect. It is not necessarily the kind of thing transmitted from parent to child. I would not say it is usually a thing transmitted from parent to child. It is congenital; it is due to a mal-development of the tub^{er}cles from which the ear is normally developed. I did examine Mrs. Routledge's ear. I sat approximately 2 feet from her. I did not make any suggestion that I should make a thorough examination of her ear. If it is suggested that I did not out-roll the ear to see just what was the condition, I say the helix was rolled and I made the suggestion that I thought it would be worth while having a photograph of Mrs. Routledge's ear. I have not heard that suggested in Court. Mrs. Routledge may have sworn that there was a nick or a notch in her ear similar to that which is in the body. I did not see it. If either Mrs. Routledge or Dr. Benbow swore that Mrs. Routledge has a defect in her ear and the ear structure is similar to that which is found on the body, I say my impression is that throughout her evidence she was referring to this lobe ~~ring~~. I did not know that the ears of the body had been plugged with cotton wool for some time. I agree that some of the structures of the ear are likely to be affected if the dead body has the ears plugged with cotton wool over a considerable time. I proffered His Worship a book of anthropological tracings. Those are not resorted to for the purpose of identification. They are compiled for an entirely different purpose from that for which my evidence and Dr. Benbow's evidence is offered to serve in this matter. It is not correct to state that they have as much to do with it as the flowers that bloom in spring. If it is suggested it only shows that anthropologists take measurements in a different way for different purposes, I say anthropologists take measurements in a certain way

because photographically it cannot be done. At your request I cover one eye with my hand and look at Dr. Benbow. I can describe his face. I would describe his face as follows: forehead broad, narrowing slightly down towards the chin, square chin, lips straight, nose straight and symmetrical, eyes - upper lid up under a fold, lower lid can be observed, ears - superior portions of the helix slightly protruding outwards, the lobes, I cannot see ~~correctly~~ ^{clearly}, are close in towards the head, hair parted on the lefthand side and grey-brown in color; depth of eyes - not particularly deep, they are not ~~receded~~ receded in under the orbital ridge; chin - not protruding, I would say; nose - I could not say whether it is long or short; teeth - I can barely see the teeth, I can only see the outlines and I could not say whether they are forward or prominent. The fact is I need two eyes to get a stereoscopic image. Looking at a thing with one eye you are looking at a flat ~~plain~~ ^{plane} surface just as when you look at a photograph. Looking with one eye one has got no more perspective than there is in any camera, even a stereoscopic camera. If it is suggested that a proper dental X-ray picture of the right maxillary area would show whether this was a first or second molar by reason of the presence of the alveolar cavity, I say in my opinion that would not assist in the identification of that tooth. I am unable to express an opinion whether an X-ray film might be expected to show the alveolar cavity of the extracted tooth if the tooth had been removed at, say, 14 years of age. I am not a radiologist. There are two nicks on the cutting edge of the right upper central incisor. I look at Exhibits "N" and "H", and I compare the two. I cannot see any shadows of nicks in Exhibit "H". I cannot see shadows about approximately the same place as those nicks would be. I cannot even see the cutting edge of the incisor in Exhibit "H". I look at the left upper lateral incisor of the cadaver's mouth shown in

Exhibit "N". The left upper lateral extends towards the left central as it passes down. It leaves a triangular space at the gum margin. I look at Linda Agostini's photographs. The upper portion of the left lateral upper incisor in this photograph ~~ix~~ up towards the gum is also inclining here towards the central incisor. If it is suggested it then slopes away, I say you cannot see it on this one because part of the tooth that would slope away is absent. I look at the other photograph of Linda Agostini. The distal portion of the mesial border of the tooth inclines away from the central incisor. That is the impression I get looking at these two photographs of Mrs. Agostini. I look at the photograph of the mouth of the corpse. I should say that it would do the same thing there, for two reasons. The most distal portion of the mesial border of that tooth is absent, but I think you can see the trace where it is beginning to swing away already. In other words, the tooth comes across and makes contact and is now beginning to leave again. In other words, there is a small triangular interval in that position and that indicates, I believe, that in life that margin of the tooth was dropping down in that direction. I would not express an opinion on whether or not the nail in the big toe of the right foot is of an ingrowing type. It is extremely difficult to say in its present condition. If Philomena Morgan commenced to menstruate in her eleventh year, that would indicate the early onset of menstruation and not necessarily the early onset of puberty. There are other factors than menstruation associated with puberty. Menstruation is one of the main indications of the advent of puberty. On evidence that I have heard I find similarity in age, teeth, hair, midline frontal peak, ears, hands, build, general coloring, and three pigmented spots on the left arm with Linda Agostini. I agree I did not know Linda Agostini. I have only such description as I have been able to collect

listening to the evidence here. That is the only description I have. I have no other material to go on as to what Linda Agostini looked like in life than what is before His Worship. If you are describing it as it is now, I would agree that there is practically no toenail on the little toe of the right foot. In my opinion, the tooth to the left of the left central incisor in Exhibit "H" is a canine tooth. That involves that there is a left lateral incisor missing. I agree that photograph Exhibit "M" of the ~~XXXXXX~~^{cast} looks like the life size of the teeth. At your request I measure from the inclusion lacuna which is shown there to the outer edge of the right upper lateral incisor. I do not know whether that photograph is life size. It is apparently a photograph of that cast. Asked to look at the shadow which it is suggested is a pit or depression or inclusion lacuna in what I call the canine tooth, in Exhibit "N", I can see a very indistinct shadow extending downwards to the lip margin. I can see an indistinct shadow.

(PAGE 814 FOLLOWS)

TO MR. BARRY: I would only say that the surface of the right lateral ^{gives} incisor was curved. That is the impression it ~~gives~~ me. I cannot see any shadow there. I cannot see any shadow on that tooth. I cannot see any shadows, I can see what appears to be a dark part in that position.

TO MR. READ: As to the circumstances under which I was first invited to give any anatomical assistance in this case, I came up from my lecture on a Friday morning, that would be about the 17th or 18th March, and I was informed by my assistant that Sub-Inspector Hobley wished to see me. That was the first time I saw him, and he mentioned that he had come in connection with the Pyjama Girl case. He had with him a copy of the book dealing with the Ruxton case. He said that he was anxious that this particular case should be explored from every possible scientific aspect, and he asked me if I was prepared to undertake an anatomical examination, to act as an independent investigator. I informed him that I would first have to obtain the permission of the University authorities to do so. I eventually got permission from the University to do so, and I have done so ever since. As to the reasons why I said we were discussing this on an impossible basis, it is for the reasons I have already set out in my evidence. Firstly, that the planes of presentation are in no way comparable, no measurements have been taken out in three dimensions and in my opinion soft land marks have been used almost exclusively, and they are substantially inaccurate. There are no matters at all that have been put to me by Mr. Barry that in any way alter my opinion as regards the identity of that body, consistent with the evidence I have heard of it being the body of Linda Agostini.

TO THE CORONER: I see the shape of the nostrils as shown in the photographs exhibits 16, 17, 18 and 19. The shape of the nostrils in the photograph is nothing like the shape of the nostrils in the body. I should say that from a comparison

the nostrils in the photograph and in the body do not resemble each other. To explain that, of course, the nose has been fractured and there has been a certain amount of distortion there. It is possible that that distortion, plus the changes which have occurred subsequently with preservation and contracture have ~~allowed~~ led to modification of the distal part of the nose. That is the only suggestion I can offer. I have come here from the point of view of anatomy. From the photograph and looking at the body there is definitely a difference in the nose. As to whether my examination has led me to form an opinion on that matter, actually a comparison is extremely difficult because of the change which has certainly taken place in the nose. All that I can do is to say that comparing this photograph with the body as it stands they bear no resemblance. At the same time, I have to point out that we are comparing what is apparently a normal nose in this photograph with an abnormal nose in the body. If the nostrils were plugged with cotton wool very early, and then the subject placed in a formalin bath and left there for a long time, and after that long interval the plugging was removed, it would, under those circumstances, modify the shape of the nostrils. So far as I could determine on my examination of the body the nostrils were not plugged. As to how hazel eyes are produced, actually the only primary colours in eyes are blue, grey, brown, and green. A pure green eye is one which is very seldom seen. They are the primary colours and then you can have a mixture of any of those, and when you get a brown eye with green tinges in it you are getting into the hazel type of eye. It is not a deep brown, it is a light brownish green, just a sheen of green through it. I did not see any flattening or scolloping of the helix of Mrs. Routledge's ear. There are recognised types of faces. They are usually classified in terms of what is known as a facial index. That is the distance from the point at the root of the nose here (indicated); that is

the nasion to the point of the chin, which is called the
✓ gnathion. That distance is taken, and then what is called
the bizygomatic width of the face is taken. With those measure-
ments you work out the types of faces. One is the extra
broad short face, and the other the very long face. Mrs.
Agostini would fall into the class of the extremely broad
type of face, what is called the hyper-euryprosopic type of
face. There is quite a definite classification for it.
Anatomically an ovoid type of face is not a recognised type.
I would say an ovoid type would be broad above and narrowing
below. From the general description that has been given it
would fit into the broad type of face. It would be closer
to the broader type than it would be to the narrow type;
I would not describe it as a narrow face. The outlines of a
number of those faces would not necessarily coincide. You
must, of course, then take additional measurements on the
facial portion of the skeleton - such measurements to give
you the nasal index, the orbital index - and then there are
measurements to be taken in connection with the mandible
itself. There is no way of estimating the age of the molar
at this stage, not from that single molar, because it is well
erupted, and already shows some wearing. The degree of
wearing will give you some indication of age, but not in an
accurate manner. That also applies to the others. You
cannot estimate the age of it by the length. Occasionally
when a tooth is not opposed by another tooth it continues
to grow, that is, it continues to erupt, and it comes down
and projects beyond the normal margin of the teeth. The
extent to which that tooth projects downwards does give a
very rough estimate of age. It takes some time for a tooth
to erupt beyond the normal cutting edge margin of the mouth.
In that particular molar I could not rely on that in any
way.

Sydney Sunderland
.....

TAKEN AND SWORN BEFORE ME AT MELBOURNE THIS 19th DAY OF APRIL 1944.

Wingate
.....
CORONER.

JOHN FRANCIS OVEREND on his oath saith:

My full name is John Francis Overend, and I am a soldier in the 7th Division, Carrier Company, A.I.F. For a number of years I lived at the home of my aunt, Mrs. A.M. Quin, at Albury. I was brought up by her. It is correct that to some people I am known as "Johnnie" or "Ginger Quin". Prior to joining the Australian Imperial Forces I was a shed hand by occupation. I worked in various shearing sheds, and travelled throughout various parts of the Riverina. During the months of August and September, 1934, with my cousin Tom Quin, I was employed as a shed hand at Yanco Station. I could not say exactly the distance that Yanco station is from Albury; it would be well over 60 miles. To the best of my recollection I first went to Yanco station about the second week in August. I went there at the same time as my cousin Tom Quinn. I never went down to Albury at any time during the period I was at Yanco. I was at Yanco station for approximately four weeks. Whilst I was at Yanco I saw in the newspapers and heard from general conversation of the finding of a body in a culvert at Albury. I knew a woman named Lucy Collins. I have known Lucy Collins for about 15 years. During the time I have known her she has lived in and around Lavington in the Albury district. I remember a ^{shack} ~~shap~~ that my cousin Tom Quin owned near Lavington. To my knowledge Lucy Collins has lived in that shack. Prior to Lucy Collins going to live in that shack, I went to the shack when my cousin Tom Quin was living there. Whilst I was there I never saw an iron bedstead in the shack; there was one outside the shack. After my cousin left the shack I never went to the shack whilst Lucy Collins occupied it. I have never been friendly enough with Lucy Collins to visit her at her shack or at any other place. I never knew any girl who fitted the description which you read of a statement made by Dr. Benbow, and which reads, "Lucy Collins said to me, 'During the month of August

One thousand nine hundred and thirty-four a very bright, fair-haired girl wearing a fawn coloured soft hat, a light black woollen overcoat and white painted openwork shoes, which were very worn, arrived about 9 o'clock in the morning at Quin's shack in which I was living at the time. She was carrying a small brown suitcase." I never went to this shack occupied by Lucy Collins whilst she was occupying it and talked to any girl there. I was never fighting on the bed in the shack with any girl or woman. I never saw Lucy Collins knocked on the floor in any struggle in the shack when I was present. Asked about the portion of the statement which reads "Ginger Quin then picked up a bit of broken bed and knocked her on the head and battered her and knocked her to the floor," I say nothing like that ever took place. As to the portion of the statement which reads "I then said to the said Lucy Collins, 'What did Ginger Quin do then.' She replied 'Went for his bloody life out the door, over the quarry and over the hill to the home farm', " nothing like that ever took place. My aunt, Mrs Quin, who reared me is going grey. I have no knowledge of anything like the following statement ever happening - "The next thing that happened was that Snowy headed old Mrs Quin and her husband came along. They were in their sulky. They broke the padlock on my gate, then they came into the hut and Mrs. Quinn had a towel with her, and she did certain things with it."

TO MR. MONAHAN: There are seven real Quins in the Quin family. There are three boys. They are William, Thomas, and Roy Murray. Roy Murray is one person. There is one Overend. I am the only one, that is with them. I have a sister. There is only one boy. I am the only one. I do not know of any other male Overends. I do not know Marjorie Farr of 208 Glenmore Road, Paddington. I have been in Sydney. I do not know anyone in Sydney named Overend, with red hair, and who is related to the Farr's of 208 Glenmore road. I do not know a chap, in ~~Sydney~~ Sydney named Boy Johnson, or Norman Johnson.

It is correct that the Quin who was here last week gave his second Christian name as Johnson. As to that being a family name, it comes from his grandfather. The name Johnson is not mixed up with the name Quin among these Quins as far as I know. I do not know of any Johnsons in that family. I do not know a girl in Sydney named Marjorie Johnson of 208 Glenmore Road, and I do not know Boy Johnson.

TO MR. READ: I have never heard of those names until I was asked about them here; I have never heard them before.

TO THE CORONER: Johnson comes in on the grandfather's side. I believe that Johnson was his name. It came from Thomas Quin's father's father's side.

(Signed) J. F. OVEREND.

TAKEN AND SWORN BEFORE ME AT MELBOURNE THIS 19th DAY OF APRIL 1944.

W. S. King
.....CORONER.