

The Advertiser

Suspect passes lie-detector test

By Michael Corkill

24apr06

RAYMOND John Carroll, the man accused of killing Ipswich toddler Deidre Kennedy 33 years ago, has confounded critics by passing a lie-detector test.

In yet another twist in the long-running saga, Mr Carroll demanded the polygraph as a condition of interview for last night's *60 Minutes* program.

He was tested for an hour by Australian Polygraph Services, while electronic devices recorded his breathing, blood pressure and perspiration rates.

Asked if he killed Deidre Kennedy, Mr Carroll, 48, who received no payment for the interview, replied: "No, I did not."

The tester said: "The score I got for Raymond Carroll of plus seven was a conclusive result that he is telling the truth."

Reporter Richard Carlton played down the results, putting it to Mr Carroll that it could be that he had convinced himself that he had not killed the baby.

It was not the first time Mr Carroll had offered to sit the test.

Author Debi Marshall reported his willingness last year and Mr Carroll's claims that he wanted to do it for his trial but was advised against it by barrister Kerry Copley, QC.

"I asked for a lie-detector test," Mr Carroll said.

"He said that after all the accusations that had been put to me, that under hypnosis it might come out that I admit to it, subconsciously or however he put it."

Deidre Kennedy, 17 months old, was taken from her family home west of Ipswich on April 13, 1973.

She was strangled, sexually assaulted and had bite marks on her leg.

Mr Carroll fell under police suspicion after he was traced to a bizarre break-in at the women's quarters of a nearby RAAF base at Amberley.

A photograph of a woman taken during the break-in was found with his fingerprints on it.

Mr Carroll, who lived nearby, was convicted in 1985 of murder, after the jury heard evidence that his teeth matched the marks on the toddler.

But the conviction was overturned by the Court of Appeal.

More than 14 years later prosecutors tried to charge Mr Carroll with perjury.

His conviction by jury was later overturned by the Court of Appeal, in a decision supported by the High Court.