

Special Inquiry

into

St Andrew's Hostel, Katanning
(including St Christopher's Hostel, Northam)

Held at: Courtroom 4, Level 18,
111 St Georges Terrace, Perth

Tuesday, 19 June 2012 at 2.00pm
(Day 35)

Before: The Hon Peter Blaxell

Please note: this transcript contains explicit sexual material

1 HIS HONOUR: Please be seated. Yes, Mr Urquhart.
2
3 MR URQUHART: Yes, thank you, sir. The Inquiry is going
4 to hear evidence this afternoon from Elizabeth Jane Stroud,
5 and Ms Stroud is available on video link --
6
7 HIS HONOUR: Right.
8
9 MR URQUHART: -- so I'll call her. And we clarified, sir,
10 with Ms Stroud, that Mr Ellis won't be appearing for her
11 this afternoon.
12
13 HIS HONOUR: Very well. Thank you.
14
15 MR URQUHART: Thank you, sir.
16
17 HIS HONOUR: Now, can you hear me, Ms Stroud?
18
19 THE WITNESS: Yes, I can.
20
21 HIS HONOUR: Now, do you have an affirmation - form of
22 affirmation there in front of you?
23
24 THE WITNESS: Yes. I also have the Bible.
25
26 HIS HONOUR: What do you prefer?
27
28 THE WITNESS: I'm comfortable with either, if one is
29 easier for you, sir.
30
31 HIS HONOUR: Well, it might be easier if you just read out
32 the affirmation, will be sufficient, thank you.
33
34 <ELIZABETH JANE STROUD, affirmed:
35
36 <EXAMINATION-IN-CHIEF BY MR URQUHART:
37
38 MR URQUHART: Q. Now, Ms Stroud, can you hear me and see
39 me in front of the screen there?
40 A. Yes, I can, sir, thank you.
41
42 Q. All right. If you have any difficulty hearing me or
43 you lose the picture, please let us know. There's a little
44 bit of static --
45 A. Thank you, I'll do that.
46
47 Q. There's a little bit of static coming through at this

1 end, but hopefully it will be okay at your end.
2 A. Yes, it's very clear, thank you.
3
4 Q. That's good. All right. Ms Stroud, do you recall
5 providing a typewritten three-paged letter dated 23 May of
6 this year to the Inquiry, titled "St Andrew's Hostel
7 Inquiry Response"?
8 A. Yes, I do, sir.
9
10 Q. And, in fact, do you have that there in front of you?
11 A. Yes, I do.
12
13 Q. I'll just see whether you can remember this, but do
14 you recall in that response providing names of those who
15 worked in the Department of Employment and Training that
16 were involved in Westrek? It's on page 2 in the first full
17 paragraph.
18 A. Yes, I do, yes.
19
20 Q. And you mention a number of names there, and to put it
21 in context, this is the names that you were providing to
22 Mrs Dawkins in that second telephone conversation you had
23 with her last year.
24 A. Yes, sir.
25
26 Q. I mean, you've named some people that we've already
27 heard of that were working in the department that was
28 involved in Westrek - like Peter Sherlock, Ian Carter,
29 Peter Kenyon, Mike Cross, and you also refer to an
30 "I"?
31 A. Yes.
32
33 Q. Did he work --
34 A. And a Deb Piatt.
35
36 Q. Yes, but "I" - did he work in the Perth
37 office?
38 A. No, he was the second team leader in Katanning.
39
40 Q. Right.
41 A. He was the second one to join.
42
43 Q. I see. So you're saying he was the group leader that
44 was with --
45 A. Yes, he was Maggie's peer.
46
47 Q. Right. Did he ever, to your recollection, work at

1 head office?
2 A. I have absolutely no memory of Ian being in the Perth
3 office at all, sorry.
4
5 Q. Did you work on the 9th floor of the Superannuation
6 Building when the head office was there? Can you --
7 A. Yes, I did.
8
9 Q. And how many other people who were involved in the
10 Westrek project worked on that floor, about?
11 A. How many people?
12
13 Q. Yes.
14 A. Initially it was Peter Sherlock, myself and a
15 Secretary or a PA, and then Trish Thomson came into the
16 Perth office.
17
18 Q. Yes.
19 A. There were occasional --
20
21 Q. Go on.
22 A. Okay. Sorry, there were occasional people that came
23 in, like Tarquin Bowers and other - the other people
24 associated with the outdoor program.
25
26 Q. I see.
27 A. They did not hold a desk in the office as such.
28
29 Q. Now, Ms Stroud, just going back now to the time when
30 you gave evidence on 10 April?
31 A. Yes.
32
33 Q. One thing that you and I agreed on when I questioned
34 you at the public hearing on that day was this matter, and
35 it's just one question I'm going to read out to you - and,
36 sir, it's at page 1502 --
37 A. Yes.
38
39 Q. I asked you:
40
41 When you were involved in this Westrek
42 program ... I gather you would regard any
43 offence being committed upon a participant
44 as a Westrek concern?
45
46 And your answer was, "Absolutely"?
47 A. Yes.

1
2 Q. And do you --
3 A. Yes, sorry.
4
5 Q. And do you stand by that answer?
6 A. Yes.
7
8 Q. Now, Ms Stroud, in a situation where a Westrek
9 participant has made a complaint to police about being
10 offended against, would you expect those of you who are
11 managing the project at head office to be notified?
12 A. I would have expected someone in head office to be
13 notified; yes, I would, sir.
14
15 Q. Particularly if the participant had been withdrawn
16 from the project as a result?
17 A. Yes.
18
19 Q. And, Ms Stroud, who would you expect to have been
20 notified at head office about that?
21 A. I would have expected it to be Peter Sherlock, as
22 first point of contact.
23
24 Q. Yes.
25 A. And if he was not available, then me, hypothetically,
26 yes.
27
28 Q. And anyone else?
29 A. No.
30
31 Q. No?
32 A. Perhaps - pardon?
33
34 Q. This information though, would be relayed on to
35 others, wouldn't you expect?
36 A. Yes, I would have - sitting here today, yes, I would
37 expect that.
38
39 Q. Yes. People like Ian Carter and Peter Kenyon?
40 A. I would have expected that Ian Carter, Peter Kenyon
41 and perhaps the chairperson being notified of something
42 outside of the norm happening, yes.
43
44 Q. Well, this would certainly be something outside of the
45 norm, wouldn't it?
46 A. Having read the letter, I can only say I was staggered
47 at reading it; and, yes, that's extremely outside of the

1 norm.
2
3 Q. Well, I'm going to get to the letter in a moment, but
4 I'm just staying with that scenario that I've said to you,
5 about a Westrek participant being offended against.
6 A. Yes, sir.
7
8 Q. Now, the letter you're referring to - and, Ms Stroud,
9 if we can talk about this matter on the basis that you
10 don't refer to any names of the parties allegedly involved,
11 okay?
12 A. Yes, sir, I understand that, yes.
13
14 Q. Or, indeed, the location of where this incident took
15 place, or this alleged incident, okay?
16 A. Yes, sir.
17
18 Q. Thank you.
19 A. Yes, sir, I understand that.
20
21 Q. So earlier this month I gather you do recall receiving
22 a letter from me outlining an incident described in police
23 records in 1985 and 1986?
24 A. Yes, sir, I did receive the letter, and I have read
25 it.
26
27 Q. All right. And that concerned a complaint, do you
28 recall, that was made by a 19-year-old female Westrek
29 participant?
30 A. I only recall it from reading the letter, sir.
31
32 Q. Yes, that's right. Okay. I'm going through just the
33 contents of the letter with you --
34 A. Yes.
35
36 Q. -- and if you need to have a look at that letter by
37 all means, but the letter also indicated that this took
38 place in October 1985, okay?
39 A. Yes, yes.
40
41 Q. And the allegation was that she was indecently dealt
42 with by a male Westrek employee. Do you recall that - as
43 in do you recall that --
44 A. Yes.
45
46 Q. -- being in the letter?
47 A. Yes.

1
2 Q. And you also recall in that letter that you were
3 advised that police records show that authorities at
4 Westrek were advised, and two social workers from Perth
5 collected this person and returned her back to Perth?
6 A. Yes, sir.
7
8 Q. And those records also stated that the Westrek
9 employee was transferred to the Perth office at the
10 Superannuation Building at 32 St Georges Terrace.
11 A. Yes.
12
13 Q. Do you remember that?
14 A. Yes, yes.
15
16 Q. And I also must make it clear that you recall this
17 letter also advised you that from police records no charges
18 were actually laid by the police?
19 A. Yes, yes.
20
21 Q. Now, I think you've agreed with me that an incident
22 such as this would be a very significant one?
23 A. Absolutely.
24
25 Q. And a potentially damaging one for the Westrek
26 program?
27 A. Potentially, yes.
28
29 Q. And one that I would suggest to you would have been
30 brought to the attention of those higher up in the chain
31 who were responsible for managing the Westrek program?
32 A. I really - to me, that would be making an assumption,
33 and I'm not comfortable to do that. I apologise, sir.
34
35 Q. Ms Stroud, why wouldn't you be satisfied or prepared
36 to make that assumption, given the fact that, yes, it's
37 albeit an allegation, but it's an allegation of a sexual
38 nature made by a Westrek participant against a Westrek
39 employee, serious enough for the participant to be removed,
40 and for the Westrek employee to have to come back to head
41 office to assume duties there? Why aren't you prepared to
42 make that assumption, that in those circumstances it should
43 be something that is conveyed higher up the chain?
44 A. I would have imagined that that would go to the Board,
45 yes. My discomfort, I guess, is in the context of the
46 times - that our feet barely touched the ground day to day
47 throughout the entire pilot program, your Honour.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Q. Well, Ms Stroud, that might well be the case, but something like this is unique, or let me put it this way - would be completely unexpected?

A. I would say it's appalling; yes, sir.

Q. You're - sorry, it's what?

MR KING: Appalling.

HIS HONOUR: Appalling.

MR URQUHART: Appalling, yes.

THE WITNESS: It must be my Australian accent, sorry.

MR URQUHART: Q. Would you agree that this allegation is far more significant than any of the indiscretions that you've attributed to Maggie Dawkins in her time at Westrek?

A. Yes.

Q. So with all that in mind, can I ask you what is your recollection of this particular incident?

A. Yes. I have - with absolute honesty, I have absolutely no memory of the said person returning to the Perth office, nor do I have any memory whatsoever of the situation that occurred. I am completely honestly unaware of that, and I am staggered that I have no memory of the person in the Perth office - we shared one room.

Q. I know it happened 27 years ago, but something like that, which was a potential bombshell for Westrek, you had no memory whatsoever of this occurring?

A. Sir, I believe I was not informed of it, and I have absolutely no memory of it whatsoever, nor do I have a memory of the said person being within the office environment, and I am staggered by it. My jaw dropped when I read the letter.

Q. It's just that - I go back to what you're able to recall about Maggie Dawkins' indiscretions, which you agree with me are not as significant as this one, and yet are you saying that you may well have been told about this, but you no longer can recall?

A. With all due respect, I'm saying that I have no memory of it. I - when I read the letter, I was absolutely staggered.

1
2 Q. Would you expect, Ms Stroud, for someone in the
3 Westrek management team to have a recollection of this
4 incident?
5 A. Certainly the person that dealt with it should have a
6 recollection of it, yes.
7
8 Q. And you're saying that would be, in the ordinary
9 course of events, Peter Sherlock?
10 A. Yes, he was responsible for performance management.
11
12 Q. And if he wasn't there at the time this came to light,
13 then yourself?
14 A. I would think that if it was something of a serious
15 nature like that, there would have been Ian Carter,
16 probably, would have stepped in.
17
18 Q. Yes. And I'm going to suggest to you that with that
19 chain of command, Peter Kenyon and Mike Cross would have
20 also been notified of it?
21 A. Quite possibly, yes.
22
23 Q. Well, we know Mr Cross is deceased, but --
24 A. Yes.
25
26 Q. -- Ms Stroud, I can advise you of this, that Ian
27 Carter, Peter Kenyon and Peter Sherlock all received the
28 same information as you did about this particular incident,
29 okay?
30 A. Yes, sir
31
32 Q. And all were asked to respond as to what their
33 knowledge was of the incident, okay?
34 A. Yes.
35
36 Q. Now, I don't suggest for one moment that any of you
37 have conferred with each other about what your
38 recollections are of this particular incident, okay?
39 A. Yes.
40
41 Q. And I'll just tell you what the responses were. Mr
42 Carter said he was not informed of the alleged sexual
43 misconduct. Peter Sherlock said he had no memory of the
44 matter, and Mr Kenyon said he had no recollection of ever
45 being told about a police investigation into indecent
46 dealings. Okay.
47 A. Yes, sir.

1
2 Q. Now, you say you have no recollection either?
3 A. That is correct.
4
5 Q. Can you see why it could be said, Ms Stroud, that even
6 though 27 years has elapsed, that given the significance of
7 an incident such as that, that one might say beggars
8 belief, that not one of you has any recollection about it?
9 A. I can only speak for myself, sir, and I was not
10 involved in performance management, and I honestly have
11 absolutely no recollection of it whatsoever.
12
13 Q. But if I can again compare it to the matters involving
14 Maggie Dawkins. You all had recollections as to why she
15 was removed from Katanning to Bunbury, yet this particular
16 matter, which, as an allegation, was far more serious - not
17 one of you seems to have any recollection about it.
18 Doesn't that strike you as a little unusual?
19 A. Speaking only from myself, I can only say I was
20 removed from performance management. I would imagine the
21 person that dealt with something like that should, in fact,
22 remember it, yes.
23
24 HIS HONOUR: Can I just ask a question here, if the camera
25 could come to me.
26
27 Q. Now, Ms Stroud, you say you were removed from
28 performance management, yet you remember things about the
29 performance of Maggie Dawkins, and detailed matters to do
30 with what you call behavioural issues. If you were able to
31 remember things about her performance, why can't you
32 remember a more serious matter about
33 ... ? Can you explain that?
34 A. I can, your Honour. My only explanation would be that
35 the issues surrounding Maggie were much talked about in the
36 office, and this issue, I have with all honesty no
37 recollection whatsoever, your Honour.
38
39 HIS HONOUR: Right. Thank you.
40
41 MR URQUHART: Now, just, sir, we may have to do some
42 editing of the transcript of that question.
43
44 HIS HONOUR: Did I say something about it?
45
46 MR URQUHART: Your Honour just asked --
47

1 HIS HONOUR: I beg your pardon.
2
3 MR URQUHART: Yes, that's okay. We'll --
4
5 HIS HONOUR: Yes, I think I did. Yes, I made an error
6 there.
7
8 MR URQUHART: -- make a note of that, that's fine.
9
10 HIS HONOUR: Yes.
11
12 MR URQUHART: Yes, thank you, sir.
13
14 Q. Wouldn't a matter such as this have been the talk
15 around the office as well?
16 A. Clearly it wasn't. Perhaps due to its confidentiality
17 it was not discussed. Because it was a legal matter, I
18 cannot speculate, I'm sorry, sir.
19
20 Q. Ms Stroud, do you still maintain that as far as you
21 were aware in 1985, that Maggie Dawkins' complaints
22 regarding Dennis McKenna's sexual abuse of a hostel student
23 did not play a part in her removal from Katanning?
24 A. Hearing Peter Sherlock's evidence and understanding
25 that he received a phone call from Dennis McKenna, I now
26 understand differently. When I gave evidence - and I have
27 re-read my transcript - I believe it to be accurate and
28 truthful to what I knew at the time, sir.
29
30 Q. Well, you --
31 A. I believed --
32
33 Q. Sorry, go on.
34 A. I believed that Maggie was being moved as a result of
35 her behaviours, and I only became aware of anything
36 different during the Inquiry, with Peter Sherlock
37 disclosing that he had a phone call from Dennis McKenna.
38
39 Q. And, indeed, I think you - you may well recall his
40 evidence that he said he would have told you about that
41 phone call, but your account of that is that you didn't
42 receive any information regarding that?
43 A. That is correct, I did not receive any information in
44 1985 about that.
45
46 Q. Yes. So, again, is it the case of you being able to
47 say that you certainly did not get that information, or is

1 it the case that you no longer can recall?
2 A. Sir, with all due respect, I think the severity of
3 that I would have remembered.
4
5 Q. Okay, yes.
6 A. And I have no memory of that.
7
8 Q. Thank you. I did ask you that initial question --
9 A. Thank you.
10
11 Q. -- on the basis that as far as you were aware in
12 1985 --
13 A. Yes.
14
15 Q. -- Mrs Dawkins' complaints about Dennis McKenna had
16 nothing to do with her removal, okay?
17 A. Yes, yes.
18
19 Q. And I gather then from what - the answers that you've
20 now given, is that you still maintain that as far as you
21 were aware, her removal had nothing to do with what she was
22 saying about Dennis McKenna?
23 A. Yes, sir.
24
25 Q. Thank you.
26 A. Until the evidence of Peter Sherlock's, yes.
27
28 Q. And, again, we'll just confirm it again - you still
29 maintain that as far as you were aware, it was her
30 consistent inappropriate behaviour as a group leader that
31 caused her removal?
32 A. Yes, sir. That is what I believed at the time.
33
34 Q. And is that what you believed right up until the time
35 you read Mr Sherlock's evidence at the Inquiry?
36 A. Until the Inquiry, when I spoke - one of the phone
37 conversations when I spoke with Peter Sherlock on the
38 phone, he told me that he had received a message - he had
39 received a phone call from Dennis McKenna, and that Maggie
40 Maruff/Dawkins used to ring him nightly and on the weekends
41 and speak to both he and his wife.
42
43 Q. Okay.
44 A. And that was the first that I had heard of that, sir.
45
46 Q. All right. Thank you for that. Now, Ms Stroud, has
47 the Inquiry provided you with a copy of an email exchange

1 you had with an ABC reporter, Jake Sturmer, on 23 September
2 last year?
3 A. Yes, sir, I have copies of that, and I have a comment
4 in my notes in paragraph 3 that I would like to discuss,
5 please, sir.
6
7 Q. Yes, we will certainly get to that. I will give you
8 an opportunity, as I have before, for you to give a full
9 explanation as to this matter.
10 A. Thank you, sir.
11
12 Q. And is it the case that you were provided, through
13 your lawyer at the time, Mr Ellis, that copy some time last
14 month, about a month ago now?
15 A. I've had a copy in my - saved in my inbox; and, yes, I
16 believe Mr Ellis sent me a copy.
17
18 Q. Right.
19 A. I've had very limited and now no internet access.
20
21 Q. I just want to know whether you agree or disagree with
22 me with this question. I'm going to suggest to you that
23 what you said in that email exchange is inconsistent with
24 your evidence to this Inquiry regarding your recollection
25 of why Mrs Dawkins was moved from Katanning?
26 A. I guess I believe that that was a part of a
27 conversation with Jake, and my intent behind that was
28 clarified in a conversation with Jake, Tuesday 27
29 September. We had approximately a 12 to 15 minute
30 conversation while I was driving, and the content that we
31 covered was to clarify the email. I provided a bit of
32 background on the program, the role and structure, my
33 memory of the phone conversation with Maggie in 1985 that I
34 had received. I also sought to clarify what I meant by
35 "banished by Ainslie Evans", as the reasons I understood
36 why she left Westrek occurred because of her behaviours. I
37 also provided names that she could potentially contact -
38 Carter, Kenyon, Sherlock, Holmes a Court and
39 Deb Piatt, Sandy Johnson, and I did not
40 respond to the email on the 26th because I was in flight
41 home, and he rang me on the morning of the 27th, my battery
42 ran out, he then rang me back and said - left a message
43 saying, "Thank you for the information, no need to ring me
44 back". I then left Perth again on the 28th, and was away
45 outside of Kalgoorlie from the 28th to the 30th.
46
47 Q. Now, Ms Stroud, I'm going to ask you the question

1 again, and I'd like you to answer the question now. The
2 question was that what you've said in that email exchange
3 on 23 September with Mr Sturmer is inconsistent with your
4 evidence to the Inquiry regarding your recollection of why
5 Maggie Dawkins was removed from Katanning. So just staying
6 with what you --
7 A. No, sir.
8
9 Q. -- staying with what you said in --
10 A. No, sir, with all --
11
12 Q. -- that email exchange.
13 A. Sir, with all due respect, I believe that it was a
14 very quick-fired off email which was then followed up with
15 a full explanation.
16
17 Q. I understand all that. I understand what you're
18 saying about the full explanation.
19 A. My intention --
20
21 Q. But --
22 A. My intention of the email, and I agree that we don't
23 see things how they are - we see things how we are. I
24 agree the email is not well written, and I sought to
25 clarify that immediately with Jake, the morning of the
26 27th.
27
28 Q. Well, you say the email is not well written, but would
29 you accept this: that it is consistent with what Maggie
30 Dawkins says was the reason why she was removed from
31 Katanning. Would you accept that?
32 A. I understand the intent that I wrote the email - and I
33 believe I probably wrote it immediately after talking about
34 Maggie on the phone, in the first phone call, and my intent
35 was explained, and I can only - where I sit, I understand
36 my intent --
37
38 Q. Ms Stroud, the question was: would you accept that the
39 explanation you've given in that email is consistent with
40 what Maggie Dawkins has always said was the reason why she
41 was removed from Katanning?
42 A. Sir, with all due respect, I feel that I am answering
43 that, that my intent was explained to Jake the following
44 morning.
45
46 Q. Ms Stroud --
47 A. Sir, on the morning of the 27th.

1
2 Q. Ms Stroud, just reading that email - reading that
3 email on the face of it, without any other explanation,
4 would you accept it is consistent with what Maggie Dawkins
5 has said was the reasons behind her removal? Now, you can
6 either agree or disagree with me?
7 A. As it is written, yes, I can understand that
8 interpretation.
9
10 Q. Thank you. I want to go now to have a look at that,
11 and, sir, it's - we have a barcode number for this
12 document. It's barcode 0486. Now, Ms Stroud, I understand
13 that you have a copy there?
14 A. Yes, sir, I do.
15
16 Q. I want to deal now first with the email from the
17 bottom, starting on the second page. We see it's from a
18 Jake Sturmer --
19 A. Second paragraph.
20
21 Q. No?
22 A. Yes.
23
24 Q. I was going to go through --
25 A. Okay.
26
27 Q. -- the titles first.
28 A. Yes.
29
30 Q. It's from Jake Sturmer?
31 A. Yes, sir.
32
33 Q. And ABC email address. It was sent on Friday, 23
34 September 2011, 4.40pm, and it's sent to your --
35 A. Yes.
36
37 Q. -- work email address; is that right?
38 A. Yes, sir.
39
40 Q. And do you accept that you did receive that email from
41 Mr Sturmer?
42 A. Yes, sir, I did.
43
44 Q. And the subject matter is "ABCTV 7.30 WA Story"?
45 A. Yes, sir, I have a copy in front of me.
46
47 Q. Thank you. Now, do you accept that as a matter of

1 logic this email would have been sent after you and Maggie
2 Dawkins spoke for the first time in September last year?
3 A. Yes, sir, it would have been.
4
5 Q. And it reads:
6
7 Hi, Elizabeth,
8
9 My name's Jake Sturmer, I work for the
10 ABC's 7.30 WA program.
11
12 I'm just going to stop there for a moment. Do you also
13 accept that this, by virtue of that first line, is the
14 first communication you have had with Mr Sturmer?
15 A. Yes, sir, and that's an issue that I raised, that I
16 said I wanted to come to my statement that was written on
17 the 23rd.
18
19 Q. All right. So this is your first communication with
20 him?
21 A. Which is inconsistent with my third paragraph --
22
23 Q. We'll get to that?
24 A. -- in my statement on 23 May.
25
26 Q. We'll get to that.
27 A. Yes, sir.
28
29 Q. It reads:
30
31 I've been investigating what happened at
32 the St Andrew's hostel in Katanning in the
33 70s and 80s and just spoke to Maggie
34 Dawkins who suggested I contact you.
35 Maggie told me she spoke to you about
36 raising concerns about what was happening.
37
38 Second paragraph:
39
40 I was just wondering if you were able to
41 tell me what happened from there? I would
42 have called but Maggie said you were
43 overseas and I didn't want to disturb you.
44 If there's a good time to have a chat on
45 the phone, please let me know.
46
47 Otherwise, we can converse by email.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Hope to hear from you soon.

Cheers,
Jake

So that's his email.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, when he says:

I was just wondering if you were able to
tell me what happened from there?

Being what happened after Maggie raised concerns about what
was happening at St Andrew's Hostel, would not have your
response been that as far as you were aware, the concerns
that Maggie had, had nothing to do with her removal from
Katanning?

A. Can - I'm unclear what you're asking me, sorry. Can
you please repeat the question?

Q. Mr Sturmer's email sets out clearly, does it not, what
he's asking you about. He says that Maggie's told him --

A. Yes, sir, I have read it.

Q. Yes. That Maggie's told him that she spoke to you
about raising concerns about what was happening at St
Andrew's Hostel in Katanning in the '70s and '80s, okay.
Now, sorry, I withdraw that - that's he's investigating
what was happening at St Andrew's Hostel in Katanning in
the '70s and '80s. He said to you that Maggie's told him
that she spoke to you about raising concerns about what's
happening at St Andrew's; okay?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. When you read that portion of his email, you would
have realised that what he was referring to was, or were -
was the allegations that Dennis McKenna was sexually
abusing a boy there; yes?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. He then asks you:

I was just wondering if you were able to
tell me what happened from there?

1 Now, according to your evidence that you gave at the
2 Inquiry in April, your response would have been, would it
3 not, that as far as you were aware, the concerns that
4 Maggie had had nothing to do with her removal from
5 Katanning?

6 A. Sir, I can understand that logic. I believe, for me,
7 I sought to clarify what would be a poorly worded email. I
8 wanted to be able to give my truth, I wanted to support
9 Maggie to tell her my truth, what I remembered. I was in a
10 public place and I had the further conversation with
11 Maggie, as you are aware, in October, and I sought to
12 clarify my intent of that email with Jake, Tuesday, the
13 27th. I believe it is a very poorly worded email, but I
14 wrote very quickly following a discussion with Maggie, and
15 very quickly shot off an email.

16
17 Q. No, but --

18 A. And yes, I can understand.

19
20 Q. -- the discussion --

21 A. Yes, I can understand what you are inferring from the
22 reading of that email, that is consistent with Maggie's
23 message.

24
25 Q. Maggie's message, which was what?

26 A. That she was removed from Katanning as a result of
27 blowing the whistle on Dennis McKenna.

28
29 Q. Yes, because isn't that how you responded in your
30 email to Mr Sturmer?

31 A. Please, sir, with all due respect, that was not my
32 intent, and I sought to clarify that with Jake, Tuesday,
33 the 27th.

34
35 Q. Well, why did you send it?

36 A. I can only plead stupidity on that, sir.

37
38 Q. Or you can plead the truth?

39 A. I'm thinking --

40
41 Q. You can plead the truth, Ms Stroud, that that was a
42 truthful answer to Mr Sturmer's email?

43 A. Sir, with all due respect, it was an unconsidered
44 response and, you know, I have spent --

45
46 Q. Well, Ms Stroud, we'll stop --

47 A. -- days and nights --

1
2 Q. -- we'll stop there for a moment. I think we
3 should --
4 A. Yes, sir.
5
6 Q. -- go to your response then.
7 A. Yes, sir.
8
9 Q. Can we just go to the front page now. And your
10 response has been sent on Friday, 23 September 2011 at
11 4.57pm, which is 17 minutes later. And I'll just read out
12 your response:
13
14 Jake
15
16 I am currently in Zambia working. I return
17 Monday night and depart Wednesday for
18 Kalgoorlie and will be on a mine site
19 running a training program, so unavailable.
20
21 My recollection of the issue is that Maggie
22 raised the concern and was quickly banished
23 from town by the then mayor Ainslie Evans.
24 That is my sum total of recollection. I
25 believe she also spoke to Peter Sherlock --
26
27 And then you write "wrt" is that abbreviation "with regard
28 to"?
29 A. With regard to.
30
31 Q. All right.
32 A. Yes.
33
34 Q. In that case I'll read that out then with that full
35 description - thank you for that:
36
37 I believe she also spoke to Peter Sherlock
38 [with regard to] the issue. I have not
39 maintained contact with him; at the time he
40 live in Mundaring area.
41
42 I hope this is helpful, regards,
43
44 Elizabeth
45
46 So you sent that email?
47 A. Yes, I did, sir.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Q. So I'm going to ask you now something about what is in the second paragraph. You said that:

My recollection of the issue is that Maggie raised the concern --

Now, what was the issue that you were referring to?

A. That Maggie rang Peter Sherlock's phone and disclosed the abuse of a young boy by Dennis McKenna, and that she had gone to the police and spoken to Ainslie Evans.

Q. Right. And Maggie raised the concern, and so the concern that you were referring to?

A. As I said, that she rang the office, Peter Sherlock's phone, to disclose she'd been to the police and to Ainslie Evans with regard to an abuse of a young boy by Dennis McKenna.

Q. Right. And then it reads:

-- and was quickly banished from town by the then mayor Ainslie Evans. That is my sum total of recollection.

Now, Ms Stroud, was that the sum total of your recollection at that time?

A. Please, sir, understand the environment in which I'm in. I'm working away, I'm in the midst of a program, I had just --

HIS HONOUR: If I can intervene there.

THE WITNESS: -- spoken to Maggie --

MR URQUHART: Sorry, Ms Stroud --

THE WITNESS: -- and I did not give much thought --

MR URQUHART: Ms Stroud, sorry. Sorry, his Honour just wants to ask something.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

HIS HONOUR: Can I just ask you --

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

1
2 HIS HONOUR: -- when you're asked a question, if you could
3 just - before launching into a long explanation about
4 leading up to your answer, could you give the answer first.
5 It will then make it easy to follow what you are saying.
6
7 Q. So the question was - was that the sum total of your
8 recollection then, and I think you're saying, "Yes, but
9 you've got to understand the environment", and I think
10 that's what you're saying, but it would be helpful if you
11 could give the answer first?
12 A. I apologise your Honour.
13
14 HIS HONOUR: That's all right. No, it's just very hard to
15 follow your evidence, otherwise. Yes, if you can repeat
16 the question, please.
17
18 MR URQUHART: Thank you, sir.
19
20 Q. The question was: was that the sum total of your
21 recollection at that time?
22 A. At that time I wrote a very quick email, yes, it was.
23
24 Q. Okay.
25 A. I really - it was a reactive email from talking to
26 Maggie, and getting an email and firing off a very quick
27 response without giving a lot of thought. I apologise,
28 sir.
29
30 Q. All right. So you're saying that's from talking to
31 Maggie. So that conversation you had with Maggie before
32 you sent this email, that's what she was saying, wasn't
33 she - that she was banished from the town because of the
34 matter she was raising regarding Dennis McKenna's sexual
35 abuse of a boy?
36 A. Yes, sir, that's what she was saying.
37
38 Q. But as I understand your evidence, Ms Stroud, you have
39 never accepted that, insofar as your recollection was
40 concerned?
41 A. Yes, sir, and that's correct, that I didn't accept it,
42 and as soon as I got to Perth I discussed with Jake - I
43 gave it a lot of thought, and I --
44
45 Q. But wait on.
46 A. -- discussed with Jake what I believed.
47

1 Q. But why then did you tell Mr Sturmer that this was, in
2 fact, your recollection and not Maggie Dawkins'?

3 A. Sir, it was a very poorly worded email, and it was a
4 mistake, yes.
5

6 Q. Ms Stroud, I have questioned you for about half a day
7 in April, and now today. You strike me as a very
8 intelligent woman who gives great thought to her answers.
9 Now, would you agree with me that that is most
10 uncharacteristic of you just to get it so wrong?

11 A. I have been known to make many mistakes in my life,
12 sir. Yes, it is out of character, and I accept
13 responsibility for that.
14

15 Q. You see, your evidence has been that the first
16 conversation you had with Maggie in September, you and her
17 couldn't agree on anything?

18 A. My first conversation in September was a very short
19 one, and I said to her when I would return, and I provided
20 names for her, and distinctly said, "Maggie, you rang me
21 and gave me the information".
22

23 Q. Ms Stroud, I'm going to stop you there. Wasn't it the
24 case that you were disagreeing with her on key points with
25 respect to why it was she was moved from Katanning?

26 A. The first phone conversation, with all due respect,
27 was very short. I said to her, "Maggie, I can't talk now".
28 We disagreed on some things, yes, sir, and we - and I
29 stated, "Maggie, you've told me the messages in the
30 office."
31

32 Q. So you agree with me that your stated recollection of
33 what happened as you've set out in that email is totally at
34 odds with your version of events that you gave before this
35 Inquiry in April?

36 A. I believe that it can be interpreted as this, yes,
37 sir.
38

39 Q. It can't be interpreted any other way, can it, Ms
40 Stroud?

41 A. From where I sit with my intent and my - I was quick
42 to clarify what I meant by the email with Jake the 27th,
43 because I felt that email was misrepresenting my opinion,
44 when I sat down and gave it some very serious thought, and
45 I sought to clarify that error with Jake in a phone
46 conversation on the 27th.
47

1 Q. So what should have you said in the response to that
2 email he sent to you on 23 September?
3 A. "Hi, Jake, currently working in Zambia. I get home
4 Monday, happy to discuss it. Let me have some - give it
5 some thought, and I'll talk to you on Tuesday."
6
7 Q. Right. And why didn't you do that?
8 A. That is a very good question, and that I can only feel
9 ashamed that I didn't. Sir, with all due respect, I
10 recognise that that was not my understanding, and I sought
11 to clarify my mistake with Jake in the phone conversation.
12
13 Q. See, I just - I hear what you're saying, Ms Stroud,
14 but I'm just curious as to why it was that you would, after
15 stating what was so clearly wrong, that you then say, "That
16 is my sum total of recollection"?
17 A. It's something that happened 27 years ago, and I had a
18 quick two second, while participants are working in small
19 groups, and fired off a response. I then recognised that
20 evening that I should actually sit down and think carefully
21 about what I did remember.
22
23 Q. Yes.
24 A. And I sat down and thought long and hard about it that
25 evening and on the flight home, and sought to clarify with
26 Jake in the phone conversation on the 27th.
27
28 Q. Your recollection changing after 23 September - did it
29 have - did that have anything to do with your first
30 telephone conversation with Ian Carter last year?
31 A. No, sir, my conversations with any of the other
32 parties were long after that. They were not until February
33 2012.
34
35 Q. Ms Stroud, that's not your evidence in April of this
36 year?
37 A. No, no, no - yes, sorry, when I - I believe I rang Ian
38 Carter in September and asked him if he knew what was going
39 on.
40
41 Q. Yes, yes, that's right.
42 A. Yes.
43
44 Q. Yes, page 1515 of your evidence --
45 A. Yes.
46
47 Q. Is that you rang him for the first time after the

1 September phone call with Maggie Dawkins, but before the
2 October phone call --
3 A. Yes, that's correct, I did.
4
5 Q. -- with her, yes.
6 A. Yes, that is correct. I apologise, sir.
7
8 Q. And again on that same page you asked him, amongst
9 other things, what was his understanding of what was
10 happening?
11 A. Yes, sir, that's correct.
12
13 Q. You were asking him about what he could recall about
14 Maggie Dawkins' removal, didn't you?
15 A. Yes, sir; yes, sir.
16
17 Q. You see, I'm going to suggest to you those
18 conversations you had with Ian Carter, Peter Kenyon and
19 Sherlock from September last year to February of this year
20 was to ensure your memory was accurate.
21 A. I certainly wanted to check if things that I
22 remembered were accurate; yes, sir.
23
24 Q. And I'm going to suggest to you it was after those
25 conversations, and in particular the first one that you had
26 with Mr Carter, is you decided your recollection insofar as
27 what you told Jake Sturmer in that email was not accurate?
28 A. I spoke with Jake Sturmer before I spoke with Ian
29 Carter, sir.
30
31 Q. Are you sure about that?
32 A. I'd only returned home - pardon.
33
34 Q. Are you sure about that?
35 A. Sir, I don't believe I would have time from when I got
36 home on the 26th, to the morning of the 27th. I cannot
37 categorically state that I am sure of that, but I do
38 believe I spoke with Jake Sturmer first, but I cannot be
39 categorically certain, sir. I was home on the 26th, and
40 spoke with Jake, the 27th.
41
42 Q. You see, Ms Stroud, why the Inquiry is interested in
43 your email to Mr Sturmer on 23 September? Can you see why
44 we're questioning you about that?
45 A. Yes, sir, I can.
46
47 Q. Because, you see --

1 A. Yes, sir, I can.
2
3 Q. For example, Mrs Dawkins' evidence - and this appeared
4 at page 242 of the transcript - this is back in February.
5 She said that at a meeting with you and Peter Sherlock, she
6 was told that she was putting the Katanning project in
7 jeopardy by upsetting Ainslie Evans and Dennis McKenna,
8 which is, of course, very consistent with that email that
9 you responded to with Mr Sturmer in September last year.
10 Do you agree?
11 A. Sir, I was not in a meeting. I was not in a meeting
12 with Peter and Ms Maruff.
13
14 Q. Leave that aside. Leave that aside. This is what
15 Mrs Dawkins says, all right, and I'm just saying to you can
16 you see the consistency between --
17 A. Yes, sir, I can see.
18
19 Q. Yes.
20 A. Yes, sir, I can - I can understand that
21 interpretation.
22
23 Q. And, again, I just wanted to read from a passage from
24 the typewritten account that you've given to the Inquiry
25 that's dated 23 May, and this is in regards to the second
26 telephone conversation that you had --
27 A. Yes, sir.
28
29 Q. -- with Mrs Dawkins, all right?
30 A. Yes.
31
32 Q. And it's the second full paragraph on the second page?
33 A. Yes, sir.
34
35 Q. You stated - you say you said this to Mrs Dawkins:
36
37 I clearly stated to Maggie that I did not
38 believe she was removed (banished) from
39 Katanning because of raising the issue of
40 Dennis McKenna. That is because that is
41 what I honestly believed.
42
43 Isn't that right?
44 A. Yes, sir, I wrote that.
45
46 Q. And do you stand by that?
47 A. Yes, sir, I do.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Q. But do you also agree with me that's not what you said in the email to Mr Sturmer?

A. Sir, I - I can only confess to ignorance in the email that I have to accept responsibility for, and I understand your interpretation of it.

Q. And between that email to Jake Sturmer and your second telephone conversation, you had spoken to Mr Carter and asked him what his recollection was regarding the reasons why Maggie Dawkins was moved?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And did he not tell you in that conversation what he believed was the reason behind Maggie Dawkins' removal from Katanning?

A. Yes, he did.

Q. And we know from his evidence that he, like your version that you gave to the Inquiry in April, is that his recollection was that Maggie Dawkins was removed because of her inappropriate behaviour as a group leader, okay?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you read Mr Carter's evidence since you've completed giving your evidence in April?

A. Yes, sir, I did.

Q. So I just want to put to you what he says was discussed in that first conversation that he had with you last year, okay?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And this appears at page 1621, at line 9. Now, I'm going to read it all out, it's about two-thirds of a page, okay, and this is what he said you spoke about:

-- we talked broadly about the fact that our recollection of the time was not what had been published in the press at that time; that we were all aware of issues around child abuse being raised against Dennis McKenna, and they've been raised directly with us, and we both basically confirmed to each other that wasn't our recollection of what had occurred.

1 And I asked:
2
3 All right. So both you and her were saying
4 that you did not have a recollection?
5 A. That's what she said to me, and what I
6 said back to her.
7
8 That was his answer, and I continued:
9
10 -- that you did not have a recollection ...
11 of child abuse allegations being raised?
12 A. Against Dennis McKenna, with us.
13
14 Was his answer:
15
16 Q. And is that still your recollection to
17 this day?
18 A. It's still my recollection, that it
19 was not raised directly with me at all.
20
21 Q. What about indirectly?
22 A. Not indirectly either.
23
24 Q. So let me get this right. Are you
25 saying that throughout 1985 --
26 A. Yes.
27
28 Q. -- you were completely unaware of a
29 matter involving Maggie Dawkins making
30 allegations that the warden of St Andrew's
31 Hostel had sexually abused a boy?
32 A. That's correct, I was not made aware
33 of that issue.
34
35 Do you agree with Mr Carter's account of what you said to
36 him regarding your recollection?
37 A. I think what he's saying is that we both said we
38 didn't remember any allegation.
39
40 Q. Yes.
41 A. And I don't know if I told him that Maggie - I'm
42 pretty certain, but I cannot categorically state that I
43 said Maggie had rung the office. I was wanting to - so,
44 no - so is that completely accurate? I'm not certain if I
45 did disclose to Ian that Maggie had rung the office and
46 told me. I was asking questions what his reality was.
47

1 Q. But he says he was asking you about your recollection?
2 A. Yes, and I'm - and I'm sorry, I am vague with it, and
3 I'm not certain if I told them that she had rung the
4 office. I would have thought I would have.
5
6 Q. Yes. You see, I was thinking that as well, so I
7 confirmed - because based on your version, you would have,
8 but you see at page --
9 A. Yes, I would imagine.
10
11 Q. But you see at page 1625, I actually asked him
12 directly about that - and this is at line 19, sir. It's
13 just one question at this time, Ms Stroud. This was of Mr
14 Carter.
15 A. Yes.
16
17 Q. :
18
19 So let me get this right - so Ms Stroud was
20 saying to you on that occasion --
21
22 And I pause there - that was the first occasion, first
23 conversation you had with him:
24
25 -- so Ms Stroud was saying to you on that
26 occasion that she had no idea about any
27 allegations that Mrs Dawkins had heard
28 about Dennis McKenna sexually abusing a
29 student?
30 A. That's what she told me in that phone
31 conversation, yes.
32
33 So he's quite emphatic about that.
34 A. Yes, I - look, I wouldn't make up that Maggie rang me
35 in the office, you know. I - I accept responsibility that
36 I refused a phone call, and I didn't do enough in receiving
37 it. I --
38
39 HIS HONOUR: I wonder if I can just ask a question. If
40 you can put the video onto me, please.
41
42 Q. See, Ms Stroud, Mr Carter's evidence that you told him
43 in that phone call that you had no recollection of the
44 allegation against McKenna, had been told about that
45 allegation about McKenna. Do you appreciate that that's
46 his evidence. Now, do you agree with that?
47 A. Yes, sir, I do understand that, your Honour.

1
2 Q. Do you agree with that evidence, or do you say that
3 that's not correct?
4 A. Your Honour, I can only say I'm confused with that
5 because I don't know what --
6
7 Q. Well --
8 A. -- what the conversation was.
9
10 Q. Well, I just asked you a very simple question: do you
11 agree with Mr Carter's evidence on that, or do you disagree
12 with his evidence? You must remember whether or not you
13 said that?
14 A. With all due respect, your Honour, I don't - I don't
15 really remember that. I --
16
17 Q. There wasn't a --
18 A. I feel fairly certain that I would have disclosed. So
19 I guess I would have to say that I disagree with that, or -
20 sir, I'm confused, your Honour.
21
22 Q. Well, isn't it correct that the whole purpose of that
23 telephone call of Mr Carter's was to discuss what each of
24 you knew about what was being publicised in the press about
25 Maggie making allegations against McKenna?
26 A. Yes, sir, and --
27
28 Q. So you must have discussed whether or not you could
29 each remember that; is that correct?
30 A. Look, we did discuss it and the conversations went all
31 over the place and I'm not sure if I --
32
33 Q. Yes, all right. Now, just - don't go on --
34 A. -- discussed --
35
36 Q. -- for a long explanation, but you did discuss that
37 subject. What do you say you told Mr Carter about your
38 recollection about that?
39 A. Sir, your Honour, with all due respect, I can't
40 remember. I would have imagined that I said there is a
41 phone call, sir.
42
43 HIS HONOUR: All right. Mr Urquhart.
44
45 MR URQUHART: Thank you.
46
47 Q. Ms Stroud, am I right in saying that when you had that

1 first telephone conversation with Mr Carter, you weren't
2 aware of what Maggie Dawkins was going to say about the
3 telephone call she had with you?
4 A. That is correct, yes.
5
6 Q. Yes. Now, is it the case that you're now giving a
7 different version of that telephone conversation that
8 Maggie Dawkins had with you, because you now know --
9 A. No, sir, I --
10
11 Q. -- what her version is regarding that phone call?
12 A. No, sir, I believe my statement to be true and -
13 truthful and accurate.
14
15 Q. All right, then. So notwithstanding what we've gone
16 through this afternoon, you are still maintaining that as
17 far as you are aware in 1985, you believed that Maggie
18 Dawkins was removed from Katanning because of her
19 inappropriate behaviour as a group leader?
20 A. Yes, sir, that was my memory from 1985.
21
22 MR URQUHART: Thank you, sir. That's all the questions I
23 have for Ms Stroud.
24
25 HIS HONOUR: Right, no other questions.
26
27 MR JENKIN: No, thank you, sir.
28
29 MR KING: No, sir.
30
31 HIS HONOUR: All right.
32
33 Q. Well, is there anything else you wish to add, Ms
34 Stroud in relation to what we've been asking this
35 afternoon?
36 A. You know, I - it's a very difficult. I feel there are
37 huge inconsistencies in what I've presented, and with all
38 absolute honesty, I have tried to stay with my truth, and
39 every day I get more and more confused about it and feel
40 sickened by it. And my intention of my phone calls with
41 Maggie was to support her by giving her my truth. I spoke
42 with Janet Holmes a Court to clarify, "Did you and I go to
43 Katanning? Did we have a conversation with Maggie because
44 I have no memory of it?" Janet said, "No." I have been
45 around so many iterations of it, and I have endeavoured to
46 tell my absolute truth.
47

1 HIS HONOUR: All right, thank you, Ms Stroud, that
2 completes your evidence.
3
4 MR URQUHART: Sir, I suppose I should just tender that
5 email in the presence of Ms Stroud.
6
7 EXHIBIT #129 EMAIL CHAIN BETWEEN MS STROUD AND J STURMER,
8 ABC JOURNALIST
9
10 HIS HONOUR: So, thank you very much, that completes your
11 evidence, we'll now cut the video link.
12
13 THE WITNESS: Thank you, your Honour, for the opportunity.
14 Thank you, sir.
15
16 HIS HONOUR: Very good.
17
18 <THE WITNESS WITHDREW
19
20 HIS HONOUR: Yes, sir. What's next, Mr Urquhart?
21
22 MR URQUHART: Yes, sir, for the balance of the afternoon I
23 propose reading some statements that are regarding the
24 inquiries - special inquiries undertaken regarding Northam.
25 Before I do that, sir, I just may seek to clarify some
26 matters that a witness made regarding a statement I read
27 out yesterday.
28
29 HIS HONOUR: Yes.
30
31 MR URQUHART: And that is the statement of Frances
32 Rosemary Newman. Now, whilst I didn't read out
33 paragraph numbers when I read Ms Newman's statement into
34 evidence, I will just state that she wishes to clarify two
35 paragraphs in her statement. The first one is at
36 paragraph 21, and I'll read that out in full as I read it
37 out yesterday, and then clarify what Ms Newman wishes to
38 make. Paragraph 21:
39
40 I contacted the St Andrew's Hostel Board.
41 I'm pretty sure it was the Board Chairman
42 of the Katanning High School. I don't
43 remember his name.
44
45 I think, sir, from memory, we may well have clarified this
46 ourselves, I'm not all together certain, but to put it
47 beyond any doubt at all, it should have read, "I'm pretty

1 sure it was the Board Chairman of the Katanning Hostel",
2 not the "Katanning High School".
3

4 Now, sir, the other matter concerned paragraph 28, and
5 I'll read it out as I read it out yesterday, and then I
6 will read out the clarification that Ms Newman wishes to
7 make:
8

9 It has stayed with me since, that there
10 existed a toxic culture at the St Andrew's
11 Hostel. I believe this culture at
12 Katanning High School was evidently covered
13 up by people who held positions of trust.
14

15 She wishes to clarify that that last statement starting
16 with "I believe" should have read, "I believe this culture
17 at Katanning High School and the hostel was evidently
18 covered up by people who held positions of trust."
19

20 HIS HONOUR: Right, thank you.
21

22 MR URQUHART: Sir, now, I turn our attention to the
23 inquiries that have been undertaken with respect to the
24 Northam Hostel, and these are further matters and
25 statements that have come to light since we concluded our
26 public hearings in relation to that particular hostel.
27

28 Now, the first statement, sir, is from an ex-student
29 at the Northam Hostel. He has requested his name not be
30 disclosed, and has also asked that the names of other
31 students he refers to not be read out. Given the subject
32 matter of this statement, the Inquiry will respect those
33 requests. He will simply be referred to as "Q", and he has
34 confirmed that this statement is true and accurate. And
35 he's done that by email correspondence with the Inquiry.
36 It reads - and it's somewhat lengthy, sir. So "Q" states:
37

38 I am 56 years old and live in Duncraig with
39 my wife --
40

41 He then refers to his number of children that he has, and
42 he refers to what his current employment is. Paragraph 3:
43

44 Only recently while I was away working, I
45 turned up the radio when I heard some
46 discussion about Northam. They were
47 talking about someone called Wenlock.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

I remember some time ago I emailed Gary --

Reads "Adshed" but it should be Adshead:

-- from the Western Australian Newspaper,
and told him about some things that
happened in Northam about Roy Wenlock, so
this rang some bells in my head. I didn't
have access to the Internet at work, so
when I returned to Perth I looked him up on
the Internet. I Googled Wenlock on Perth
Now.

I saw an image which was the dead spitting
image of this man I knew as Roy Wenlock.
Roy Wenlock was the warden at the hostel.
His nickname by the students was Snoz.

When I read the articles about him
wrestling with students and making them
squeeze his armpits, the news articles
couldn't have been any more correct.

When I heard this discussion on the radio,
I thought it might have been my
imagination, but then I remembered. It had
been horrific what Wenlock did to me.

I will describe some of the incidents I can
recall, although because it was so long
ago, I'm not sure in what order they
happened.

I was raised in Dalwallinu originally,
where I lived with my parents and my
younger brother --

He refers to his brother's name, which I won't disclose,
and the occupation of his father, which I won't either. It
continues at paragraph 10:

In 1970 I went to Dalwallinu High School
for my 1st year at high school. I left
St Joseph's Convent in Grade 4 because of
abuse by the nuns who ran the school; I
used to be an altar boy. I was smart at

1 school and got good grades. I wanted to go
2 to Aquinas College, but my parents couldn't
3 afford a private school.
4

5 I wasn't able to get a better education in
6 Dalwallinu, so in 1971 I went to Northam
7 Senior High School, and St Christopher's
8 Hostel was where I was Boarder for my for
9 my 2nd Year High. Sometime during the year
10 the family moved from Dalwallinu to
11 Kalgoorlie.
12

13 I was only 14 when I first arrived. I was
14 a good-looking, quiet kid who always had a
15 fit body as I played a lot of sport. I
16 excelled at football and cricket.
17

18 Things started off well, however, for some
19 reason I started smoking and I got caught.
20 I was called to Wenlock's office where he
21 gave me the cane across the fingers.
22

23 I remember Wenlock had a range of canes of
24 different lengths. I think he had three
25 and the really small one was made out of
26 something like Balsa wood.
27

28 Wenlock also kept a Caning Book. He told
29 me he put my name in the book for smoking
30 and that he would show my parents at the
31 end of term. I remember the Caning Book
32 was often stolen and there would be a
33 lock-down within the hostel for it to be
34 located.
35

36 Not long after my caning, I was in the
37 Boys' Dormitory (Dorm); it was almost
38 'lights out' time and I was in my pyjamas.
39 I can't remember if a Prefect or a House
40 Master came down to tell me Wenlock wanted
41 to see me in his flat and to go up there.
42

43 He then names a student. I will just simply refer to that
44 person as "a student":
45

46 -- from Dalwallinu was opposite me and
47 already in bed. He told me Wenlock was a

1 pervert. I didn't know what he meant at
2 the time.
3
4 Wenlock's flat was at the end of the Dorm
5 just past the 1st and 2nd year students'
6 Dorms. I knocked on Wenlock's door and
7 waited for him to answer. He was a very
8 tall man and a bit podgy. I was just a
9 small fella and I remember thinking there
10 was no-one you'd fear more. I can't
11 remember much about what we talked about.
12
13 He said something like, 'You shouldn't be
14 smoking and let's forget it'.
15
16 Then he said, 'Let's do a little bit of
17 wrestling!'.
18
19 He told me to put on these things, like
20 leopard skin jocks. They looked like the
21 type that wrestlers used to wear in the
22 Wide World of Wrestling. He wore normal
23 pyjamas at first, and then he put on brown
24 tiger-spotted leopard silky jocks.
25
26 Wenlock lay down on the floor and said that
27 this is the 'start' position for wrestling.
28 He told me to sit on top of him and put my
29 hands under his armpits and squeeze. He'd
30 try and get you off him by bucking his hips
31 around.
32
33 After a while I was thinking this was
34 weird, getting poked by this hard thing
35 around my backside area. He did this until
36 I felt wetness in his jocks against me.
37 Then he said it was time for me to go. He
38 changed back into his pyjamas and I left
39 his flat.
40
41 This was the first time Wenlock wrestled
42 me.
43
44 Wenlock had either a Prefect or House
45 Master call me up to his flat every time
46 after he caned me. It felt like he caned
47 me every week, sometimes 3 times a week,

1 sometimes less. He seemed to have all
2 sorts of reasons to cane me and then offer
3 'solace' in his flat afterwards by
4 wrestling me.
5
6 On one of these occasions, I took off from
7 the hostel. I was still in my pyjamas.
8 The Police were called and brought me back.
9 I know I wasn't the only one who ran away
10 from Wenlock after 'wrestling' with him.
11
12 You also had to get permission from Wenlock
13 in his flat to leave the hostel which
14 included playing sport, then report back to
15 him at his flat when you got back. He said
16 it was to tell him about your day's
17 activities which usually ended in a
18 wrestle.
19
20 On average I played either football or
21 cricket every week. Sometimes when I
22 played sport two days in a row, I used to
23 stay at a mate's house --
24
25 Who he names, but I won't disclose:
26
27 -- who lived in town, known as a 'townie'.
28 I'd stay at his place as I'd only have to
29 check in with Snoz once to avoid a wrestle
30 with him.
31
32 At some stage I talked to my mate --
33
34 Who "Q" names but I will refer to as "H". So I will start
35 that sentence again:
36
37 At some stage I talked to my mate 'H' about
38 it. His brother was a Prefect and I knew
39 Snoz never went near them. I knew 'H'
40 wasn't a virgin from the stories he told
41 about girls and should be able to help me
42 out with what Wenlock was doing.
43
44 'H' told me the 'deal' about Wenlock
45 'going off on me' and by that I mean what
46 the wetness was I felt during the wrestling
47 routine and he explained to me about

1 masturbation. He gave me instructions on
2 how to do it to myself, so I would then
3 know what to look for.
4
5 I surmised that was similar to what Wenlock
6 had been doing during the wrestling. I
7 thought it was ok as it wasn't as bad as I
8 expected. I was pretty naïve at that
9 stage.
10
11 The wrestling routine was Wenlock was
12 common knowledge amongst the boys. Apart
13 from being called up to Wenlock's flat
14 after a caning or to check in with him, he
15 also called you to attend his flat on your
16 birthday which also ended up in a wrestle
17 with him.
18
19 It felt like every 2 weeks Wenlock tossed
20 between me and another 14 year old boy. He
21 was a little, good-looking blonde kid who
22 had been Wenlock's favourite. He'd be
23 about 55 now. I don't remember his name.
24 The boys used to count down until his 14th
25 birthday and he often wet his bed. He also
26 used to cry every night when he got the
27 cane.
28
29 I used to say to him 'When you check in
30 with Wenlock you'll get molested'.
31
32 I remember in the boys' shower area there
33 was a curtain and white tiles. Wenlock was
34 always there all the time. We'd say he was
35 probably checking out the talent. Everyone
36 knew he was a pervert. There was always a
37 teacher or one person there when we were
38 showering.
39
40 He then refers, sir, at paragraph 35, to a teacher, which I
41 won't disclose because it involves a degree of speculation.
42 Paragraph 36:
43
44 There was a lot of hazing at the hostel.
45 This is where the boys would tease and
46 bully the weak and Snoz I believe was right
47 behind it as were his thug Prefects or

1 henchmen for another word. I was a boxer.
2 There was one bloke who was a big bully. I
3 was in the boxing ring with him and I hit
4 him and knocked him out. Fortunately I was
5 under my mate 'H's protection, so none of
6 the hazing ever happened to me.
7
8 Another time a Prefect or House Master came
9 to the Boys' Dorm after 'lights out' to
10 tell me Wenlock wanted to see me in his
11 flat. He introduced me to alcohol and
12 allowed me to smoke cigarettes in front of
13 him. This was very confusing for me as I'd
14 get caned for smoking. Wenlock didn't
15 smoke but I remember he had a packet of
16 Capstan. It was a red packet. They were
17 rollies without a filter. It tasted
18 horrible.
19
20 After I had a smoke, he gave me a glass of
21 beer. I can't remember if he had a drink.
22
23 Then the wrestling routine started. He lay
24 on his back while I was on top of him.
25 He'd tell me to squeeze his armpits and he
26 bucked his hips like simulating a sex act.
27 After a while he told me to leave and when
28 I got off him he noticed he had what I now
29 know to be an erection.
30
31 In the end I asked Wenlock about what he
32 was doing. He said it's all about the
33 birds and the bees. In hindsight, that was
34 the worst thing I did, was to ask him.
35
36 He said it's what happens when you become a
37 man, we have erections; I can't remember
38 his exact words. He said something like,
39 discharge and a feeling of nirvana. He
40 says it's great, it's good.
41
42 He pulled his penis out of his pants and
43 said, 'it's easier if someone else strokes
44 it'.
45
46 So I did. I remember while I did that he
47 had a red, screwed up face, with his veins

1 popping out until he ejaculated. I got
2 covered in it. He took me into his shower.
3 I got undressed and he washed me with soap.
4 He was kneeling down in front of me. He
5 touched me on the penis until I ejaculated.
6
7 This happened on other occasions when I was
8 called to his flat. The routine was a
9 quick wrestle after a smoke or a drink,
10 sometimes both, then I would masturbate him
11 and he would do the same to me. Then he
12 would wash me in the shower.
13
14 Somewhere in the middle of the year, I was
15 caught smoking again. The next day I had
16 to go see Wenlock. He said he'd been told
17 I'd been smoking. That's when I got the
18 caning of all canings. Snoz made me pick
19 one of his canes. I picked the smallest
20 one.
21
22 Wenlock kept caning me trying to make me
23 cry but I wouldn't break. I couldn't tell
24 you how many times he hit me but he kept
25 going until he couldn't anymore and had to
26 stop.
27
28 During the caning I could see my little
29 finger was bent in an 'L' shape. Wenlock
30 broke my finger. He shit himself. He told
31 me to get dressed out of my pyjamas and he
32 drove me in his personal car to the Northam
33 Hospital.
34
35 Wenlock said something like, 'You'll never
36 have to come back to my flat, just tell
37 them you did it at football'.
38
39 When we got to the hospital, many of the
40 staff knew him. I told the nurse or doctor
41 I'd hurt it at football, like Wenlock told
42 me. I think they knew I'd been caned, but
43 believed him. Either the doctor or nurse
44 said I had to go to Perth to get it fixed.
45
46 On the way back to the hostel Wenlock said
47 it was my fault for smoking. He said he

1 would have to tell my parents and they
2 wouldn't be happy if I got expelled. So I
3 said I would just leave it.
4

5 During a caning, Wenlock would sometimes
6 hit me 20 times. I only ever had a caning
7 on the hand. He'd hit your left hand so
8 you could still write. I'm sure some
9 teachers must have known. I remember my
10 maths teacher spoke to me about my low
11 grades.
12

13 As a result of the caning by Wenlock my
14 little finger was badly damaged and is
15 still bent and twisted.
16

17 I think Wenlock managed to last about 4
18 weeks before he got me called to his flat
19 again. One time he made up that I was
20 caught smoking again and he caned me and
21 another time when I invited --
22

23 He refers to a lady's name but I will refer to that person
24 as "D":
25

26 -- another time when I invited 'D' a townie
27 to the house cinema Wenlock gave me the
28 cane for taking her and not a girl from
29 Adamson House.
30

31 After that, the many times Wenlock had me
32 called to his flat he'd allow me to smoke
33 and have a glass of beer. We didn't
34 wrestle for as long any more. I think the
35 wrestling was the way he could covertly get
36 me into the shower with him after the
37 wrestling got him a little bit excited. I
38 would masturbate him and he would do the
39 same to me, then he would wash me in the
40 shower.
41

42 Eventually, the routine progressed to oral
43 sex. I couldn't tell you when this started
44 or how often it happened.
45

46 Wenlock would say things like, 'I need you
47 to do a favour for me' or 'You owe me

1 favours!'

2

3 Initially, I'd be looking forward to the
4 shower bit by then. The oral sex would
5 always be in the shower. He'd always give
6 me oral sex first, then I'd reciprocate
7 until he ejaculated. I remember Wenlock
8 would have the same red face as when he was
9 caning you.

10

11 At the end of the year, when I was called
12 to his flat, there was always oral sex in
13 his shower with him. He liked using the
14 soap. Once he'd done his 'deed', he
15 couldn't get you out quick enough. He'd
16 have a look of shame on his face.

17

18 The House Masters used to run study every
19 night. You'd get the tap on the shoulder
20 and everyone knew you were either getting
21 the cane or going to see Snoz for
22 'wrestling' or more in my case.

23

24 Imagine if you were getting tapped all the
25 time. Although I have never had any doubts
26 about my sexuality, this was terrible for
27 my self-esteem. I'm not sure if Wenlock
28 picked me as the type of kid who wouldn't
29 tell anyone about what he was doing. He
30 always threatened that I would get expelled
31 for smoking or something and tell my
32 parents and be made a ward of the State.

33

34 I don't think I'd have been the only one
35 that this happened to.

36

37 Again, towards the end of the year, I can't
38 remember when it started, Wenlock asked me
39 to wash his car with him. Then I went with
40 him to his flat. There was a knock on the
41 door and a bloke turned up.

42

43 Wenlock said this bloke was a friend of his
44 who liked to watch our wrestling matches.
45 I was uncomfortable that the bloke was
46 there and that he wanted to watch Wenlock
47 wrestle me.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

I recognise this bloke as a person who addressed us at St Christopher's School assemblies. He was the head honcho. By that I mean he was high profile person from the local church. He was always in a suit and collar. He was the one in power, even over Wenlock.

He wore glasses, had black hair which was thinning at the sides. I can't remember if he had an accent but I'm not sure if I would recognise him again after such a long time.

I have seen Michael Challen on the news and I didn't recognise it to be him or remember if he was at the hostel at any stage.

Wenlock introduced me to the bloke as Michael and the bloke said he was always called Michael.

He said something like, 'It's a lovely name. It's the same as mine, St Michael'.

He never spoke after that or participated. The bloke just sat on a single chair while Wenlock wrestled with me.

Wenlock lay down on the floor. He told me to sit on top of him and put my hands under his armpits and squeeze. He bumped his hips around to try and get me off him. He got excited as he usually did and then he told me to get off. Wenlock said I can go now. I left straightaway. Nothing else happened.

This bloke watched about 7 or 8 times. It became a Sunday ritual.

Sir, I pause here to emphasise something. Inquiries are continuing as to the identity of this man, however, I must stress that there is absolutely no suggestion that it is Bishop Michael Challen. Bishop Challen did not become involved with this hostel until 1976 and these incidents

1 that "Q" refers to took place in 1971.

2

3 Also, I stress, sir, that "Q" himself said at
4 paragraph 66:

5

6 I have seen Michael Challen on the news and
7 I didn't recognise it to be him or remember
8 if he was at the hostel at any stage.

9

10 Of course, it is not in dispute that Bishop Challen would
11 not have been at the hostel in 1971.

12

13 HIS HONOUR: I seem to recall he was in Melbourne at that
14 time or something like that. I will check the transcript.

15

16 MR URQUHART: Yes, but I need to make that abundantly
17 clear. Thank you, sir. "Q's" statement continues:

18

19 I never ran away or told anyone as Wenlock
20 threatened me. He said I'd become a ward
21 of the State.

22

23 At the end of 1971, on a Thursday or Friday
24 night, the school put on a school play.
25 The other class were dancing the
26 Charleston. I was dressed up as Elvis
27 Presley. I played the GI Blues. I had jet
28 black hair and wore a light blue shirt with
29 epaulettes. Wenlock was in the audience.

30

31 On the weekend he invited me to come over
32 dressed in my Elvis gear. I said I didn't
33 have a guitar. Anyway, he still made me
34 get dressed up. When I got to his flat he
35 had the guitar waiting for me.

36

37 I performed the GI Blues for him. Then
38 performed oral sex in the shower as usual.

39

40 A couple of days later at the end of the
41 year, my mum came and got me and I left the
42 hostel for the school holidays. Wenlock
43 would have thought I was coming back. I
44 didn't want to go back.

45

46 I won't refer to anything in paragraph 76 because it is not
47 relevant. At paragraph 77:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

At the beginning of 1972, my parents put me on the Indian Pacific, overnight with my luggage in Kalgoorlie to start a new year at St Christopher's. I got off the train before it left the station and left my bags. My luggage arrived but I didn't.

Someone from the hostel rang mum to see why I hadn't arrived. It didn't take long to find me and I never told my parents what happened. I just said I hated it and refused to go back.

My brother was a little blonde boy who was a year below me. He wasn't going back either as he didn't have good grades. We have never spoken about what happened to me at the hostel with Wenlock.

I ended up going to the Eastern Goldfields High School in Kalgoorlie for a short time before I ran away from home and joined the Army.

I suffered cold sweats when I heard people walk through the Dorms at the Army as it reminded me of the practice at 'lights out' time at the hostel when you were tapped on the shoulder when you were called to Wenlock's flat.

I have never met anyone more intimidating in my life, including my 23 years in the Army. He was the biggest manipulator who could then change to Mr 'nice guy' and then you'd want to help him. He was a tall man, powerful and the meanest prick you've ever met.

I met my wife when I was 19 years old. I have only just told her that I've been interfered with but nothing in detail.

Making this statement is the first time I have ever spoken about these events.

1 This statement is true to the best of my
2 knowledge and belief. I have made the
3 statement knowing that, if it is tendered
4 in evidence, I will be guilty of a crime if
5 I have wilfully included in the statement
6 anything that I know to be false or that I
7 do not believe is true.

8
9 Sir, "Q" has added the following below that declaration.
10 He added this over the weekend just gone and it reads as
11 follows:

12
13 This is a true and accurate record of
14 events during 1971 whilst I was a boarder
15 at St Christopher House in Inkpen St,
16 Northam.

17
18 I have never sought compensation, revenge
19 or an apology from those who suppressed the
20 truth whilst despicable things happened to
21 me and my fellow boarders. I thank the
22 Inquiry for revealing the sort of truths
23 behind a hypocritical organisation called
24 the church that is so concentrated on
25 self-protecting its image that it allowed
26 the serial molestation of its charges to go
27 unpunished and unnoticed by the authorities
28 for fear of damaging its holy reputation.

29
30 Sir, that concludes "Q"s statement. There are two more,
31 neither as long as that one. The next one, this witness
32 will simply be referred to as "B". Again for the same
33 reasons he has made that request and for reasons that
34 become apparent in his statement, the Inquiry respects and
35 acknowledges and agrees to his request. "B" states:

36
37 I am 43 years old and live in Perth. I am
38 a lawyer.

39
40 I became aware of the recent reports in the
41 press in relation to the conduct of Roy
42 Wenlock in relation to his role as warden
43 of St Christopher's Hostel in Northam.

44
45 The name Roy Wenlock was familiar to me as
46 I came in contact with him after his time
47 in the hostel.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

In 1985 I was 16 years old and there was an umpiring course that the WACA was holding, so some students attended the weekend at Point Walter.

I kept a diary at that time, although I would often record things after the date on which they happened. It is clear from the diary, however, that the course was in September 1985 on the weekend of 6th to 8th September. A letter that Roy Wenlock later sent me also mentioned those dates.

My father was (and still is) an Anglican Priest and he drove me to the umpiring course. My father knew Roy Wenlock through his association with the Anglican Church.

Roy Wenlock was at the course (both adults and students attended), and he put all of us school kids in one dorm, and the reason he said was he thought us kids would be offended by the language of the adults, which I, and I think other, thought was a bit silly. He stayed in our dorm as well. He was very nice, and I recorded in my diary that us boys had an interesting talk --

And after that should be the words "with him":

-- before going to bed, but did not record the details of this. Nothing happened that weekend.

When the course finished you had to sit an assessment paper (an exam) to be a qualified umpire.

Roy Wenlock sent me a letter dated 13 September 1985. My name and address, and the date, were in a different type. The main body of the letter and the signature looked like a photocopy. It looked like a standard letter. It invited me to sit the exam at the WACA on 18 September 1985 at

1 7pm. Among other things, the letter said:
2 'Your (sic) were a credit to your school,
3 your family and indeed to yourself'.
4

5 The last paragraph of the letter said: 'As
6 I indicated at the Camp I would be pleased
7 to see you at the WACA any time convenient
8 to both of us should you wish to discuss
9 any matter on umpiring or cricket in
10 general. Please ring and make prior
11 arrangements with me'. I don't remember if
12 he actually said that to me at the camp,
13 but he might have done so.
14

15 I couldn't sit the exam at the appointed
16 time, so instead it was arranged for me to
17 sit it at his house. My mother (and I
18 assume my father) knew all about this.
19 That happened on 12 October 1985, according
20 to my diary. My mum dropped me off in
21 South Perth at Richardson Park where he was
22 working, doing something with boys. I
23 think he may have been umpiring.
24

25 For all but about 10 minutes that day he
26 was so nice. I later noted in my diary:
27 'Mr Wenlock was very kind'.
28

29 He drove me back to his home which I think
30 was in Wembley and we chatted about things
31 like Perth's freeway system.
32

33 When we were back at his home we had lunch
34 together. I remember that he talked about
35 a well-known umpire's battle with
36 alcoholism. This was quite an adult
37 conversation. He also talked to me about
38 an Old Boy of my school (who I knew), as
39 well as the previous rector (also known as
40 the parish priest) of Floreat Park (who
41 both of us knew, as did my father).
42

43 He mentioned that other boys in the past.
44 He said something like how --
45

46 And the word "they" should appear after "how" so I will
47 read that again:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

He said something like how they have come round to see him and it seemed that it was a common thing. He mentioned one who was the son of the previous rector of Floreat Park. I had met that son before. I think he mentioned other boys who I think played for Southern Districts and were a few years younger than me. I think he was suggesting I could come around to his home again too if I wanted to do that. Looking back now I think he was grooming.

I think it was after lunch that the event in his bedroom happened. He took me where his bedroom was (which I think was upstairs).

I do not recall his exact words, but he said he wanted to show me something like how I could pin someone down in a fight. He got me to take my shirt off and he also took his shirt off. We went onto his bed. I think the order was that he pinned me down first and then I pinned him down afterwards.

I remember thinking that there was something wrong about it, but he had said that it was not 'hanky panky'. He used that exact expression. He had a photo of this woman by his bedside who I assumed was a wife or something. I was very naive at the time.

He seemed to enjoy it. It probably only lasted five or 10 minutes. I don't know if he had an erect penis. He didn't try to touch me in the genitals or anything like that. We were both on the bed with our shirts off. We both had trousers or shorts on.

After that, we put our shirts back on. I sat the exam (which I think happened after the incident in the bedroom). He marked the paper then and there and went through

1 the questions I got wrong. I passed the
2 exam and I thought it was good of him to
3 explain what questions I had got wrong.
4

5 He said he had to drop some things off at
6 church (St Nicholas Church in Floreat
7 Park). He drove me to the church and we
8 talked to the new rector for a while.
9

10 In an Anglican Parish you had two wardens -
11 the rector's warden and the people's
12 warden. They were the two head laypeople
13 in the parish. Roy Wenlock was the
14 rector's warden. I noted that fact in my
15 diary. It was a respected position. He
16 was appointed by the Rector. (I do not
17 know whether it was the current Rector or
18 the previous Rector who appointed him).
19

20 Later that day Roy Wenlock dropped me off
21 at home, on the other side of the river.
22

23 In my diary I referred to him as "Roy
24 Wenlock" or "Mr Wenlock", rather than just
25 by his first name. At the time I would
26 usually refer to adults by their title,
27 although there was some adults I would
28 refer to by their first names.
29

30 I only recall seeing Roy Wenlock three
31 times after that. Once was a few months
32 later at a cricket thing on 4 January 1986.
33 I think that we smiled at each other. We
34 might have said a quick hello, but I don't
35 think it was anything more than that.
36

37 It took me some years to work out that
38 there was something really wrong in what he
39 had done. I eventually told my mother
40 about it in 1990. I was studying for my
41 final exams of that year. I told my mother
42 that I thought he might be a paedophile.
43 My father was out when I told my mother,
44 and I think that she told him about it
45 later.
46

47 Once my father knew about it, he found out

1 through the church that Roy Wenlock had
2 been in trouble with training some altar
3 boys who had complained about him. As a
4 result, the church had got him to see a
5 psychiatrist. It seemed like the matter
6 was being dealt with.

7
8 Roy Wenlock knew I had complained about
9 him, and that my father had made inquiries
10 about it. I saw him again in about early
11 1991 at a church service my father was
12 conducting, but we never spoke.

13
14 Then I remember at a WACA function in 1992
15 he was there, but I didn't say hello. That
16 was the last time that I recall seeing him.
17 We might have been at the same events at
18 other times (such as funerals for people
19 who went to the Floreat Parish), but I do
20 not recall actually seeing him at those
21 events.

22
23 On Saturday 26 May this year I was having a
24 conversation with friends. One of them
25 told me about what had been in the news. I
26 didn't know that Roy Wenlock had ever
27 worked in Northam, but I only had to hear a
28 few details to know that the friend was
29 talking about him.

30
31 Despite some of the painful memories this
32 has brought back, I am glad this has all
33 come out into the open, and I'm glad people
34 from the hostel in Northam are having the
35 chance to tell their stories and be
36 listened to.

37
38 Although I knew then and now that I am
39 attracted to other males, this had
40 absolutely no bearing on the experience I
41 had with Roy Wenlock. I was at his home
42 purely to sit an exam, not to do things
43 with him on his bed, nor for any other
44 purpose.

45
46 At the time this happened to me, I was very
47 involved with the church. For instance, I

1 would attend services and went to a youth
2 group. The fact that Roy Wenlock was
3 associated with the church made him seem
4 safe, even though I did not know him, and
5 also made me trust him.
6

7 This statement is true to the best of my
8 knowledge and belief. I have made this
9 statement knowing that if it is tendered in
10 evidence, I will be guilty of a crime if I
11 have wilfully included in the statement
12 anything that I know to be false or that I
13 do not believe is true.
14

15 It's then been signed by "B", on 7 June of this year. Now,
16 sir, the final statement that will be read into evidence
17 this afternoon is a statement from Craig Laffer. That's
18 spelt L-A-F-F-E-R. Craig Laffer states:
19

20 I am 35 years old and live in South London.
21 I am employed by an IT company.
22

23 I was born in Perth in Western Australian
24 and lived there until 10 years ago when I
25 moved to London.
26

27 My sister still lives in Perth and recently
28 contacted me in relation to reports in the
29 press in relation to Roy Wenlock and St
30 Christopher's Hostel in Northam.
31

32 In the 1980s I knew Roy Wenlock through my
33 grandfather. They attended the same church
34 as each other. I believe the church was St
35 Edmonds which was in either Wembley or
36 Subiaco.
37

38 Roy Wenlock was employed at the WACA and
39 used to do the announcing and press
40 inquiries. He used to get free tickets for
41 the cricket, and would give them to my
42 grandfather. My grandfather and I would go
43 to the cricket and we would always stop in
44 and say hello to Roy when we were there. I
45 was around 10 or 11 years old at the time.
46

47 In 1990, when I was 14 years old, Roy said

1 that I was old enough to do the drinks cart
2 at the cricket. This involved bringing out
3 drinks, cleaning the dressing rooms and
4 helping the cricket players with anything
5 they needed. This was a function that was
6 usually performed by teenage boys. Roy was
7 responsible for managing the boys who
8 worked on the drinks cart.
9

10 On one occasion Roy suggested that we get
11 together outside of the WACA to catch up
12 socially. He suggested we could have meal
13 and said that he had other friends my age.
14 I refused as I was not really interested in
15 spending time with Roy, I had my own
16 friends who were around my age, and he was
17 not in my age group at all.
18

19 I mentioned this to another boy who worked
20 on the drinks cart with me. He said,
21 "Whatever you do, don't go to his house",
22 and said that Roy would try "all sorts of
23 stuff" with me if I went to his house.
24

25 I was not sure what he meant, and asked him
26 what sort of stuff he was talking about.
27 He said that Roy would get boys to go for a
28 walk with him so that they would be very
29 hot. They would then go back to Roy's
30 house and he would let them have a shower,
31 but would be walking in and out of the room
32 watching them shower. He also told me that
33 Roy would get the boys onto his bed and
34 wrestle with them.
35

36 On another occasion my grandfather was at
37 the WACA and Roy suggested to him that it
38 would be good for me to spend time with
39 him, as he would be good role model. He
40 said he would invite me to his house for
41 dinner. He said he would be a good
42 influence on me. My grandfather spoke to
43 my parents and they arranged for me to go
44 to Roy's house. I never said anything
45 about what I had heard about Roy to my
46 parents or grandfather at this stage.
47

1 I went over to Roy's house on one occasion
2 when I was 15 years old. He lived near
3 Lake Monger. We went for a walk around the
4 lake first, and then went back to his
5 house. He told me I could help myself to
6 anything in the fridge, which was full of
7 drinks and chocolate. There was also
8 alcohol in the fridge. He did not
9 specifically offer me the alcohol, but made
10 it clear that I could have anything that I
11 wanted.
12

13 Within a few minutes of being in the house
14 he asked me to go upstairs to his bedroom
15 as he had something to show me. He opened
16 his wardrobe and pulled out a crate that
17 was full of brand new cricket gear, and
18 asked me what size I was. He told me I
19 could have anything I wanted, but I had to
20 try it on there and then. I refused as I
21 did not feel comfortable, and said that I
22 knew my size and would not need to try
23 things on. Roy became quite agitated when
24 I refused and I eventually said that I
25 would try them on later.
26

27 He then told me that he liked to show boys
28 some fighting techniques when they came to
29 his house, and said that he would show me
30 how to wrestle. He laid down on his back,
31 on his bed, and told me to come and attack
32 him. I said, "no" and he became quite
33 agitated again, and was red in the face. I
34 used to play a lot of sports, so I told him
35 that I had injured my ankle and could not
36 wrestle as I thought he would stop then.
37 He got up and grabbed me and I pushed him
38 away and walked out of the room and went
39 downstairs.
40

41 A few minutes later Roy came downstairs and
42 said to me, "It's okay, we're still
43 friends." He told me not to tell anyone
44 what had happened and said that when my
45 ankle was better, I could come back and
46 wrestle with him.
47

1 I told him that I wanted to go home, and
2 rang my parents. They came and got me and
3 drove me home.
4
5 I told my parents at the time, but they did
6 not do anything. Roy was a friend of the
7 family and part of the church, and they did
8 not feel that he had actually done anything
9 to me. I did not really agree with it at
10 the time, but did not take it further. I
11 also think my parents did not want to upset
12 my grandfather.
13
14 I worked at the WACA a few times after
15 this, and always refused any further
16 invitations from Roy to go to his house.
17 He then stopped hiring me to do the drinks
18 carts.
19
20 I never saw Roy Wenlock again after I
21 stopped working at the WACA, and the matter
22 was never spoken about again.
23
24 I did tell my sister about what happened,
25 and we have been talking about it recently.
26 I do not think what happened has really
27 affected me in any way.
28
29 Now, sir, the next paragraph does refer to some speculation
30 by Mr Laffer, so therefore I won't read that out. I'll
31 just simply read out paragraph 21, which says:
32
33 This statement is true to the best of my
34 knowledge and belief. I have made this
35 statement knowing that if it is tendered in
36 evidence, I will be guilty of a crime if I
37 have wilfully included in the statement
38 anything that I know to be false or that I
39 do not believe is true.
40
41 It's then been signed by Mr Laffer and witnessed at London
42 on the 31st of May of this year. Sir, that concludes the
43 matters that I was going to attend to today. And if we
44 could now adjourn until 9 o'clock tomorrow, and I expect
45 will be a full day, sir.
46
47 HIS HONOUR: Very good. We shall adjourn until tomorrow

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

at 9am.
AT 4.02PM THE HEARING ADJOURNED TO
WEDNESDAY, 20 JUNE 2012 AT 9AM