

Reflections on the Process – the <sup>CKU</sup> Barrack Case

*These reflections are the result of a conversation between The Rev'd <sup>CKR</sup> and the Rev'd Rosemary Gillham on Wed 4<sup>th</sup> October 2006.*

1. A lack of duty of care at St John's College.

The Rev'd <sup>CKR</sup> and her family were required by the diocese to live within the grounds of St John's College for three years during her training for ordination. This was not a safe environment for <sup>CKU</sup>. When it became apparent that there were problems, no-one in authority did anything to remove the danger, even though they were aware of the problems – it was left to the Rev'd <sup>CKR</sup> her family and fellow students to try to protect <sup>CKU</sup>.

2. Confusion as to the roles being played by senior clergy.

In 2002, when the allegation was made and police were contacted, it was not made clear to the Rev'd <sup>CKR</sup> who in the diocese was responsible for caring for her – in fact it seemed that no one was. She was 'interviewed' by some senior male clergy, but it did not seem to be in the context of listening to her story, but rather of gathering information for their own benefit.

3. A sense of isolation from colleagues.

The nature of the case being a 'closed' case made it difficult for the Rev'd <sup>CKR</sup> to know who in the diocese knew about it and who she could talk to. This gave her a sense of isolation from other clergy. She also assumed that as some clergy were particular friends of the accused, that they had some knowledge of the case, but she could not talk to them.

4. The case was dealt with outside the diocesan process of dealing with allegations.

In May 1999 a meeting was held in the old registry office in Darby St, Newcastle with officers from DOCS and the police. The bishop at the time felt it was not necessary to put the case through the process which was in place at that time in the diocese. In 2002, because the matter went directly to the police and because the complainant's mother was a member of clergy, there was no contact person allocated to this case. Later, Jean Saunders, the chair of CASM, was in contact when she heard about the case, but this was when the investigation was well underway.

5. Support for the accused and not for the victim.

The accused was supported at all court appearances by a priest from this diocese who wore full clerical garb. This priest gave evidence at the sentencing. The victim and family had no such support until the sentencing when the Rev Rosemary Gillham was asked by Philip Gerber to carry out a support role. Up until this time the family felt totally alone and unsupported as they dealt with the trauma of court appearances. The only reason that Rev'd Rosemary attended the sentencing was because Rev'd <sup>CKR</sup> had said to Philip Gerber 'how strange it was that the Diocese had not suggested that throughout the whole court appearances that a contact person be present with the victim and the family while the accused appeared to be supported by a priest from the Newcastle Diocese.' It was then that Philip Gerber offered the family a contact person for the sentencing. 'Once more the victim's mother had to ask for some action.'

**6. Confusion of roles or conflict of interest.**

This question has arisen for the family as they are not sure whether this other priest was acting as a representative of the Anglican Church in this Diocese or just as a friend of the accused. He appeared to be acting in a priestly role.

**7. Ongoing needs.**

Some counselling sessions have been provided for the victim and his mother at the expense of the diocese. An assessment needs to be made in regard to their ongoing needs as they deal with the aftermath of this trauma. The family need to know what they can expect in the way of ongoing support.