

RC96

Bishop Keith Slater
Anglican Church Diocese of Grafton
PO Box 4
Grafton
NSW 2460

Richard "Tommy" Campion
REDACTED

December 14, 2012

Dear Bishop Slater

My long awaited meeting with you and Senior Counsel Garth Blake to discuss the duty of care and various other facts of the Church of England North Coast Children's Home was unbalanced and unfair.

I was allowed to have a support person, but because you conjured up thoughts that I was going to litigate, I was not permitted to have a lawyer present. I was not allowed to tape the meeting. In fact Mr Blake wrote to you saying: "I am not participating if the meeting is taped." And I never received an answer to my query if I could have a stenographer present.

Garth Blake said the "Constitution" (which was kept from me until the meeting) stated that a rector of the Church of England shall be President of the Home Management Committee, and although such position under DOCS licensing held the Control Licence, he felt the church was "not in control" of operational matters within the Home.

If control is held in licensing it should apply to legal responsibility. That's what I need to know. There is so many questions to be answered.

I do not have the finances to employ a barrister educated in church law, so it is impossible for me to believe all what I was told.

Garth Blake only felt the church was "not in control", however, every piece of information I have strongly points out that the Anglican Church not only had the "moral responsibility to protect the children", also required by the Anglican Church to run the Children's Home, to nurture and protect every child who ever lived in there.

And the details below strengthens the facts of the Anglican Church's ownership of ultimate responsibility for the control of the Children's Home and that they had the overarching responsibility for the absolute control of the Children's Home.

* By way of clarification of the Child Welfare Act of 1939, the two essential features are these: The Child Welfare Act issued licences to denominational organisations to establish Children's Homes (not to Home Committee's). And the same act issued a separate licence called a Conduct licence to the person nominated by the Home Management Committee as being the person in charge of the Home at any particular time. The same act provided an overarching responsibility for such churches to operate the Home at a standard which safeguarded the well-being and care of the residents and did not place them at risk of abuse or neglect.

* According to the Home Committee Monthly Minutes and other documents I have, the Anglican Church held a vital position in the functioning of the home and the caring of the children.

* Grafton Anglican Church's Bishop R.G. Arthur had much input into the running of the Home.

DPSS

* Bishop R.G. Arthur and Archdeacon J.V.J. Robinson attended many functions at the Children's Home to do with extensions (openings) and fundraising. They both played a major role.

* Additionally, minutes of a meeting of the Children's Home Board attended by Bishop R.G. Arthur leaves little room to accept a lack of involvement between the Anglican Church and the Home when he was suggesting ways to raise the financial viability of the Home by having residents made Wards of the State. Why would the bishop with a supposedly distance relationship from the Home need to be concerned about such matters?

* Anglican Church clergy had unquestioned access to the Home and the children. They moved freely about the home anytime day or night.

* Some Anglican clergy entered the young girls bedrooms at night and abused them.

* The children were ordered to attend services at St Andrew's Anglican Church (next to the Home).

The Anglican Church signed children in and out of the Children's Home.

Anglican Church clergy held church services in the Home chapel for the children once or twice a week.

*** Anglican Church clergy abused the children. Sadly enough, not one person from the Anglican Church stopped the abuse. In fact, while I lived there, at times, the abuse was encouraged.**

* No one person from the Children's Home Committee stopped the abuse of children.

* No one that I know of involved with the Home Committee abused the children.

* Reverend Alan Kitchingman, an Anglican Church clergyman who was for some time Chaplain of the Children's Home was convicted in 2002, sentenced and sent to prison for sexually assaulting a child who lived in the same Home.

* The Anglican Church paid the abused child compensation. Why would the Anglican Church pay the compensation if it was no fault of theirs? The Home Management Committee did not pay.

* Some of the Home staff employed by the Anglican Church abused the children in the Home.

* The Children's Home was situated on Anglican Church grounds.

* The Home was subsidised well in excess of community fundraising and that come from the Anglican Church.

* The Home was not an income producing establishment, so support came from the Church.

* That Anglican Church's Archdeacon J.V.J. Robinson was the President of the Home Management Board for around 30 years reinforces the disciplinary and staffing matters involving the suitability of certain senior Children's Home staff.

* The Anglican Church collected the child empowerment for children in the Home.

* The Anglican Church carried the insurance.

* The sign at the entrance of the home once read: North Coast Children's Home. Later it was changed to Church of England North Coast Children's Home where it stood for more than three/four decades. It did not read Church of England Management Committee Home.

* Board members who were Church of England parishioners were selected by the Archdeacon or his delegate.

* St Andrew's Anglican Church clergymen were paid wages by the Anglican Church.

* The Church paid wages to the Home staff.

* The Church employed the matron(s)

* Anglican Church clergy resided in church owned homes right next to the Children's Home.

* The Anglican Church offered a sincere apology for the abuse to residents of the Children's Home. Why would they do that if they had no involvement with the Children's Home?

In a letter to me on September 5, 2005 Reverend Pat Comben wrote: "...we will do all that we can to assist you to move beyond the pain that was caused in an Anglican place that should have been safe, but which was clearly not."

* Chaplain Jenni Woodhouse position in the Anglican Church was to help victims of abuse. When she was helping me, Rev Pat Comben told her **"to leave the matter with him and not have a further role in the process."** Why would he do that when there was so much at stake.

* The material I have is pretty conclusive that it shows: a) the home has a control and conduct license: b) the control license was held by an Anglican clergyman: c) that a Board of Directors supported the matron in overlooking operations of the Home.

* I have copies of Section 28 of the Child Welfare Act that shows the Anglican Church run the Home.

* The Anglican Church paid a small settlement to about 37, 38 or 39 people (not sure exactly how many) who wrote a statutory declaration concerning the abuse they suffered in the Home. Why would the Anglican Church do that if they didn't have that very strong connection to the Children's Home? However, yourself and Pat Comben stated it was because the "church was a church of compassion." That is not completely true: There are other people who suffered abuse in the Children's Home who you refuse to pay a "compassionate payout." (There are four. I have names?)

*In a face-to-face meeting with me on May 9, 2012 Archbishop Phillip Aspinall said: **"There is no doubt in my mind that because of that involvement the Church had responsibilities to protect the children in the Home and to ensure they were not subjected to cruelty or abuse."**

* In a face-to-face meeting with me on May 9, 2012 Archbishop Aspinall said: **"The Church did not distance itself from the Home, so if it allows its name to be associated, to my mind, in a lay person's mind, it means you've got responsibilities."**

* Garth Blake acknowledged that Archbishop Dr. Phillip Aspinall's written admission of "acceptance of responsibility by the Church of England". He went on to say that he **"would not have used those words"** but Mr Blake did not say what the Archbishop said was untrue.

* On June 19, 2012 you wrote: **"Rather, I do not consider it appropriate to put at risk any persons who may have had a duty of care, and not actually involved in any abuse. Such persons may be elderly, frail or otherwise unable to cope with litigation..."**

The people who Garth Blake and yourself say had the duty of care, the people who allowed the abuse of more than 200 children, deserve to be exposed, elderly or frail, dead or alive. And it should be told that you wrote: **"It would in my opinion be quite wrong to proceed in that manner."**

* You deserted me for more than five years and even though you replied to a few letters, you didn't answer my questions and you refused to see me.

* The leader of the Anglican Church of Australia Archbishop Phillip Aspinall avoided me for five years. He kept telling me to make contact you, but that was ridiculous because you weren't answering my letters.

* You and the Archbishop more or less had to be "forced" to meet with me.

* There are many more reasons that show the Anglican Church had the responsibility to run the Home and to follow your code of ethics. There must be transparency.

All the above shows that the Anglican Church were deeply entrenched within the walls of the Children's Home. It is sad that you have refused to address or discuss the above. You and others cannot walk away and forget everything that has happened in the past – the absolute day-to-day involvement of the Home.

It is important that the Anglican Church recognises that their earlier denial of claims was framed on legal advice in a damage control mode. You and others of the Anglican Church have a huge responsibility to admit the truth, not to cover-up the facts.

Bishop Slater you admit "the Anglican Church had a moral responsibility to protect the children." However, the Anglican Church must not dismiss that comment so easy. As the Anglican Church ruled the day-to-day running of the Home, and they had a "moral responsibility to protect the children", they must take complete responsibility for the abuse of the children.

The Anglican Church should accept history's recall of events or stonewall the ongoing emotional abuse of former victims whose legitimate grievances are denied.

... Hoping I will receive an answer as soon as possible..

Regards



Richard "Tommy" Champion

Cc: Archbishop Dr Phillip Aspinall