

**(vii) CHILD "V" AND HER SISTER "VV"**

Both sisters were complainants at Depositions. However, VV was not a complainant at Trial. The relevant count in the indictment (count 5) related to a charge of indecent assault against V. In respect of this count the jury returned a verdict of not guilty.

The and were aged six at the time of Trial. V was aged 3 to 4 for the period covered by the count in the Indictment. Both complainants had evidential interviews in Auckland, firstly, on 15 June 1992. V was interviewed for a second occasion on 2 September 1992 and was aged 5  $\frac{3}{4}$  years.

Prior to the evidential interview there was an interview at the offices of the Department of Social Welfare. No disclosure was made, it was clear that neither child was going to talk about the crèche (Trial p.65, line 19). This interview was a matter of weeks before the evidential interview.

The family had moved to Auckland in January 1991, after the children had been attending the crèche

The complainants' mother first heard about the inquiry into the activities of the staff at the crèche in about the middle of March 1992. She was telephoned by a friend in Christchurch. ~~As a consequence the mother contacted the Police (Eade) the following~~ day. At that stage she had no concerns for her own children. (Depositions p.566, line 16). The mother was contacted by a friend who had no involvement with the crèche but who knew                    had a child at the crèche (Depositions p.567, line 20).

The telephone call from the mother's friend reminded her of having been told while in Christchurch at Christmas in 1991 that there had been a complaint of misconduct against Mr Ellis. After that call the mother immediately connected the two matters.

As a consequence of speaking with Detective Eade, the mother asked her children the recommended questions:

"Do you remember going to the crèche, who do you remember that was at the crèche, who were the people there that you liked and who you didn't like? That sort of thing." (Depositions p.564, line 17).

#### **Support Group Meetings**

The complainant's mother did not attend any support group meetings, as she was resident in Auckland.

#### **Contact with Other Parents and Sharing Information**

As for contact with other parents:

At p.570, line 35, of the depositions, this mother stated that she had

"very little contact with parents from Christchurch".

After she was referred to a sheet with a list of names and complainants she indicated that she thought that she had had contact with the parents of two of the complainants (not Trial complainants). In respect of the parents of complainant 12, the only

discussion related to the fact that that family might be moving to Auckland. Each parent asked after the other's children. There was no discussion regarding the Crèche inquiry.

---

As to complainant 19, the mother stated in Depositions at p.571, line 8, that she discussed the meeting of the parents that was held at the Knox Hall at which she could not be present because was living in Auckland. The parents inquired after each other's children.

#### **Attendance at Official Meetings**

As this family was at all relevant times resident in Auckland, the mother did not attend any official meetings.

#### **Parent/Child Contamination**

There is no suggestion and nor was there any cross -examination to suggest that there was any risk of contamination between parent and child.

After initially approaching both girls some time in March 1992 and the evidential interviews of 15 June 1992 their mother did ask further questions of her children. See Trial p.62 line 30:

"We had advice about questioning the children which we always followed which was not to ask any leading questions so any questions we asked them were following questions but not leading questions".

At page 64, line 29:

"If I was going to introduce the subject rather than them, sometime they would initiate it, if I was going to I didn't start actually with a question, I would say something like I spoke to Colin today.

And they would have known who Colin was?

Yes. And if they would say something further that would be fine and if they didn't I wouldn't push it so I avoided introducing the subject by asking a question directly about what had happened to them."

---

### **Child/Child Contamination**

Neither of the complainant children had any contact with any other complainant children and there was no suggestion that these children had discussed their allegations between themselves.

#### **Summary**

This complainant family is another example of a family in respect of who there can be and was no suggestion of any form of contamination of evidence. Both complainants made disclosures over eighteen months after leaving the crèche and moving out of Christchurch.