

Date: 31.1.2013Exhibit number: 302

**QUEENSLAND CHILD PROTECTION
COMMISSION OF INQUIRY**

Our reference: [eDocs document number]

Statement of Witness

<i>Name of Witness</i>	Suzanne Jane Crook
<i>Date of Birth</i>	22/02/1958
<i>Address and contact details</i>	Known to commission staff
<i>Occupation</i>	Senior Policy Officer
<i>Officer taking statement</i>	Detective Sergeant Fabian Colless
<i>Date taken</i>	8/1/2013

I, Suzanne Jane Crook state;

1. I am 54 years of age.
2. I am a senior policy officer for the Department of Justice and Attorney General.
3. I am a former employee of the Department of Family Services. I first started working for the department in late 1988.
4. I have had experience in the field of industrial relations in both the government and the not-for-profit sector. In 1989/90 I was the principal industrial relations officer for the Department of Family Services.
5. From early April 1990, I was absent from the department on maternity leave for approximately ten months.
6. Back in 1988/1990, the three main unions associated with the department were: the Professional Officers Association [POA], the Qld State Services Union [QSSU] and

Witness signature..........Signature of officer..........

Australian Workers Union [AWU]. All three unions had coverage of certain staff at the John Oxley Youth Centre [herein referred to as JOYC].

7. When I was working in the industrial relations section of the department there were about three staff which included David Herbert and Ted Clarke, both of whom reported to me. I was responsible for providing advice to all levels of management in the department. This advice sometimes included briefing the Director General and, at times, following the change of Government in 1989, the Minister. I recall the unions back then were fairly active on behalf of their members. There was a bit of jostling for position between the unions. I was also responsible for the development of new disciplinary and grievance management policies and procedures for the department.
8. The industrial relations area was responsible for the day-to-day management and coordination of disciplinary issues and grievances and as such assisted and advised managers in these processes. Where necessary, I would brief Crown Law for further advice in these and other matters. These processes also involved the relevant Union/s.
9. I would regularly meet with all three unions, either together or separately, depending on the issues. Generally the joint meetings, which occurred monthly, had an agenda and would focus on the broader issues rather than individual disputes about particular matters. I would meet with the unions separately on individual issues or discuss matters over the telephone. Overall, I spent a lot of time on telephones with either managers or unions to keep a track of what was happening. I did this to try and stop situations escalating and becoming a dispute.
10. As far as reporting relationships and briefing management is concerned, I reported to the Manager of Human Resources [HR]. At that time, this position was occupied by Maria O'Leary who reported to the Director of Organisational Services, Gary Clarke. He, in turn reported to Col Thatcher, whom I believe was a Deputy Director-General, with responsibility for Corporate Services. This included human resources, finance and information services (including IT). With the exception of Col Thatcher, these persons remained in the department for some time following the government transition in 1989.
11. The head of the department was the Director General, who prior to the change of Government was Alan Pettigrew and after, Ruth Matchett. Following the change of Government, from my perspective, the department did not always operate hierarchically. Depending on the urgency or sensitivity of the matter, I received requests for advice from

Witness signature.....

Page 2 of 7

Signature of officer.....

all levels of the Department, including the Director-General. On occasion, I could get calls directly from the Minister's Office.

12. I recall some of the union officials I would speak to with regard to the three unions: Kevin Lindeberg of the POA, Brian Mann and Janine Walker of the QSSU and also Wayne Mills of the AWU.
13. I remember speaking to union delegates from JOYC, one of whom was Fred Feige. I also recall speaking to a Brad Parfitt. No issues were raised to me about sexual abuse at JOYC. I formed a view that there was significant unrest at JOYC and that there were two camps as far as personnel were concerned. Broadly speaking it was the professional staff verses the youth workers. There were issues about Peter Coyne's management style and his management capabilities. My understanding is that these issues led to the establishment of the Heiner Inquiry. As best as I know the Inquiry was about the management practices at JOYC.
14. My first involvement or anything to do with the Heiner Inquiry was at the request of the then Acting Director-General, Ruth Matchett and related to whether the Inquiry had been properly established.
15. To the best of my recollection, there were two key two issues. The first issue was whether the Inquiry was duly constituted The second related to the potential for defamation arising from the information gathered by Mr Heiner and the issue of indemnity in terms of the staff who had given information during the Inquiry. My advice to Ruth Matchett on these issues was to get Crown Law advice, which was duly sought. I did not give Ruth legal advice. My advice was on a recommended process. I was involved in series of meetings with Crown Law on these issues, some of which were attended by Barry Thomas. I also had dealings with the Crown Solicitor, Ken O'Shea. about the material obtained from the Heiner Inquiry but I don't recall meeting with him
16. I recall attending one meeting between Ruth Matchett and Noel Heiner as an observer. I believe Ruth Matchett arranged the meeting where she raised some concerns with Noel Heiner as to how the Inquiry had been established. To the best of my recollection, it was agreed that Noel Heiner wouldn't be conducting any more interviews or going any further until the matter was clarified. I remember Noel Heiner expressed concern because he thought he had been appropriately appointed . This meeting was conducted in the Director General's office at the Family Services Building in Brisbane City. I can't recall if anyone

else was present at this meeting. I did not take minutes of this meeting. I think Noel Heiner's main concern was the issues of potential defamation for him.

17. It is my understanding that Crown Law advised that the Chief Executive of the department had the authority to delegate somebody to conduct an investigation under the Public Service Act. It is also my understanding that the Inquiry was not constituted under a Commission of Inquiry or under its own legislation and, as such there was no protection. During this meeting I can't recall discussion on any report that had been prepared by Noel Heiner. I think a plan developed during this meeting to wait for further Crown Law advice.
18. I am not exactly sure of the next sequence of events in this process but I recall seeing correspondence and being advised of phone calls from Peter Coyne's lawyer. I was advised that the calls related to them wanting documentation relating to the Inquiry and Mr Coyne in particular and stating that they would take legal action if they didn't get it.
19. It is my understanding that they were seeking access to documentation under public service legislation concerning documents that were placed on a file that could be detrimental to the interests of an employee. Under the legislation at the time such documentation was to be made available to the employee so they could note and respond to it.
20. To the best of my recollection, Crown Law advised that the material from the Heiner inquiry should not be opened and the State archivist should be consulted with a view to destroying those documents before they went into any file.
21. I never saw any of the documentation or material obtained by Noel Heiner during his Inquiry into JOYC. I don't believe Ruth Matchett did either. I also say this because to the best of my knowledge those documents were delivered in a box and Ruth said on a number of occasions to me that she had not viewed those documents.
22. There were a number of meetings between myself, Ruth Matchett, and Trevor Walsh. There was also various correspondence and documentation produced at this time. I would prepare reports and other documentation for consideration by Ruth Matchett. If necessary, I would meet with Ruth for this process. Trevor Walsh and I at times would sign documents on behalf of Ruth Matchett.

23. I had no knowledge of any specific content obtained from the Heiner Inquiry. I don't know whether or not people at JOYC said anything derogatory about somebody however it was common knowledge in the department about the unrest at JOYC and its disputation. I became aware of complaints from the union which led to the establishment of the Inquiry only after the Inquiry had ceased. I was only aware of these complaints in general terms only.
24. I can state that Crown Law did not receive advice from me in relation to of any child abuse matters or allegations sexual abuse matters at JOYC.
25. When Beryce Nelson was the Minister I became aware of an issue at JOYC relating to a resident being handcuffed. I observed a memo, addressed to another member of the department about this incident.
26. In relation to Cabinet's consideration of the Heiner Inquiry, I had input in the submission regarding the indemnity issue. This included drafting sections of the Cabinet submission. It is an accepted process for public servants to draft such submissions for consideration and sign-off by the Director General. This occurs prior to its submission to the relevant Minister for consideration and presentation to Cabinet. It is not unusual for significant changes to be made to submissions during the deliberative stages of the process. I believe there were two submissions made to Cabinet on the Heiner Inquiry. To the best of my recollection, I had input into one submission relating to indemnity in terms of providing information to enable Cabinet to make a decision.
27. During this process at some stage I vaguely recall writing or seeing a letter to or about the State Archivist.
28. On the 8th January 2013 I met with Detectives Colless and Barber of the Queensland Child Protection Commission of Inquiry and had a conversation with them about my employment with the department in 1989/1990.
29. During this conversation with detectives from the Commission I was shown a number of documents.

Witness signature.......... Signature of officer..........


30. Detective Colless showed me a document dated the 12th September 1989 under the authorship of Janine Walker about a Mr Lannen. I don't recall seeing this document previously. I do recall that Mr Lannen's name came up fairly frequently. I may have had some dealings with the unions about this matter.
31. Detective Colless showed me a document dated the 27th September 1989. My writing appears on this document. This document was about the development of disciplinary process, grievances, and storage of documentation.
32. Detective Colless showed me a document dated the 17th November 1989. This document related to a meeting between the Department of Family Services, the POA and QSSU and AWU. I recognised a number of names mentioned on that document including mine. I am not sure if that was a Family Services document.
33. Detective Colless showed me a document dated the 17th November 1989. This document related to staff disciplinary processes and is authored by Gary Clarke. After perusing this document it relates to Peter Coyne wanting advice.
34. Detective Colless showed me a document dated the 12th December 1989. This document is a report by Peter Coyne.
35. Detective Colless showed me document. This is report was by Sue Ball. The report outlines a meeting with Ruth Matchett, acting Director General that was held on the 19th January 1990. This document appears to me as being general minutes of this meeting.
36. Detective Colless showed me a document dated the 22nd January 1990.
37. Detective Colless showed me a document authored by Sue Ball. This document is about a meeting that is dated to occur on the 6th of February 1990.
38. Detective Colless showed me a document dated the 14th February 1990. The document is authored by Trevor Walsh. The letter related to the legal action being taken Peter Coyne, where Peter Coyne was seeking documents under Regulation 64 or 65 of the Public Service Act. In relation to giving advice to Ms Matchett or senior management of the

Department about this issue mentioned in this documentation, I can state I gave advice to Ruth Matchett to seek advice from Crown Law.

Suzanne Jane Crook

Declaration

This written statement by me dated 08/01/2013 ^{an}d contained in the pages numbered 1 to 7 is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

 Signature
Signed at Brisbane this 30th day of January 20 13

Witnessed:  Signature
Name John Mison Rank Det Sgt Reg. No. 8065

Witness signature  Signature of officer 
Page 7 of 7