Rosemary's Baby!

Andrew Rule – Herald Sun – May 14. 2012

We all wanted to believe - desperately. Girl in horribly twisted body learns to communicate after a life locked away in an institution. But as ANDREW RULE reports in this special investigation, sometimes you need more than hope to make a fairytale come true.

Rosemary Crossley was the star of her own Hollywood script. She didn't actually write it herself— her long-time partner Chris Borthwick helped do that — but she created a compelling storyline.

It went like this: brave, outspoken woman takes on sinister, Dickensian institution to save brave, handicapped girl from living death... then they both live happily ever after.

First came the book, *Annie's Coming Out,* so moving that star Vanessa Redgrave wanted to be in the film it inspired. Redgrave pulled out but Angela Punch-McGregor stepped in to play the Crossley-inspired heroine in an award-winning production screened in America under the title *Test of Love.*

It was part *One Flew Over The Cuckoo's Nest, part Free Willy* — a touching story about little people taking on city hall, featuring an object of pity being saved by an object of admiration.

And, best of all, "based on a true story" set in Melbourne.
It was stirring stuff.

The profoundly disabled Anne McDonald was not only soaking up modern literature *(Catch-22,* for one) and science *(The Double Helix)* and starting a university degree, but doing advanced mathematics.

All via "facilitated communication" with Rosemary Crossley.

The Florence Nightingale of North Melbourne had found her own Stephen Hawking, if you believed her— and a lot of people did, especially reporters dazzled by Crossley's formidable enthusiasm and connections in politics and the law.
But *how* true was the heartwarming tale that Rosemary Crossley sold the world? The story of how she rescued the disabled with a miraculous communication breakthrough that unlocked hidden intelligence imprisoned in twisted bodies.
The real story behind the fairy tale has intrigued a Melbourne journalist for years.

Determined to set the record straight, she is writing a book that will pose uncomfortable questions:

Is Rosemary Crossley a zealous angel of mercy — or just zealous? And is the system she created no more than Scientology for the disabled?

CHERYL Critchley, now a freelance writer, was working for the *Herald Sun* in 2005 when she interviewed Dr Crossley (she has a PhD) and the late Anne McDonald for a "Q&A" piece, looking back over the 25 years since the landmark legal action to remove McDonald from St Nicholas Hospital in Carlton so Crossley could care for her at home. It was a routine feel-good story, one of many that had puffed the Annie and Rosie legend since the court case in 1979.

Critchley did not question the "answers" she got from McDonald, a woman so stricken by cerebral palsy that she could not feed herself, touch her nose or make sounds apart from groans.

The answers were supplied by email from Crossley, who said it would be quicker that way.

But others over the years had watched as Crossley held McDonald's elbow while "Annie" apparently pointed to letters and phrases on a customised communication board.

Crossley predicted which words her protege was spelling after the first few letters, speeding up a slow process.

The answers were surprisingly long and sophisticated — with the lofty vocabulary, idiom and rhetorical flourishes you might expect from an older politician or barrister making a point.

Critchley would later notice the same thing in passages attributed to McDonald in the book *Annie's Coming Out* 21 years before, when the young Anne had not long left "St Nick's".

After the story was published, Critchley received letters from Anne McDonald's mother Bev — and from parents of another handicapped woman, Annie's contemporary Leonie McFarlane — criticising her for publicising Crossley. Puzzled, Critchley contacted them. They told her they believed that Crossley manipulated the answers supposedly coming from her handicapped pupils. Critchley thought about the high-flown language and testy tone of the sentences she had seen spelled.

It was uncannily like the fiercely articulate Crossley's writing.
She started asking questions.

The more she asked, the more the legend unraveled.
Critchley's investigation led her to a Harvard University professor, a Melbourne psychologist, a retired psychiatrist (since died) whose public service career was effectively ruined by Crossley's claims, and relatives of disabled people disillusioned with her theory of "facilitated communication".

They criticised Crossley and her work, often bluntly.
But against the critics were Crossley supporters, who see her as some sort of secular saint — or, at worst, a "difficult" person who can be forgiven her flaws because of her ferocious devotion to the disabled.

Crossley's supporters included some who'd staked their credibility on the book and the film, but also well-meaning politicians, bureaucrats, lawyers and journalists who took her at face value.

Some have gradually distanced themselves but a few remain true believers despite cracks in the story that have become gaps since the days when Annie "came out". Others, maybe, can't retreat without losing face.

EWAN McDonald was two when his sister was born in 1961 at Seymour.
The doctor later said it was the most difficult birth he had ever handled, and it was a miracle that baby Anne survived.

Ewan's parents Bev and Gus McDonald were determined to look after their disabled daughter, but when they had another baby the following year —the third of an eventual five — it became steadily harder to run their dry-cleaning business and look after their brood.

For Bev, it meant not working in the shop, which was tough financially. Then it became physically impossible. "I can remember trying to wheel two prams — one with Anne, one with the baby—up the hill in our street," Bev recalls.
There was no outside help.

Ewan was five when his parents gave in to their doctors' suggestion to take Anne to St Nicholas' Hospital in Carlton.

The grim old building sheltered some of Victoria's most disabled children.
"St Nick's" was run by a paediatrician and psychiatrist, Dr Dennis Maginn.
He and others did tests that indicated Anne was like most cerebral palsy victims and had suffered serious brain damage as well as spastic limbs.

But when a bright young woman with an arts degree and a computer programming qualification started as a ward assistant in the mid-1970s and volunteered to teach the children, Maginn encouraged her.

The young woman was Rosemary Crossley, a Western District farmer's daughter who'd also been raised in an institution — Morongo Girls School boarding house at Geelong — after her mother died giving birth to her in 1945.

Crossley gave up a computer programming job in Canberra to work at St Nick's. For someone with other options, it was a strikingly selfless choice.
Later, Crossley's recollections would clash with the McDonald family's. Ewan McDonald, now a police inspector at the police academy, recalls the family piling into their Valiant Safari station wagon for Sunday drives to see Anne.

As a boy, he disliked the long drive but remembers the family taking Anne for outings, wheeling her around local parks and buying her ice creams.
Which is why, years later, he was puzzled that in *Annie's Coming Out* Anne supposedly wrote that her family rarely visited or took her out of the hospital.
It wasn't the only false note.

In the book, passages credited to Anne refer to her missing her rabbit when she went to St Nick's. Ewan and his mother say Anne had never had either a pet or a toy rabbit.
Ewan also says the book mentions Anne's siblings by name — except her little brother Alistair. "She misses one completely," he says drily. "Just one of the curiosities you would not anticipate."

When Ewan was older he would talk to Anne about football—and suggest taking her to an Essendon game. Footy was one subject the family shared.

Surely, he thought, if she could communicate freely, she would make some reference to it through Rosemary. But it seems she never did. "I'm not a psychologist, so I don't know whether Anne was super intelligent," he says. "But her written material is full of vitriol, anger and rage you didn't see when you met her.

"You don't get the sense that she's the person that wrote those hundreds of articles supposedly penned by her.

"Anne could certainly communicate to let you know if she was happy or annoyed.
"Away from Rosemary she was invariably cheerful and laughing.

"If she was so angry and outraged at the way she was treated, common sense indicates she would display that. "But she didn't."

Ewan McDonald is grateful that Anne flourished under Crossley's care — she grew, gained weight and led a relatively normal life, looked after by state-paid carers that Crossley organised.

But he resents that his parents were misrepresented as uncaring and ignorant.
He remembers how delighted his mother was to hear from Rosemary Crossley in the 1970s that Anne was showing signs of advanced intelligence through a new way of communicating.

But Bev McDonald's excitement died when she saw Anne and found the claims were hollow.

Bev McDonald quietly tried the alphabet board but when she held her daughter's arm nothing happened unless she moved it herself.

She desperately wanted Anne to communicate with her but not desperately enough to delude herself. Once she held Anne's elbow and subtly guided her arm to tap out a deliberately rude message about Rosemary Crossley, all the while watching Anne's face for some reaction. There was none.

Other times, she would give Anne messages to pass on to Crossley.
None were.

"I was the one who could see the emperor had no clothes," says Mrs McDonald, now in her 70s.

But, around the world, other parents would embrace facilitated communication as a miracle that would transform the lives of their handicapped children. It appealed to the vulnerable, much as the promise of "cancer cures" does to families of the dying. Some argue that it has proved about as effective.

TONY Catanese was a keen young psychologist with the Spastic Society of Victoria in 1981 when he met Rosemary Crossley — already well known after the Supreme Court ruling that Anne McDonald was an intelligent adult entitled to leave St Nicholas' to live with Crossley.

At first Catanese was "one of Rosemary Crossley's followers", he recalls.
They got on well because both questioned the prevailing idea that people who could not speak (because of a physical handicap) be treated as if they were less intelligent than others.
Those who couldn't speak could not easily be assessed, so they tended to be treated like babies.
Crossley's "facilitated communication" seemed to promise a voice to the voiceless, which gave it instant appeal to lay people.

Among the severely handicapped children Crossley taught, some seemed to display intelligence astonishingly quickly and grasped written language despite never having read before.

Crossley suggested that this amazing hidden ability came from watching television. Many believed her. But some sceptics wondered if watching *Sesame Street* was enough to produce the sort of prose, literary knowledge — and advanced mathematical ability — that Anne McDonald supposedly displayed when the well-educated Crossley or Borthwick held her arm.

A trained observer who quietly resisted Crossley's claims was Maginn. He had encouraged Crossley to teach the severely handicapped children— known as "bean baggers" because they spent all day lying on bean bags and mats. Maginn believed Crossley's enthusiastic approach would stimulate the children's minds.

But his support was not blind: he refused to validate her communication theory without independent testing. His family believe his principles wrecked his career. This is how it happened.

Anne McDonald supposedly alleged — through Rosemary Crossley and her alphabet board — that Maginn had tried to smother her with a pillow.

It was ridiculous on every level: Anne then weighed less than 20kg and had no control of her limbs, so could not have resisted even a small child.

But when the Health Department was forced to call in police to check the allegation, the damage to Maginn's reputation was done — despite the fact that homicide detectives and a department investigator dismissed the accusation.

Crossley's defence is that she was only the messenger.
She agrees she had no reason to believe the "smothering" allegation was true.
She concedes the only other possibilities are that Anne "dreamt it" or "made it up" or that "I made it up".

Retired homicide detective sergeant Bill Townsend headed the inquiry.
He told the *Herald Sun* last week that he never believed Anne McDonald "wrote" the accusation herself and that in any case it would never stand up in court. "Crossley offered us to have a go (at faciliated communication) with the girl but we could not make any sense of it," he says.

Until the day Dennis Maginn died in 2009, his family felt he had been wronged.
His son Paul Maginn, a lawyer, referred to it in his eulogy.

The family believe Crossley hid behind a handicapped woman "and a ouija board" to make an outrageous allegation to serve her own ends.
But that was later.

In 1983 Tony Catanese still wanted to believe in Crossley's self-taught and untested technique. But then something happened that shattered his faith in it — and in Crossley.

Handicapped students and their teachers were watching a documentary about iron ore mining in a room at the Dame Mary Herring Centre in Armadale in late 1983 or early 1984. As it ended, a teacher wrote the word "iron" on the board.

Coincidentally, as Crossley arrived to practise facilitated communication, the teachers started chatting about anaemia — lack of iron in the blood.

The most believable explanation for what happened next is that Crossley must have heard the chat and seen "iron" on the board and wrongly concluded what had just been on television.

Because when she started "facilitating" communication with the students about the program, the "answers" they supposedly gave were about blood's iron content—not about iron ore mining. In other words, they were Crossley's answers, not the students'.

A psychologist who saw this was aghast and told Catanese. "It was a Eureka moment," he says. "It showed us that if you give a false message to the facilitator about the subject to be communicated, then it's like setting a trap."

Catanese studied Crossley's technique and was dismayed. "Done slowly, it's so subtle you can't tell but when she does it fast it's different. When it's done quickly you can see the cues: she pushes up the communicator (alphabet board) so they touch the letter she wants."

Catanese says he had tried to support Crossley but he insisted on objective methods, without skewing results to hide holes in her theory.

He tried to warn community affairs minister Caroline Hogg, but was ignored.
When Bambi turns bad, he says, no one wants to know.

He wanted to believe in Crossley's "breakthrough" but never saw evidence it was valid.

"I never saw Anne McDonald communicate in the times we met. Rosemary did all the talking," he says. "Anne was in the corner. Rosemary talked *about* her but she didn't help Anne talk to me. The book came out, then the film. Rosemary would say things like, "They wouldn't make a film about it if it wasn't true.' Later on, when she got the Order of Australia, it was the same. It all became 'proof — but it was all circumstantial."

But "Annie caught the spirit of the times," he says. "In 1983 the Cain government made enormous reforms to look after disabled people. A big supporter of Rosemary became executive officer of the Myer Fund — and she turned up with all this money from philanthropists.

"To be associated with the old regime was to be perceived to be against the 'flow of hope'. For parents of a handicapped child, hope is absolutely important. That's why they might not want to listen to bad news about their kids. We were all guilty of letting this thing go ahead. It didn't seem to do any harm."
But it did.

In America, Crossley's wave of hope became a tsunami. After meeting her in 1992, an academic from New York's Syracuse University adopted facilitated communication and trained practitioners to spread the faith. They sold hope to parents desperate to buy.

The fad spread from the physically handicapped to the autistic — a growth field, as thousands of children were being diagnosed with autism.

Distressed parents wanted to believe their child was transformed when a facilitator held their elbow as they pecked at an alphabet board.

They ignored the fact the children were often not looking at the board as they hit the keys.

But "FC" had an inbuilt flaw: as tests would prove, even well-meaning "facilitators" often subconsciously directed the words spelled by their "partners".
When the message was "I love mommy" the deception didn't matter. But when white lies turned toxic, it mattered a lot.

From the start, FC had its doubters. The most prominent is Prof Howard Shane, now of Harvard University.

He is a professional educator of severely handicapped children in a field of enthusiastic amateurs, some with a deep emotional stake, others a financial one. When he first saw Crossley speak at a Swedish conference in 1990, he thought her theory was "the craziest thing I ever saw" but dismissed it as harmless.

He realised it wasn't harmless after being called in to the first of several legal cases in which handicapped people had supposedly made shocking allegations of abuse.
The Wheaton case would inspire a devastating US television documentary that shredded facilitated communication's scientific credibility, though not its popularity with diehard believers.

Betsy Wheaton was an autistic teenager from a stable family. But that all ended when she apparently made rape and assault allegations against family members, via an alphabet board, her arm held by a facilitator named Janice Boynton.
Before a trial could proceed, the law required something that FC's promoters had avoided: stringent scientific testing.

Boynton's shock and shame was caught on camera when Howard Shane — called as an expert witness — devised a simple test proving that Boynton, not Betsy, dictated every word on the board.

Shane did this by covertly showing Betsy a picture of one object, then showing Boynton a picture of another.

If Betsy saw a ball and Boynton saw a cat, for instance, the word spelled would be "cat". Film caught handicapped people looking away as they supposedly typed, while facilitators always watched the keyboard. It was patently bogus.

There were other cases, and each ended the same way: FC discredited. It took facilitators like Boynton a while to face the fact they were deluded.
Some never have, preferring to blame the abysmal results on the testing process or the "anxiety" of those being tested.

This year Boynton wrote a long mea culpa apologising to the Wheaton family and others whose lives had been wrecked by what she now says is not a science "but a belief system".

The confession runs to thousands of words, but one paragraph stands out.
She wrote: "How could this have happened? How could my actions bring about so much pain and devastation? ... How could I not know that I was moving the child's hand? This is what lawyers, parents, school administrators, researchers, and reporters asked me back then... In hindsight, the answer is both simple and complex: I did not want to believe FC was a hoax. " Crossley, apparently, doesn't want to believe it either. This, despite the fact that a video recording of her "communicating" with a semi-comatose man in a Geelong hospital in the late 1980s dented by her credibility with professionals who had tolerated her until then.

Despite the man being in a vegetative state, they fit a head pointer to him and Crossley holds up a cardboard sheet offering four alternatives about where he should be nursed after leaving hospital.

The head pointer doesn't move but the board does, so Crossley gets a particular result — one suiting the man's parents, who had recruited Crossley against the wife's wishes.

One professional was so outraged she sent a videotape of it to Tony Catanese. It became a damning scene in the American documentary that highlighted the Wheaton debacle. The documentary narration says: "... it is easy to see that Rosemary Crossley is ever so slowly moving the board".

A marker line inserted by the film editor shows Crossley gradually lowers the board to meet the pointer. Crossley claims that the pointer pushes the cardboard back, creating an optical illusion.

As even her friends agree, she is a tireless talker with an explanation for everything. But these days, fewer people are listening.

Governments years ago quietly dropped funding for Rosemary's baby — now called the Anne McDonald Centre, opened when the film was big news and donations rolled in.

Assoc Prof Pamela Snow, of Monash University's school of psychology and psychiatry, has doubted Crossley's credibility since she (then a speech pathlogist) witnessed her performance with the semi-comatose man in Geelong.
"Rosemary is highly motivated and committed—but that is in itself not enough," Snow says. "Communication should not be a quasi-religious faith."

It seems the Supreme Court now agrees. A year ago, it blocked Crossley taking McDonald's fellow "bean bagger" Leonie McFarlane to an Adelaide conference against her family's wishes.

Judge Robson found that the order Crossley sought was based "on a false assumption" and that she had no legal relationship with Leonie McFarlane and was not entitled to remove her from the care of the Department of Human services.
It would be "a very bold step" to order Leonie be handed over to Crossley against the wishes of her parents, the judge found.

Howard Shane and Tony Catanese applaud the decision. Shane says Crossley based a career on "using people's shoulders as a joystick" and should be stopped "from getting another puppet".

Catanese says Crossley "doesn't allow an objective assessment to take place — then, pushed, she drops it and moves onto another client."
It will all be in Cheryl Critchley's book.

Rosemary said, "I'm here for the speechless

ROSEMARY Crossley and her partner Chris Borthwick staunchly defend the communication system they say has liberated intelligent minds locked in by cerebral palsy, autism and some brain injuries.

In a three-hour interview Crossley occasionally shouts, swears and thumps the table but she is more often charming - and rarely silent.

She speaks warmly of Anne McDonald and hundreds of other ~ "speechless" handicapped people with whom she has "facilitated" communication.

She mentions her supporters, who include Joan Dwyer OAM, former chair of the Equal Opportunity Board and her husband, Dr John Dwyer QC. Overseas, Professor Doug Biklen of Syracuse University in the US is the leading academic exponent. Crossley, in her mid-60s, is intelligent, articulate and - for all her mock modesty - a skilful writer with a strong sense of drama, as shown in her books.

She has a powerful personality and doesn't suffer fools or interruption. Her definition of fool might at times include most others in the room- except, — perhaps, for her lifetime partner and supporter, Borthwick. The quietly-spoken but determined man has backed her since they met at university in Canberra in the 1960s.

He stays cool even when Crossley's emotion-charged defence verges on melodrama. She sobs more than once and veers from subject to subject as she talks animatedly about their life's work.

The centrepiece of that work is their relationship with Anne McDonald, which began in 1974 before Crossley chose the handicapped girl as the subject of a "prac" exercise for her Diploma of Education studies in 1977.

The couple argue that questioning the validity of facilitated communication "trashes" Anne's memory - and undermines all the disabled people Crossley teaches at the modest Caulfield building now named the Anne McDonald Centre.

At one point Crossley says "I know you think I'm a fake and a fraud but equally I'm also the person of last resort (for the disabled and their families).

"This is not a game. This is not something we're making up."

She contends that facilitated communication has been demonstrated to the satisfaction of two Supreme Court judges, three psychologists, two universities and *60 Minutes.* She also cites the fact that Anne McDonald graduated from Deakin University in 1994, received the National Disability Award for Personal Achievement at Parliament House in 2008 and received (posthumously) an Award for Service to "Augmentative and and Alternative Communication."

She plays videotapes of the young Anne McDonald apparently communicating with alphabet boards and with a headpointer for a television current affairs show. Crossley shows the *Herald Sun* a DVD recording of her assisting an autistic teenager in Indonesia last month. It demonstrates, in part, her holding his leg with one hand while she moves an alphabet board in front of his finger with the other - a technique her detractors suggest allows a facilitator to spell words at will. Not surprisingly, her supporters strongly disagree. They have faith in her.

Reader's Comments – Sun Herald – May 16, 2012

Communication unproven

It is absurd for Rosemary Crossley to claim that facilitated communication rests on a sound scientific footing.
Since 1994 there have been at least 10 reviews published in the scientific literature of studies examining the validity of facilitated communication.
All have concluded the same thing: facilitated communication does not improve the ability of people to communicate.
There have been some individual studies, the results of which are claimed to support its use, but the methodology used was so problematic that nothing can be concluded from them.
Alan Hudson, emeritus professor, RMIT University

We're not all deluded

Andrew Rule's line of reasoning in his article, "Rosemary's Baby", suggests that I must be a vulnerable and deluded mother.
I find this extremely insulting.
But what about my son's five integration aides? Are they also deluded because they use facilitated communication with him? What about his father, sister, grandparents, aunts and uncles, numerous cousins and friends, inside and outside school?
Facilitated communication is not a miracle cure. My son still has
cerebral palsy, autism and epilepsy thrown in for good measure.
He has worked hard, and so have we, to encourage people to see his ability and not make assumptions based on his disability.
There are plenty of families quietly doing the same thing, battling the same battles and coming out on top.

Rosemary Crossley has fought for and helped so many people.
I do not doubt her motives over the past 30 years; they are absolutely clear.
Leane Leggo, **president, Anne McDonald Centre**

Lives changed for the better

I was shocked by Andrew Rule's article about Rosemary Crossley and facilitated communication.
There is a great body of opinion in support of facilitated communication and it has changed many lives for the better.
My own son, Jeremy, who is 24 and has autism, lost his limited speech between the age of two and three. He subsequently had no effective means of communication, as he was unable to speak or type due to his dyspraxia.
He was introduced to facilitated communication at the age of 15.
We soon discovered that he had language, spelling, grammar, knowledge, intelligence and a keen
interest in politics, current affairs and football.
He communicates using a communication device with voice output. Nobody who has observed Jeremy communicating in this manner has been in any doubt that the communication is his and not from his facilitator.
Phil Lipshut, Elsternwick

Son needed the support

Andrew Rule's article was unbalanced and unfair to not only Rosemary Crossley, but also to countless others who need a means to communicate.
My son, with the use of facilitated communication, wrote of "the joy of being heard".
He is now close to independent, and can type by himself for periods, but is hindered by a body impaired by dyspraxia and other health issues.
He needed the belief and support of people who looked past his disability and presumed competence. No one who has seen him communicate has doubted they were his words.
Andrew Rule should see for himself all those whose lives can now be lived because parents, good people and professionals did not give up on them?
"There are none so blind as those who will not see."
Julie Wilkinson, Eltham

Good heart, but wishful thinking

Thank you, Andrew Rule, for your insightful investigation, "Rosemary's baby".
I completed a research paper into Rosemary and facilitated communication in 1997, reading every article and research paper published to that point (about 160). I found about 10 for, and the rest against her techniques and theory.
I, too, came to the conclusion that FC was, at best, wishful thinking, and, at worst, extremely dangerous.

Despite my scepticism, I participated in training by her a few years later as part of my work with a young man with Down syndrome, autism and intellectual disability, and again a few years ago with an autistic boy. Although I kept an open mind, and did everything she asked, in the manner she asked, as did other therapists, success in any form never eventuated.
I do not doubt that Rosemary Crossley has a good heart and the best of intentions; unfortunately, I believe her belief and dedication to her own methods has led to a closed-mindedness when it comes to new technology, other communication techniques and, indeed, the failure of facilitated communication in general.
Bravo, Andrew, for having the courage to write your article.
Larissa Casamento, Carnegie

Achievements ignored

As someone who has advocated for users of "facilitated communication", it was with dismay that I read Andrew Rule's "Rosemary's baby" (May 14).
It ignored the fact that facilitated communication has led to people developing independent communication. I have worked with several such individuals.
Furthermore, its tone was disparaging of Ms Crossley, who cared for Anne McDonald for 30 years.
Also, the ambiguity of the word, "baby", indicates a patronising view towards Anne, a person with a disability who was an adult when she entered Ms Crossley's care.
Whether or not you accepted her communication — and courts and universities did — Anne was a public figure for nearly three decades.
There was ample opportunity for her communication to be challenged during her life.
Eden Parris,
Communication Rights Australia

Integrity, work questioned

I am extremely concerned that Dr Rosemary Crossley's integrity and work to give voice to people without a voice have been questioned. Although I did not have the privilege of meeting Anne McDonald in person, I attended her funeral and know that she lived a life surrounded by friends and well-wishers who attended to her physical as well as her social, emotional and deeper needs.
She lived a full life with rewarding activities that included study, writing, socialising, travel and attending and contributing to conferences.
What individual, with or without a disability, could ask for more?
This life would not have been possible had it not been for Rosemary Crossley.
Sarah Chan, Kew