

P.O. Box 305, Tolimout

W.A. 6913.

27th January, '96.

Most Rev. M. Malone, D.D.

Bishop of Maitland-Newcastle.

Dear Bishop,

Your letter dated 22nd Dec. '95 was received of me on January 25th, after my return from hospital when a friend was able to collect my Christmas mail, as I was then, and am still, on crutches by order of the doctor. Hence, there was no possibility of replying within the 15 days in the frame.

I don't know of any Canonical advisor — and my Spiritual Advisor — Fr. Lawrence Atford — died on 8th December '95. Your letter speaks of "Canonical counsel to protect your rights", but, as I have no one to give this counsel, could I, please, be advised as to my "rights" in this matter.

For my part I dispute the claim that any such relationship as mentioned "continued over a lengthy period of time" with any child. Neither do I know the names of the said accusers. I submitted to Fr. Lucas all the cases that I was aware of. Some of the names given by him were certainly not correct: one of these was that of AX — then AX, who has since divorced her husband and went through a civil marriage with someone else, having failed to bring up her children in the Catholic Faith; another name he mentioned was AJ; even though she occasionally sat on my knee on the few occasions I visited their home, I certainly did nothing to that child that was indecent.

I do know also that Fr. Alan Hart's friend, Sr. P. McCarthy, did frequently cross-examine different kids at school, mentioning my name, in a manner that could easily persuade a child that, in hindsight, something was wrong. This matter I have already submitted to Bishop Blake, who, as I understand, has passed on

the information to you. Fr. Nugent and Fr. Dargan are both
aware of the reason for Sr. M^cCarthy's animosity towards me.
In many such cases I had merely put my arm around the children
or allowed them sit on my knee - nothing further.

Finally, may I request the reason or motive behind this
process of preventing my exercise of Orders? The only reason given
by Bishop Clarke and Fr. Lucas was that some of the "victims" would
object to the fact that I was still permitted to exercise my priestly
functions. This, of course, they would be aware of in either of two
ways: by witnessing it themselves or by being informed. It is
plain in a remote part of the Philippines there was no reasonable
possibility of witnessing to it; and the information could only
be supplied by someone in a position of trust in that land
Diocese who abused that trust.

By preventing me offering daily Private Mass would be to
deprive me of the greatest means possible of making reparation
for my past failures, to deprive the Souls in Purgatory of the
benefits of daily Mass, as well as to deny the Church militant, and
in particular those who I have injured in the past and for whom
I pray daily, of the graces of the Mass.

If the purpose is merely punitive, then surely, some
other means could be devised which would affect only myself
and to which I would willingly submit, burdened as I am
already with loss of Confession faculties and other priestly duties.

Sincerely Yours - Christ.

Signed