

SPECIAL COMMISSION OF INQUIRY
INTO MATTERS RELATING TO THE POLICE INVESTIGATION OF
CERTAIN CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE ALLEGATIONS IN THE CATHOLIC
DIOCESE OF MAITLAND-NEWCASTLE

At Newcastle Supreme Court
Court Room Number 1, Church Street, Newcastle NSW

On Wednesday, 24 July 2013 at 10.20am
(Day 15)

Before Commissioner: Ms Margaret Cunneen SC

Counsel Assisting: Ms Julia Lonergan SC
Mr David Kell
Mr Warwick Hunt

Crown Solicitor's Office: Ms Emma Sullivan,
Ms Jessica Wardle

1 MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, I apologise for the late start
2 this morning. Although our wonderful transcript reporters
3 have boundless energy, the batteries that they use for
4 their equipment do not. Hence the need to have a short
5 delay this morning. I call Father Brian Joseph Lucas.

6

7 <BRIAN JOSEPH LUCAS, sworn: [10.20am]

8

9 MR SKINNER: Commissioner, my client claims protection
10 under section 23(2) of the Act.

11

12 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Skinner. That is noted.

13

14 <EXAMINATION BY MS LONERGAN:

15

16 MS LONERGAN: Q. Your full name is Father Brian Joseph
17 Lucas?

18

19 A. Yes.

20

21 Q. You're a Catholic priest?

22

23 A. Yes.

24

25 Q. You are incardinated to the Archdiocese of Sydney?

26

27 A. Yes.

28

29 Q. Prior to being ordained as a Catholic priest, you
30 completed a law degree?

31

32 A. Yes.

33

34 Q. You completed that in 1974?

35

36 A. Yes.

37

38 Q. You practised as a legal practitioner for a period,
39 did you?

40

41 A. Yes.

42

43 Q. Could you outline what kind of work you did as a legal
44 practitioner?

45

46 A. I spent two years as an articled clerk doing general
47 commercial work for a firm in Phillip Street, in Sydney.
I then stayed with that firm as a solicitor for another
year doing general commercial and property law. At the end
of 1974, or beginning of 1975, I then retired from that
work and went to the seminary at St Columba's College,

1 Springwood. I maintained my practising certificate, which
2 at that stage was an unrestricted practising certificate,
3 with a view during the seminary holidays of doing some
4 part-time practice. Towards the middle, I think, of 1975,
5 the New South Wales Law Society then established
6 a legal aid scheme in the Sydney Childrens Courts, and
7 I participated as a duty solicitor in that scheme through
8 the summer holidays and occasionally the mid-year holidays
9 from the seminary through until the end of 1979. I was
10 then ordained a deacon. At that time I asked that my name
11 be struck from the roll of solicitors and I was admitted as
12 a non-practising barrister.

13
14 Q. After the time you were admitted as a non-practising
15 barrister, did you carry out any more legal practice?

16 A. No.

17
18 Q. I'm going to ask you questions about the Sydney
19 Childrens Court duty solicitor work you did. At that time
20 the Childrens Court dealt with children who were in trouble
21 with the law; is that the position?

22 A. Yes.

23
24 Q. Or children who were having difficulties with
25 placement in terms of where they were living?

26 A. Yes.

27
28 Q. In your time in that role, did you deal with children
29 who had been victims of sexual abuse?

30 A. Many occasions, yes.

31
32 Q. That gave you some insight into the sorts of troubles
33 that can be associated with children who have gone through
34 that experience?

35 A. Yes.

36
37 Q. Father, in your study as a lawyer, you would have
38 taken notes during lectures?

39 A. Yes.

40
41 Q. And you would have taken notes during study?

42 A. Yes.

43
44 Q. That's because it's important to keep notes so you can
45 remember things?

46 A. For exam purposes, yes.

47

1 Q. For exam questions?
2 A. For exam purposes, yes.
3
4 Q. While you were a lawyer, you would have taken notes
5 from your clients?
6 A. Yes.
7
8 Q. That's so that you could present their cases at court?
9 A. Yes.
10
11 Q. And so that you could remember important things
12 related to those clients?
13 A. Yes.
14
15 Q. That's a discipline you learned as a legal student?
16 A. Yes.
17
18 Q. And as a lawyer?
19 A. Yes.
20
21 Q. That's a discipline that stays with you for your
22 lifetime, isn't it?
23 A. Not necessarily, because there are some circumstances
24 when one is a priest and no longer a lawyer when it can be
25 quite counterproductive to take notes in conversations with
26 people. One does not take notes, for example, in hearing
27 someone's confession.
28
29 Q. Oh, one would never expect that to happen, because, as
30 you know and as probably everyone in this court knows,
31 priests cannot disclose what happens in the confessional.
32 A. Yes.
33
34 Q. But in situations where you are, as part of your
35 execution of duties, an official of the Catholic Church and
36 independent of confessionals and sacraments and private
37 conferences, you had as an aspect to your role an important
38 disciplinary aspect, didn't you?
39 A. I'm not quite sure I understand that question.
40
41 Q. You were retained by the Australian Catholic Bishops
42 Conference to assist in structuring protocols for the
43 Catholic bishops to follow when they were dealing with
44 priests who got themselves into trouble?
45 A. Yes, I was part of a committee for that purpose.
46
47 Q. I'm not suggesting you did it on your own, but in that

1 role you were recognising, were you not, that important
2 rights of priests may be affected by the way in which the
3 protocol was structured?
4 A. Yes.
5
6 Q. Important rights being their being allowed to continue
7 practising as priests?
8 A. Yes.
9
10 Q. It's the position, isn't it, that a priest is a priest
11 for life; is that the way the ordination process works?
12 A. Well, that's the theological concept. Whether he's
13 allowed ever to practise as a priest for life depends on
14 circumstances.
15
16 Q. So circumstances may arise where a priest is deprived
17 of his faculties because of things he has done?
18 A. Yes.
19
20 Q. That are thought to be wrong or against the teachings
21 of the church?
22 A. Yes.
23
24 Q. And you had a role on occasion to be part of that
25 process where priests had their faculties removed?
26 A. Sadly, yes.
27
28 Q. I will hand you up a copy of your curriculum vitae,
29 which is in the statement bundles that have already been
30 served on parties at the Bar table, and also a copy for the
31 Commissioner. I'm going to ask you a few more questions
32 about some matters in your curriculum vitae. Would you
33 agree with me that having a good memory is very helpful for
34 the study of law?
35 A. Yes.
36
37 Q. You completed a Master of Laws by course work?
38 A. No, by thesis.
39
40 Q. By thesis, in 1978. You also completed a Master of
41 General Studies at the University of New South Wales?
42 A. Yes.
43
44 Q. And that was about the Good Shepherd Sisters and the
45 adolescent girl in need of care?
46 A. Yes.
47

1 Q. Did any aspect of that thesis deal with the effects of
2 or the relevance at all of sexual abuse of children?
3 A. Yes, it certainly did.
4
5 Q. That featured in the thesis, did it?
6 A. Most of the study at that particular time focused on
7 other issues related to adolescent girls who were in need
8 of care. The child welfare legislation at the time used to
9 contain the expression "exposed to moral danger" and the
10 like. What we were probably much less aware of at the time
11 I did that thesis was the internal sexual abuse of girls,
12 particularly in the familial situation. But the program
13 that I did the study on, conducted by the Good Shepherd
14 Sisters, developed particularly through the early 1980s to
15 have quite a specialist part that related to dealing with
16 young people who had been the victims of sexual abuse.
17
18 Q. You also completed a Bachelor of Theology at the
19 Catholic Institute of Sydney in 1980?
20 A. Yes.
21
22 Q. A Graduate Diploma of Religious Education in 1986?
23 A. Yes.
24
25 Q. And a Diploma of Jurisprudence through the University
26 of Sydney and you received a particular award for that?
27 A. Yes.
28
29 Q. You also completed a Licentiate in Sacred Theology
30 featuring a thesis on the secrecy of the confessional and
31 civil law and related to a case study there?
32 A. Yes.
33
34 Q. So is it fair to say you have a particular interest in
35 the questions of the way in which confidential matters
36 relating to church business should be dealt with?
37 A. Yes.
38
39 Q. You also have a Certificate in Pastoral Communication
40 from the Pontifical Gregorian University in Rome in 2002?
41 A. Yes.
42
43 Q. What was that about?
44 A. It was a course related to the way in which church
45 agencies would deal with media. It was part of a Churchill
46 fellowship that I had been awarded, and I undertook that
47 short course.

1
2 Q. You have been the official media spokesman for the
3 archdiocese of Sydney between 1985 and 2002?
4 A. Yes.
5
6 Q. And also a columnist for the Catholic Weekly from 1983
7 to 2002?
8 A. Yes.
9
10 Q. The time frame to which I'm going to direct your mind
11 shortly is 1988 to 1993 inclusive.
12 A. Yes.
13
14 Q. Before I do that, from 1988 to 1999 you were a member
15 of the Australian Catholic Bishops Conference committee for
16 professional standards?
17 A. Yes.
18
19 Q. Can you outline for the benefit of those present what
20 the work of that particular committee was?
21 A. Yes. That committee was established, I'm not sure of
22 the precise date it was formally established, but I think
23 in early 1989. The purpose of that committee was to
24 prepare a protocol to assist bishops and congregational
25 leaders in dealing with allegations of criminal behaviour
26 by members of the church.
27
28 Q. Do you recall now what, if any, particular events
29 prompted the commencement of that committee in 1988?
30 A. There had been some publicity relating to some cases,
31 I think particularly in Melbourne, but also there had been
32 some publicity relating to these matters in the United
33 States and in Canada.
34
35 Q. Are you able to say who, if any individual indeed did
36 this, prompted the establishment or recognition of the need
37 for a committee of this nature to help advise the Catholic
38 bishops and Catholic community?
39 A. I'm not sure what you're asking me, which particular
40 bishop?
41
42 Q. How did it happen? Did somebody prompt it? Did you
43 prompt it? Did a number of bishops get together and say
44 that this was an issue or how was it born?
45 A. To the best of my recollection, there must have been
46 some conversation among the bishops. I recall - and my
47 memory on this is fragile, whether it was at the end of

1 1987 or 1988, the document attached to my statement refers
2 to April 1988, but I have always had a feeling that we had
3 a call from Cardinal Clancy. I say "we" - it was either
4 a call by Cardinal Clancy to Father John Usher and he spoke
5 to me or a call by Cardinal Clancy to me and I spoke to
6 John Usher, but the two of us went out one evening to
7 Kensington to the plenary meeting of the Australian
8 Catholic Bishops Conference and gave a short presentation.
9 As I said, my recollection has always been that that was at
10 the end of 1987, but when I came upon that document in
11 April 1988, perhaps that recollection is mistaken. It may
12 have been in April 1988 that we made a presentation to the
13 bishops. In that presentation, I made a recommendation
14 that they needed to study these issues in more depth and
15 that they should establish a committee for that purpose
16

17 Q. I will show you some documents shortly that might
18 assist further with those time frames that you have just
19 given evidence about. At the time you made these
20 recommendations and gave this information to the Catholic
21 Bishops Conference, you understood, didn't you, the effect
22 of sexual abuse on children could manifest itself way into
23 their adult years?

24 A. I don't know that, to be honest, in 1988 the
25 understanding was as good as it is some 25 years later, but
26 there was certainly some understanding.
27

28 Q. Did you have an understanding that it could affect
29 children who had been abused as children into their
30 adult years?

31 A. Yes.
32

33 Q. You had discussions with Father Usher about those
34 matters?

35 A. That was more his area of expertise.
36

37 Q. He was a psychologist, was he?

38 A. No, he was a social worker.
39

40 Q. Father, I'll have you shown a copy of your affidavit
41 that you prepared for the benefit of this Commission. It's
42 dated 11 March 2013. You'll see that the affidavit has had
43 some pseudonyms slotted into it, and that is because
44 various persons have been given pseudonyms in these
45 proceedings. There are also a couple of parts that have
46 been redacted for relevance - relevance in terms of the
47 terms of reference for this Special Commission. You have

1 annexed some documents to it that you consider to be
2 helpful in outlining the matters about which your evidence
3 had been sought?

4 A. Yes.

5
6 Q. Is the affidavit true and correct?

7 A. Yes.

8
9 Q. Is there anything that you wish to change in there?

10 A. Not that I'm aware of.

11
12 MS LONERGAN: I tender the affidavit, Commissioner.

13
14 THE COMMISSIONER: The affidavit of Father Brian Lucas
15 dated 11 March 2013 will be admitted and marked
16 exhibit 142.

17
18 **EXHIBIT #142 AFFIDAVIT OF FATHER BRIAN LUCAS DATED**
19 **11/03/2013**

20
21 MS LONERGAN: Q. Keep that affidavit with you, and I will
22 show you some documents from our materials collected for
23 the benefit of the exploration of issues for the Special
24 Commission. On your right, there's a number of volumes.
25 I want you to reach for volume 2, please, and go to
26 tab 138.

27
28 MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, I should tender the curriculum
29 vitae of Father Lucas as well.

30
31 THE COMMISSIONER: That will be marked exhibit 143.

32
33 **EXHIBIT #143 CURRICULUM VITAE OF FATHER BRIAN LUCAS**

34
35 MS LONERGAN: Q. Tab 138, Father Lucas.

36 A. Is that a letter dated October 26?

37
38 Q. That's right.

39 A. Yes.

40
41 Q. That's a letter from Father Usher - was he
42 Father Usher then or Monsignor?

43 A. Father.

44
45 Q. Father Usher, to you?

46 A. Yes.

47

1 Q. And it suggests or confirms that there will be a child
2 sexual assault seminar that you and he were planning
3 together?

4 A. Yes.

5

6 Q. From reading that letter, was that seminar something
7 you were going to present to the Catholic Bishops
8 Conference or was it something else?

9 A. No, I think that seminar was for clergy.

10

11 Q. For which diocese or dioceses?

12 A. It would have been clergy of the archdiocese of
13 Sydney.

14

15 MS LONERGAN: I tender that letter, Commissioner, on
16 Centacare letterhead dated 26 October 1987.

17

18 THE COMMISSIONER: The letter from Father Usher to
19 Father Lucas dated 26 October 1987 that will be admitted
20 and marked exhibit 144.

21

22 **EXHIBIT #144 LETTER FROM FATHER USHER TO FATHER LUCAS DATED**
23 **26/10/1987**

24

25 MS LONERGAN: Q. If you wouldn't mind turning to tab 142
26 in the same volume, please. Father, you'll see that's
27 a document headed "When clergy are accused of criminal
28 acts". Before I ask you some questions about the document,
29 there was no doubt in your mind, was there, in 1988 that
30 sexual abuse of a child was a criminal offence?

31 A. Certainly not.

32

33 Q. No doubt?

34 A. No doubt.

35

36 Q. Did you have sufficient knowledge in terms of your
37 legal background to differentiate between what abuses of
38 children, sexual abuses of children, were felonies and
39 which were not?

40 A. I wouldn't know that now, and I'm not sure that
41 I would have known that then. I knew the distinction, that
42 there - I'll perhaps explain it more clearly. I knew there
43 was a distinction in the law between a misdemeanour and
44 a felony, but I don't know that I knew precisely which
45 types of offences would have fallen into which category.

46

47 Q. Is it fair to say you would have certainly had the

1 skills to make the relevant inquiry quickly if you needed
2 to distinguish between misdemeanours and felonies?

3 A. I would have taken some advice from someone, yes.

4

5 Q. But you would have had the skills to look it up
6 yourself given that you had completed a law degree?

7 A. I would have been able to eventually do the research.
8 How quickly and how accurately I would have done it at that
9 time, I'm not sure.

10

11 Q. "When clergy are accused of criminal acts" - that
12 document, would you mind just leafing through that. Do you
13 recall having any role in dispersing this document to
14 bishops or other church officials?

15 A. No, I don't recall having any involvement with this
16 document. This is a document prepared by Father Kevin
17 Matthews, who I know. I know it to be a commentary on
18 I think the Canadian protocol, and I think I have seen the
19 Canadian protocol that has the general outline of this
20 document without the commentary. And I think at some
21 stage, from what I've been told, that Canadian protocol had
22 been distributed to the bishops, but that would have been
23 done by the Bishops Conference secretariat.

24

25 Q. You weren't party to that dissemination yourself?

26 A. Not that I can recall.

27

28 Q. If you wouldn't mind turning to the last page of the
29 document, which is page 10 of the document, page 223 of the
30 bundle. Do you see the paragraph there under the
31 "Conclusion" paragraphs, which appears to be a commentary:

32

33 *This Canadian document is a fine attempt to*
34 *provide guidelines ...*

35

36 Et cetera?

37 A. Yes.

38

39 Q. Is it your evidence you didn't write that commentary;
40 Father Matthews did, to your understanding?

41 A. Oh, yes.

42

43 Q. Is there any way of distinguishing by looking at the
44 document what's commentary and what's the initial Canadian
45 document, or is that a task you just wouldn't be able to
46 assist with?

47 A. Having compared this document with the other document,

1 I think what is in bold is the Canadian document, and what
2 is in a lighter font, I think is Father Matthews'
3 commentary.
4

5 Q. Are you able to give any evidence confidently that
6 this particular document was in fact disseminated to
7 Australian Catholic bishops for their information and
8 assistance?

9 A. That I'm not sure.

10

11 Q. So you would be guessing in terms of its
12 dissemination?

13 A. Yes.

14

15 Q. Did you use any parts of this document to assist in
16 preparation of any other protocol or procedure documents
17 for the assistance of the Catholic Bishops Conference?

18 A. Yes, I think when the bishops committee began working
19 on a protocol, the general structure of the Canadian
20 document I think formed a basis for reflection and
21 consideration. I think it was in 1991 that a fairly brief
22 document was prepared for consideration and discussion and
23 consultation for about a year that led to a more mature
24 document in 1992.

25

26 Q. I'm going to stop you there. Thank you for that
27 history. Did you prepare that document you've just
28 outlined?

29 A. Not personally. I was part of a committee that
30 prepared the document.

31

32 Q. You had a role in preparing the document?

33 A. Yes.

34

35 Q. In preparing the document, was this document we're
36 looking at now, "When clergy are accused of criminal acts",
37 used in any way to prepare the subsequent 1991 draft?

38 A. I don't recall.

39

40 Q. You don't recall?

41 A. No. I presume it was available, but I have no
42 recollection as to the extent to which Father Matthews'
43 commentary was significant or not.

44

45 Q. At the time you prepared or assisted in preparing the
46 1991 draft document, you had read this 1988 document we're
47 looking at?

1 A. I presume so, but I don't recall.
2
3 Q. You presume so. Why would you presume so?
4 A. Well, I presume that if this document was available to
5 the committee, I would have received a copy of it and read
6 it.
7
8 Q. And that is a perfectly reasonable assumption, is it
9 not?
10 A. Certainly.
11
12 Q. So you can comfortably state that the likelihood of
13 you having read this document before you assisted in
14 preparing the 1991 document is high?
15 A. Yes.
16
17 MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, I tender the 1988 document.
18
19 THE COMMISSIONER: That's tab 142?
20
21 MS LONERGAN: Yes, Commissioner.
22
23 THE COMMISSIONER: The material behind tab 142 entitled
24 "When clergy are accused of criminal acts", by Father Kevin
25 Matthews, will be admitted and marked exhibit 145.
26
27 **EXHIBIT #145 DOCUMENT ENTITLED "WHEN CLERGY ARE ACCUSED OF**
28 **CRIMINAL ACTS", BY FATHER KEVIN MATTHEWS (TAB 142)**
29
30 MS LONERGAN: Q. Father Lucas, did you agree broadly
31 with the matters set out in this draft document that we're
32 looking at, "When clergy are accused of criminal acts", in
33 terms of it being a reasonable approach for bishops in
34 Australia to manage? Did you have a view as to whether
35 this was a reasonable approach, as set out in this
36 document, for bishops to approach the difficulties they
37 faced when clergy were accused of criminal offences?
38 A. I find it hard to answer that in those general terms.
39 Obviously there would be some aspects of this document that
40 were more significant than others with which I would have
41 had a more sort of central - where my agreement would be
42 more significant. I'd have to reread the document now to
43 see if there were aspects of it where I may have taken
44 a different opinion.
45
46 Q. I might ask you to do that later in the morning. If
47 you wouldn't mind turning to page 9 of the document, which

1 is tab 222 of the bundle. Do you see under the paragraph
2 next to number 2 - it's talking about return to ministry
3 of a cleric who had been accused of criminal behaviour,
4 Father Lucas - this observation is noted:

5
6 *This is one area where all bishops in*
7 *Australia should arrive at a common policy.*
8 *The damage, contradiction and seeming*
9 *injustice possible where one bishop could*
10 *advocate dismissal from the clerical state,*
11 *while another pushes for a quick return to*
12 *the ministry and yet another imposes*
13 *precepts of taking certain medication for*
14 *life need to be weighed up carefully.*

15
16 A. Yes.

17
18 Q. You agree with that as a proposition, that there
19 needed to be a consistency amongst bishops in Australia?

20 A. Yes.

21
22 Q. Part of your role on the committee that we have been
23 discussing was to assist in structuring a protocol or
24 policy so that there could be consistency?

25 A. Yes.

26
27 Q. At the bottom of that same page under the heading
28 "Other factors to be noted", there is this comment:

29
30 *In contemplation of litigation and for the*
31 *benefit of the legal counsel of the*
32 *diocese, it is recommended that a written*
33 *record be kept of all steps taken at the*
34 *diocesan level from the moment the*
35 *denunciation was first received. Care*
36 *should be taken to protect the*
37 *confidentiality of such documentation,*
38 *depending to a large extent on the*
39 *prevailing civil legislation.*

40
41 Then it goes on to say:

42
43 *The written record shall be endorsed as*
44 *being prepared for the benefit of and*
45 *assistance of the diocesan counsel.*

46
47 Are you able to say whether this is part of

1 Father Matthews' suggestions or it was in the original
2 document, or you can't say?

3 A. I think this was part of the Canadian document, just
4 by - use of the language suggests it. For example
5 "assistance of diocesan counsel" would not be an Australian
6 expression, so I think that paragraph is also involved -
7 was the Canadian document.

8

9 Q. What's your view about the recommendation or the
10 suggestion that it is a good idea to keep a written record
11 of steps taken at a diocesan level about when clergy are
12 accused of criminal behaviour?

13 A. I think that's too simplistic as it's presented there.
14 I think there are a number of different circumstances and
15 different sorts of conversations where sometimes it's
16 appropriate to have a written record and other times where
17 it's not.

18

19 Q. What about in circumstances where evidence is being
20 taken with a view to that evidence being used to strip
21 a priest of his faculties?

22 A. If there's a formal canonical trial, then the very
23 nature of church canonical trials requires that they be
24 documented.

25

26 Q. Putting aside formal canonical trials, what is your
27 view about the wisdom or otherwise of keeping a written
28 record of evidence related to, or that's going to be used
29 for, stripping a priest of his faculties?

30 A. Again, that would depend very much on the
31 circumstances. There are some circumstances where, for
32 example, in a conversation with a priest where one is
33 trying to persuade him to resign his ministry, it would be
34 counterproductive to write that down because that would
35 send a signal to him that would suggest he not say anything
36 to anyone, and that could be counterproductive. So much
37 depends on the circumstances and the type of action one is
38 trying to take.

39

40 Q. What about taking notes after the cleric left the
41 room?

42 A. Well, if you take notes after the cleric left the
43 room, in fairness to him he ought to see them and endorse
44 them as being accurate, and then you're back to where you
45 were if you had taken the notes in front of him.

46

47 Q. Surely a set of notes taken endorsed or not endorsed

1 by a cleric about whom they are recorded is better than
2 having no notes whatsoever, isn't it?
3 A. It depends on the circumstances. Generally speaking
4 I would agree, but it would depend sometimes on the
5 circumstances of what else was done by way of reporting the
6 nature of that conversation.
7
8 Q. Let's address ourselves to the situation where an
9 interview is had with a cleric at which he is presented
10 with information to the effect that he had sexually abused
11 a number of children.
12 A. Yes.
13
14 Q. And the interviewer is somebody who has been retained
15 to find out from the perpetrator what happened and/or
16 encourage him to remove himself from ministry?
17 A. Yes.
18
19 Q. Or allow himself to be removed from ministry?
20 A. Yes.
21
22 Q. Wouldn't you agree it would be very beneficial for
23 notes to be taken of that conference by the person
24 conducting the interview?
25 A. As I said, if you're sitting in front of him taking
26 notes, he will not say anything. That was my experience.
27
28 Q. That was your experience, all right. We weren't
29 necessarily talking about you in the example, but happy to
30 talk about you if you would prefer. Wouldn't the position
31 be far stronger in terms of confronting the alleged
32 perpetrator with information if he was presented with notes
33 of accounts that had been given about him?
34 A. If such notes existed.
35
36 Q. Wouldn't it be much easier to present to an accused
37 cleric the case against him if there were notes?
38 A. That would again depend on some circumstances. It may
39 be that in a particular situation, you may not wish to
40 identify a particular victim to the particular cleric.
41 There are issues of relationship, risk of reprisal. And
42 the other aspect of this sort of conversation is that
43 simply presenting a set of facts with a particular victim
44 simply leads to a denial. Sometimes that conversation
45 needs to work around the cleric's own perception of who
46 might be making such allegations with a view to confronting
47 him with his need to resign.

1
2 Q. Sometimes presenting a cleric with some facts about
3 their sexually abusive behaviour leads to an admission,
4 doesn't it?
5 A. It can do.
6
7 Q. And it has, hasn't it, in cases where you've
8 confronted clerics with allegations of sexual abuse of
9 children?
10 A. It has.
11
12 Q. It would be most useful, wouldn't it, to note that the
13 cleric had admitted to certain offences, wouldn't it?
14 A. If that was the situation in the particular case, but
15 depending on the nature of that conversation, it may be
16 simply a matter of reporting the event back to the bishop,
17 if that was what was requested.
18
19 Q. But would you agree with me that for the person who
20 was sitting there while Father X said, "I interfered with X
21 sexually when she was nine", it would be much more valuable
22 for that person who took that admission, who heard it with
23 their own ears, to write it down and then convey a note of
24 it to the relevant bishop or superior?
25 A. Not necessarily. The priest, whatever we think about
26 the law, has his right to silence. There has to be some
27 fairness to him, and the circumstances could be such that
28 if he thought that there was going to be some permanent
29 record, he would simply not speak in the first place, and
30 that was the real dilemma, and I absolutely accept,
31 counsel, what you're putting to me, and I found that
32 a constant dilemma.
33
34 Q. But, Father Lucas, wasn't that the position, and let's
35 go straight to you - in a role you completed for the
36 assistance of various bishops in New South Wales, you had
37 the role of persuading a priest to leave ministry?
38 A. Yes.
39
40 Q. That's the position, isn't it?
41 A. Yes.
42
43 Q. When a priest had been accused of sexually abusing
44 children and probably other circumstances as well; is that
45 right?
46 A. Yes.
47

1 Q. So you would, after these chats with the priests, make
2 a phone call to the bishop or the superior, would you?
3 A. Yes.
4
5 Q. Did you ever on any occasion provide to the bishop or
6 superior notes of your discussion with the alleged
7 perpetrator?
8 A. If the bishop wanted some written letter as to the
9 outcome, I would do that.
10
11 Q. Did you ever provide to the bishop or superior notes
12 of complaints of the victims?
13 A. That may have been the case. I don't recall
14 a specific instance. And I'm not quite sure - I don't want
15 to misrepresent my answer.
16
17 Q. I'm asking a very general question.
18 A. Yes.
19
20 Q. Did you ever provide to bishops or superiors notes of
21 complaints by complainants that you had taken yourself, let
22 me confine the question a little?
23 A. There would have been some instances I'm sure where
24 a victim presented a written statement and I would have
25 passed it on to a bishop.
26
27 Q. And in some circumstances you actually took complaints
28 from complainants yourself, didn't you?
29 A. On some occasions. Very rarely. Mostly the
30 complainants were dealt with by Father John Usher.
31
32 Q. But you did on at least some occasions take
33 complaints?
34 A. Yes.
35
36 Q. And at the time you made notes about what the
37 complaints were?
38 A. There could have been some instances of that, yes.
39
40 Q. Why only some instances of that?
41 A. It depends very much on the circumstances and what
42 a particular complainant wants to do. If a complainant
43 came with a written statement, for instance, and wanted
44 that written statement passed on to a bishop, it may be
45 that there were some aspects of that statement to clarify.
46 In other instances, depending again on the circumstances,
47 it would be counterproductive to sit in front of

1 a complainant and take notes. This is a more pastoral
2 conversation and, again - this is my experience - it is
3 extraordinarily difficult for victims of sexual assault to
4 speak about that experience. And to have a very formal
5 structured interview where you're taking notes while
6 they're talking, in some circumstances, depending on what
7 they might be, it may not necessarily be in that victim's
8 best interests.

9
10 Q. One thing that is absolutely common to all
11 complainants is that they're complaining; that's right,
12 isn't it?

13 A. Yes.

14
15 Q. They want a complaint conveyed and dealt with?

16 A. Yes.

17
18 Q. For a complaint to be accurately conveyed, wouldn't
19 you agree with me that it would be proper to take a note of
20 it so that it can be conveyed accurately if you do not have
21 a written note of it provided to you already?

22 A. My experience would be if a victim wanted some formal
23 conveyance of a complaint - in most of the cases I dealt
24 with, the victim had already made a complaint to the church
25 authority. That's why the matter was referred to me. They
26 had already made that complaint. I'd be very cautious of
27 wanting them to restate again what they had already stated.

28
29 Q. Didn't you need to evaluate what they were saying so
30 you could present that material to the alleged perpetrator?

31 A. Only in the most general terms.

32
33 Q. It needed to be more than general terms, didn't it, so
34 that you could confront the alleged perpetrator with what
35 was being alleged about him?

36 A. Not in specific detail. That was generally not
37 necessary. It was enough to confront him with the fact
38 that there had been allegations made against him. The
39 precise detail of those allegations, generally speaking,
40 were not necessary.

41
42 Q. You wouldn't be able to encourage a priest to leave
43 ministry just saying, "There have been allegations made
44 against you." Wouldn't you at least need some detail about
45 what those complaints were, that is, they were of a sexual
46 nature in relation to a child or they were of an
47 inappropriate nature in relation to a grown adult, or at

1 least that level of specificity?

2 A. Certainly at that level, yes.

3

4 Q. Wouldn't you need to have made some determination in
5 your mind as to whether these allegations were so fanciful
6 that you shouldn't even be confronting the priest about
7 them?

8 A. I think the question of whether they were fanciful was
9 probably already determined by the person they made the
10 original complaint to. That's not absolutely the case in
11 every instance, but the sorts of cases - I can recall one
12 specific case where there was a very fanciful conversation,
13 and that conversation took place in the presence of the
14 complainant's solicitor.

15

16 Q. Yes. And that was one fanciful account out of how
17 many that you dealt with in your career?

18 A. Oh, that would be one out of - I don't know, but very
19 rare.

20

21 Q. One out of - I'm going to ask you to make a stab, an
22 educated stab, at how many of these types of matters you've
23 dealt with?

24 A. When I was asked that question before, I took the
25 opportunity to then try to refresh my memory by looking at
26 a website where there was a list of names of perpetrators,
27 and I would think it would probably be of the order of
28 somewhere around 35, give or take a view. There are some
29 where my memory is fading.

30

31 Q. Thirty-five give or take a few over what time period?

32 A. This would be over the period from about 1990 through
33 to 1995 or 1996.

34

35 Q. And you stopped that particular special role you had
36 at 1995/1996; is that your evidence?

37 A. Around then, when the Professional Standards Office
38 was established in Sydney.

39

40 Q. Can I ask you some questions about this special role.
41 Who suggested to you that you should fulfil this particular
42 task in dealing with clerics who had been accused of
43 particular conduct?

44 A. The protocol that was established in 1992 established
45 a resource group in each province, and there were several
46 of us appointed to that resource group in Sydney.

47

1 Q. Your particular role - was it duplicated by anybody
2 else, to your knowledge?
3 A. Generally the cases I dealt with, I dealt with in
4 company with Father John Usher.
5
6 Q. So to that extent he didn't duplicate your role; he
7 accompanied you?
8 A. Yes.
9
10 Q. Do you know if anybody duplicated your role?
11 A. I expect that he dealt with some instances on his own
12 and I expect that there may have been others who dealt with
13 instances on their own.
14
15 Q. Which others?
16 A. I'd need to check who were members of the committee at
17 the particular time. I know that Father Bob McGuckin was
18 a member of the committee at one stage. Father Bill
19 Burston was a member of the committee at one stage. Sister
20 Evelyn Woodward was a member of the committee at some
21 stage, but I can't be sure of the precise times.
22
23 Q. I should make the question more specific. I'm dealing
24 with people from that particular group or committee who had
25 the role of confronting perpetrators or alleged
26 perpetrators of sexual abuse with the allegations of abuse
27 with a view to persuading them out of ministry?
28 A. Yes.
29
30 Q. That was the role you performed, wasn't it?
31 A. Generally in conjunction with Father John Usher, yes.
32
33 Q. I'm sorry, I didn't mean to leave him out of the
34 equation. Do you know whether Father Burston or
35 Father McGuckin performed that role, as well as you, during
36 the same period you did it?
37 A. I don't have any specific examples, no.
38
39 Q. By that answer, are you suggesting they didn't do it
40 or you just don't know?
41 A. I just don't know.
42
43 Q. You would be contacted by various bishops around New
44 South Wales, would you, to assist with that particular task
45 where they had a priest who had been accused of sexually
46 abusive behaviour?
47 A. Yes.

1
2 Q. Were you also asked to do that task in relation to
3 priests who had been accused of other kinds of
4 inappropriate behaviour, or was it only the sexual abuse?
5 A. No, other behaviour, but the other behaviour would
6 have probably been confined to the archdiocese of Sydney.
7 Other types of behaviour were probably dealt with locally
8 by the bishops.
9
10 Q. You're not a canon lawyer?
11 A. No.
12
13 Q. As part of your fulfilling this particular role that
14 had been allocated to you as part of the group you've
15 described, did you on occasion take canon law advice?
16 A. There was certainly canon law advice -
17 Father Matthews' document would be part of that. There
18 were a number of canon lawyers who had views on various
19 aspects of the procedure.
20
21 Q. Did you take advice from them on occasion regarding
22 the way in which you went about your particular tasks?
23 A. I don't recall that I was ever involved in a canonical
24 process that would have required canon law advice.
25
26 Q. That's a little different to the question I'm asking
27 you.
28 A. Sorry.
29
30 Q. Let me ask some preliminary questions. Do you see the
31 role that you were carrying out as having absolutely no
32 need to comply with any canon law processes?
33 A. It depends on what the canon law processes were.
34 I think the general view at the time, and a view certainly
35 that I had at that time, was that the canon law processes,
36 the formal structured canon law processes, were unworkable
37 and we needed to find a different way of dealing with these
38 allegations.
39
40 Q. So are we to understand your answer as suggesting that
41 your process was outside any canon law processes?
42 A. That would be a general observation of which many
43 canon lawyers have been very critical.
44
45 Q. Is that an accurate observation, though?
46 A. I think so.
47

1 Q. Were your processes outside canon law processes?
2 A. I don't think they were - well, I'll put it this way.
3 There were some canon lawyers who took the view that the
4 manner of dealing with a priest in soliciting from him
5 a willingness to resign his ministry did not do justice to
6 his canonical rights. I understand that view. I don't
7 accept it. But that was certainly a view that was
8 expressed strongly by some canon lawyers.

9

10 Q. What about in circumstances where the alleged
11 perpetrator admitted that he had engaged in criminal
12 conduct - would not notes of that admission or those
13 admissions have been useful to pass on to those who thought
14 a canon law process would be an appropriate further way to
15 deal with the priest?

16 A. I'm not sure - once he had agreed to resign his
17 ministry, there generally wasn't any need for a canonical
18 process.

19

20 Q. An agreement to resign ministry is not a laicisation,
21 is it?

22 A. No, there's a distinction between agreeing to resign
23 ministry and formally being deprived of the clerical state.
24 In my view, that is more a theological issue than
25 a practical issue.

26

27 Q. Did you hold the view, or do you hold the view, that
28 laicisation is appropriate for priests who sexually abuse
29 children?

30 A. That would depend on some circumstances, for a younger
31 priest who wants to leave the clerical state and make
32 a secular life. But there is also an instance,
33 particularly for an older priest, where you certainly - and
34 remembering the first priority in all of this is to ensure
35 that he's not a risk to children - whether or not he is
36 laicised may not make much difference to that particular
37 issue, again, depending on the circumstances. Sometimes
38 it's more advantageous that he not be laicised, which gives
39 the bishops some leverage over his living circumstances and
40 some better control over him. So a lot depends on the
41 particular circumstances.

42

43 Q. How does removal of faculties provide safety for
44 children in the vicinity of the priest?

45 A. Once the priest is not functioning as a priest, he's
46 been removed from ministry, his faculties have been taken
47 from him, he can't hold himself out as a priest, he can't

1 form the sorts of trusting relationships that tragically
2 are the basis of much of this behaviour, then that - whilst
3 it's never absolute - goes a long way towards ensuring that
4 children are better protected.

5
6 Q. Is it your understanding that when faculties are
7 removed, a priest is not permitted to wear his cross or his
8 collar?

9 A. That would be the normal expectation, and generally
10 that would be part of the arrangement the bishop made with
11 him.

12
13 Q. If a priest is not compliant with that arrangement and
14 continues to wear his priestly outfit, what power does the
15 bishop have to do anything further about that?

16 A. Well, the bishop can have some canonical process, but
17 even if at the end of that canonical process the sentence
18 that is imposed is laicisation, that still doesn't stop
19 a man wearing clerical dress.

20
21 Q. You mentioned that there is a pastoral aspect to
22 taking complaints from victims of sexual abuse. Was it
23 your practice when you were in the position of taking these
24 particular complaints to only do them in person, that is,
25 you sitting with the alleged victim?

26 A. In taking a complaint?

27
28 Q. Yes.

29 A. I rarely would take a formal complaint from a victim,
30 but you would do that, obviously, in some form of meeting
31 with that victim.

32
33 Q. I suggest to you in relation to two particular
34 complainants regarding McAlinden, who's the priest we're
35 dealing with in the main today, that you took the
36 complaints over the phone. Do you recollect that?

37 A. I'm aware of those comments. I would not say that
38 I took complaints. The complaints had already been made,
39 and I don't recall the specifics of conversations, but my
40 understanding and my best recollection - and I'm very
41 conscious of not turning a recollection into some
42 self-serving reconstruction, but my best understanding of
43 that was simply to pass on a message as to what was
44 happening, not to take details of the complaint. My
45 understanding is complaints had already been made
46 elsewhere.

47

1 Q. I suggest to you that in relation to McAlinden, you
2 phoned a particular person who we're referring to in these
3 proceedings as [AJ]. There's a list of pseudonyms in the
4 witness box with you if you --

5 A. I'm aware of who [AJ] is, yes.
6

7 Q. And you phoned her and actually asked her to tell you
8 what happened in relation to McAlinden over the phone.
9 What do you say about that?

10 A. Well, I don't recall any specifics, but when you say
11 "tell what happened", it probably would have gone no
12 further than something euphemistic, "I understand" - from
13 whoever told me to ring her - "that you were a victim of
14 sexual molestation" - or "inappropriate touching" or some
15 euphemistic word - "I just want to tell you that this is
16 what we're doing, we're seeing", or whatever the message
17 was. I would certainly never, ever take - firstly, I would
18 very rarely take details of sexual assault from a victim.
19 There's issues there about the risk of contaminating
20 evidence that I was always conscious of, but I would
21 certainly never do it over the phone.
22

23 Q. Presuming that you had no statement from this
24 particular person already, how would you be able to
25 confront the priest, in this case McAlinden, with the
26 information if you didn't phone the alleged complainant?

27 A. I would have received from - whoever asked me to
28 telephone [AJ] would have told me whatever [AJ] had told
29 that person.
30

31 Q. And you'd write that down?

32 A. Not necessarily.
33

34 Q. You'd just rely on your memory to be able to have the
35 phone number of this person in your mind?

36 A. Oh, no, I would have written down the phone number for
37 sure.
38

39 Q. You would have written down the name?

40 A. Yes.
41

42 Q. And wouldn't you have written down something about
43 what it was that you were going to pursue in relation to
44 that person?

45 A. Not necessarily in any detail, no.
46

47 Q. I'm not talking about in any detail. Would you have

1 written anything?
2 A. Well, I might have written the name of McAlinden next
3 to the person in my workbook, but that wouldn't have gone
4 any further than a name and a phone number.
5
6 Q. Can we take it from your evidence that you have no
7 recollection of ringing an alleged victim of McAlinden's
8 and talking to her over the phone about the alleged abuse?
9 A. No, I can't recall that directly. Obviously from all
10 of this material, that certainly happened. I don't resile
11 from the fact that that happened. As I said, I'm very
12 conscious of not wanting to in some way reconstruct what
13 might have occurred in that telephone conversation. I'm
14 sorry, I just don't recall that conversation.
15
16 Q. But your usual practice is to not phone complainants?
17 A. I would have been asked by somebody - if I phoned that
18 person --
19
20 Q. I'm going to stop you.
21 A. Sorry.
22
23 Q. I'm just asking about usual practice. I'm not delving
24 back into recollection. Your usual practice as at 1993
25 would have been not to phone victims and talk to them on
26 the phone about their abuse?
27 A. I would have telephoned them to make an appointment if
28 that was what was being asked of me. But I would not talk
29 over the phone with a victim about the details of the
30 allegation at all.
31
32 Q. That wouldn't have been your usual practice?
33 A. Never.
34
35 Q. You were based in Sydney at that time?
36 A. Yes.
37
38 Q. Let's focus on late 1992 and early 1993. Would you
39 on occasion travel away from Sydney to interview
40 complainants regarding sexual abuse?
41 A. Yes.
42
43 Q. And you would on occasion travel to other locations to
44 interview priests?
45 A. Yes.
46
47 Q. And present accusations to them?

1 A. Yes.
2
3 Q. In relation to any interviews that you carried out
4 with priests where you presented accusations to them, in
5 1992 or 1993, did you make any notes?
6 A. Of a conversation with a priest?
7
8 Q. Yes.
9 A. There were some instances where I, after the event,
10 wrote to the bishop giving a report, yes.
11
12 Q. So you would prepare that report or write that report
13 just after the interview with the priest, would you?
14 A. Yes, within a few days.
15
16 Q. Do you know how many occasions you did that in 1992
17 and 1993?
18 A. I'm sorry, I don't.
19
20 Q. More than one occasion or you can't say?
21 A. I can't say, sorry.
22
23 Q. In relation to cases where you didn't make notes, you
24 conveyed the information to the bishop, did you?
25 A. Yes, or the vicar general, depending on who I was
26 dealing with.
27
28 Q. You would do that immediately after your contact with
29 a particular alleged perpetrator?
30 A. Generally the same day, or if the bishop or the
31 vicar general wasn't available, as soon as they were
32 available.
33
34 Q. You took care to ensure the information you conveyed
35 to them about what the perpetrator had said was accurate?
36 A. Not so much what the perpetrator had said. Again
37 remembering the circumstances of that conversation,
38 certainly what the agreed outcome was.
39
40 Q. You'd want to convey what the perpetrator said as well
41 as part of that outcome, wouldn't you?
42 A. Again, this is difficult. If one has entered into the
43 conversation with the perpetrator on the basis of some
44 confidentiality, if the confidentiality extended, of
45 course, to reporting to the bishop and he agreed with that,
46 I'd report whatever level of detail the bishop would want.
47

1 Q. You were the bishop's delegate, in effect, in carrying
2 out this particular conversation with the alleged
3 perpetrator, weren't you?
4 A. Not exactly. The bishop was looking for somebody to
5 achieve an outcome.
6
7 Q. You were effectively his delegate, weren't you?
8 A. I don't think we ever used the word "delegate".
9 I think --
10
11 Q. But you were doing this for the bishop, weren't you?
12 A. Well, I was assisting the bishop in doing something he
13 asked me to do, certainly.
14
15 Q. And it was important to convey accurately to the
16 bishop what had occurred during the conference with the
17 alleged perpetrator?
18 A. No, it was important to convey to the bishop the
19 agreed outcome that the bishop was looking for.
20
21 Q. If part of the outcome that the bishop was looking for
22 was to get a particular alleged perpetrator out of
23 ministry, the fact that the alleged perpetrator had
24 admitted to offending against children in your conversation
25 with him would have been a really important thing to convey
26 back to the bishop, wouldn't it?
27 A. It would depend on how general those admissions were
28 and how specific they were and what was necessary for the
29 purposes of reporting back to the bishop.
30
31 Q. If they were made, you would have reported them to the
32 bishop, wouldn't you?
33 A. That would depend on the circumstances. I wouldn't be
34 confident that I would have given every bishop all of the
35 detail of particular parts of a conversation.
36
37 Q. But if the alleged perpetrator denied any of the acts
38 he had been accused of, you would have told the bishop
39 that, wouldn't you?
40 A. It would depend on the nature of the conversation.
41 Many perpetrators would obfuscate and minimise, and at the
42 end of the day you weren't quite sure what they were
43 agreeing with or not agreeing with, and I would have
44 conveyed that to the bishop in terms of, "Look, we've had
45 this conversation. He's all over the place. I can't be
46 sure of what's happened or hasn't happened. But at the end
47 of the day he has agreed to resign".

1
2 Q. That was more the norm, wasn't it, that the alleged
3 perpetrator would deny or obfuscate in terms of the
4 accusations?
5 A. Yes.
6
7 Q. It was very unusual in your experience, wasn't it,
8 particularly in 1992 and 1993, for an alleged perpetrator
9 to admit they had carried out any illegal conduct with
10 children?
11 A. There are --
12
13 Q. It was unusual, wasn't it?
14 A. Not necessarily. There were various grades of
15 admitting or not admitting or agreeing or not agreeing from
16 the perpetrator who would see his whole life come to an end
17 and - and I can think of one particular example of a priest
18 who spent most of the conversation absolutely sobbing his
19 heart out --
20
21 Q. I'm going to stop you there. Was that priest
22 McAlinden?
23 A. No.
24
25 Q. Then we don't need to hear that evidence. In relation
26 to your evidence along the lines that there were graded
27 types of admissions, in your experience, it was very
28 unusual, wasn't it, for a priest to say, "Yes, I abused
29 Ms X or Ms Y"?
30 A. It's hard to evaluate what's usual or unusual but --
31
32 Q. You're the one who was doing this job?
33 A. No, no, in terms of trying to remember all the
34 particular instances to work out how many fell into which
35 category, I don't want to mislead you and I'm not quite
36 sure what number constitutes unusual.
37
38 Q. If you do 35, less than 10 may be thought to be
39 unusual. Let's just use that as a working basis. Did you
40 have more than 10 priests admit to particular instances of
41 sexual abuse of particular people, broadly?
42 A. Thinking of those that I persuaded to plead guilty,
43 yes, there probably were.
44
45 Q. More than 10?
46 A. Could well be, yes. I'm not sure exactly.
47

1 Q. In relation to those, did you tell the bishops that
2 they had admitted to particular instances of abuse against
3 particular people?
4 A. I would have given a general report in whatever terms
5 the bishop asked for.
6
7 Q. The bishop would have been interested in whether
8 admissions were made about particular people and particular
9 abuse, would he not, as a general proposition for a bishop
10 in this circumstance?
11 A. That's if we were dealing with particular individuals
12 and particular fact situations, yes.
13
14 Q. Making your own note about what happened in your
15 conversation with an accused priest doesn't breach any
16 confidentiality with the perpetrator, does it, because
17 you're just making your own note?
18 A. I think fairness would suggest to him that if I'm
19 going to write down something, some fairness to him would
20 suggest that if I'm going to create some permanent record,
21 that that permanent record, given it's so adverse to his
22 interests, ought to be seen by him and regarded as being
23 accurate. That would be my understanding.
24
25 Q. That's not what I'm asking you.
26 A. Sorry.
27
28 Q. What I'm suggesting to you is you making a note of
29 your conversation with this person isn't per se a breach of
30 his confidentiality, is it? It's what you do with it where
31 it gets messier, but just actually the act of taking the
32 note?
33 A. Certainly not the act of taking the note.
34
35 Q. So there's no reason on the confidentiality basis as
36 to why you could not have taken a note of your conversation
37 with him? That's the position, isn't it?
38 A. Sorry?
39
40 Q. It's a proposition I'm putting to you; you could have
41 accepted it or rejected it. There's no reason why your
42 taking a note of your conversation with a perpetrator would
43 have breached his confidentiality, would it?
44 A. I think that would be a matter some people would argue
45 about, to be honest.
46
47 Q. I don't want to know what some people would argue

1 about. I'm asking you.
2 A. I would be cautious of doing that.
3
4 Q. Cautious of taking any note?
5 A. Yes.
6
7 Q. Is the real position as to why you didn't want to take
8 any note that you didn't want it to have to be disclosed in
9 any subsequent legal process?
10 A. I think that would be a reasonable comment.
11
12 Q. And you have on occasion published advice and your
13 thoughts on that particular subject, that it is wise on
14 occasion not to have notes so that they can't be compelled
15 to be disclosed in later legal proceedings?
16 A. That would be a position in some instances, given the
17 circumstances of duress in which a perpetrator has made
18 some statements, yes.
19
20 Q. What I'm asking about, though, is your writings,
21 independent of any particular notes you did or didn't take
22 in these types of conversations we've been talking about,
23 where you have published views for the benefit of other
24 clergy to the effect that it's a good idea not to take
25 notes, so that a subsequent legal process that would compel
26 production of them cannot be successful?
27 A. In some instances that would be accurate, yes.
28
29 Q. You published to that effect?
30 A. Yes.
31
32 Q. And it's a view you hold?
33 A. Yes.
34
35 Q. And it's a view you held in 1992/1993?
36 A. Yes.
37
38 Q. What I want to suggest to you is that you deliberately
39 didn't take notes of these events because you did not want
40 any paper trail relating to the types of matters you were
41 discussing with priests?
42 A. I think that's, with due respect, not quite the
43 position I was adopting.
44
45 Q. All right. Explain what the position was that you
46 were adopting?
47 A. We're dealing with a person who has his right to

1 silence. We're putting extreme pressure and duress upon
2 him. Probably anything he said would not be admissible
3 subsequently, anyway. But to sit in front of him and take
4 notes would mean he wouldn't say anything. If you are
5 going to take a note, and there are good reasons for taking
6 that note, I think fairness and procedural fairness to him
7 suggests that he should see that note so that it's
8 accurate.

9
10 Q. So one solution would have been for you to take a note
11 and show it to the perpetrator so he could ensure it was
12 accurate?

13 A. Yes.

14
15 Q. Did you do that?

16 A. No.

17
18 Q. Never did that?

19 A. No.

20
21 Q. That would have been a fairer process, wouldn't it,
22 because then that would have been a memo of your discussion
23 with the priest, your conversation, and his acknowledgment
24 that it was accurate?

25 A. And probably create significant disturbance in his
26 mind about the consequences of that from his perspective.

27
28 Q. But he knew you were going to convey information to
29 the bishop, such as to allow the bishop to make that final
30 definitive step of removing the faculties of the priest,
31 didn't he?

32 A. Yes, yes.

33
34 Q. So the fact that there's documentation about it or not
35 is really not a particularly important matter to that
36 particular priest when he knows he is not going to be
37 allowed to practise as a priest any more if the
38 conversation goes the way the bishop would like it to go;
39 is that a fair summary?

40 A. That would be a fair summary.

41
42 Q. Why do you say that notes made in those circumstances
43 of the conversation with you would not be admissible?

44 A. Oh, look, I think you're talking about a person who -
45 and as I understand the general procedures, people have
46 a right to be silent. Whether we agree with that being the
47 law or not is a different question. Generally people are

1 cautioned before they make comments adverse to their
2 interests. The practicalities of dealing with these
3 priests were that one had to, in a sense, seduce them into
4 agreeing to resign. And I understand the unfairness of
5 that, but that was the practical outcome.
6

7 Q. Did you receive legal advice to the effect that any
8 handwritten or typed statement by you of your conversation
9 with any alleged perpetrator would be inadmissible in any
10 court proceedings?

11 A. No.

12
13 Q. That was just your own view?

14 A. Yes.

15
16 Q. That view may be wrong; do you agree?

17 A. It may be wrong.
18

19 Q. It's a very important matter, since you were attending
20 to these types of tasks in relation to a number of priests,
21 to have received some accurate advice about that particular
22 issue; do you agree?
23

24 MR SKINNER: I object, Commissioner.
25

26 MS LONERGAN: I withdraw the question. I'll move to
27 something else.
28

29 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Ms Lonergan.
30

31 MS LONERGAN: Q. Father, did you have any meetings with
32 Father James Fletcher of the nature we've been discussing?

33 A. No.
34

35 Q. Did you at any time to your recollection take any
36 complaints from any alleged victims of James Fletcher?

37 A. No.
38

39 Q. You're aware, aren't you, that the other priest with
40 which this Commission is particularly concerned is
41 Father McAlinden?

42 A. Yes.
43

44 Q. And you did have a conversation with Father McAlinden
45 in early 1993?

46 A. Yes.
47

1 Q. Do you recall that particular meeting - was there more
2 than one meeting?
3 A. So far as I'm aware, there was only one meeting, but
4 I don't recall it.
5
6 Q. You say so far as you're aware. How do you know there
7 was a meeting if you don't recall it?
8 A. Well, all of the evidence suggests that there was
9 a meeting. I don't recall the detail of that meeting and
10 I can't, in my mind's eye, construct where it was, what he
11 looked like, or what he said.
12
13 Q. I suggest to you that the meeting was around about
14 February 1993?
15 A. Yes.
16
17 Q. Would you agree with me that the material you've read
18 suggests that's probably accurate?
19 A. Yes.
20
21 Q. Please, these propositions I'm putting to you, if you
22 don't agree with them, please say so. Have you looked for
23 any records, diaries or other information that could assist
24 you in identifying the date the meeting with McAlinden
25 occurred and/or the location?
26 A. Yes.
27
28 Q. Have you turned anything up that has assisted in
29 pinpointing either of those things?
30 A. No.
31
32 Q. At that stage, February 1993, are you able to say how
33 many priests you had had these particular special meetings
34 with?
35 A. I can't. There would be a number, but I can't recall.
36
37 Q. Are you able to say when you started - I think I've
38 already asked you this question, but just to pinpoint it
39 going backwards - doing these sorts of meetings with
40 alleged perpetrators?
41 A. It would be some time around 1989/1990.
42
43 Q. You stopped around about 1995/1996 when the
44 Professional Standards Office was set up; is that the
45 position?
46 A. Yes.
47

1 Q. Are you able to say what month of which of
2 those years, or not?
3 A. Sorry?
4
5 Q. That you stopped doing these sorts of tasks.
6 A. I think the Professional Standards Office was set up
7 at the end of 1996.
8
9 Q. So once that office was up and running, you no longer
10 performed these tasks for the archdiocese; is that the
11 position?
12 A. It wasn't just the archdiocese. It was the province
13 of New South Wales.
14
15 Q. The whole of New South Wales including the ACT?
16 A. Yes.
17
18 Q. Do you remember physically attending the
19 Maitland-Newcastle bishop's house to conduct an interview
20 or a meeting with an alleged victim of McAlinden?
21 A. I recall having a meeting with an alleged - well,
22 a victim, but as far as I --
23
24 Q. A lady?
25 A. A lady who was a victim of McAlinden. I'm not sure
26 where it was. I don't, in my recollection, recall where it
27 was.
28
29 Q. It was up here somewhere, though, in the Newcastle
30 area?
31 A. That's my understanding, yes.
32
33 Q. It's your understanding or your recollection?
34 A. I think I'd have to put it that it's my understanding.
35 I simply don't recall the place. I'm almost certain it was
36 in Newcastle, in all of the circumstances, but I don't
37 recall.
38
39 Q. You recall it was a meeting with an alleged victim of
40 McAlinden's?
41 A. Yes.
42
43 Q. Do you remember where it occurred in relation to your
44 meeting that must have taken place with McAlinden, whether
45 it was before or after?
46 A. My recollection would be that the meeting with the
47 victim was before the meeting with McAlinden.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Q. I appreciate you don't have a memory of your actual meeting with McAlinden, but do you have sufficient memory to recall that the meeting with McAlinden's victim was information upon which you relied in your meeting with McAlinden or not?

A. What I do remember very clearly - and I'm guided, counsel, by some circumstances of non-publication and confidentiality relating to the particular person we're speaking about and I'm in your hands as to how I should deal with that, because one aspect of that I have a clear recollection about.

Q. We'll have to come back to that in another setting. Now, [AJ], who I've already asked you some questions about - it's the position, isn't it, that you have no recollection of ever meeting her in person, [AJ]?

A. Yes.

Q. That's the position?

A. Yes, certainly.

Q. You say you don't remember having a phone conversation with her where you asked her to detail the abuse that she suffered at the hands of McAlinden?

A. I don't recall a phone conversation but I would be confident that I would not, over the phone, have asked somebody to detail the abuse.

Q. You've given evidence that you expect you would have spoken to [AJ] about what was planned to happen in relation to McAlinden?

A. Yes.

Q. I want to suggest to you that in your first phone contact with [AJ], you said, "Tell me what happened. How old were you? What did he do to you?"

A. While I cannot remember, I would have to refute that. It would not be in character for me ever over the phone to ask other than in the most broad sense, "We understand that there has been some allegation" or "You're making an allegation of sexual molestation" or some euphemism like that. I would never, ever over the phone ask a victim for any detail of that, for various reasons. First, as I've said before, it is very, very difficult for victims to speak about this, in any event. It is even worse to talk about it over the phone. In any event, I would be very

1 cautious of getting into detail with victims lest at some
2 stage there be some contamination or alleged contamination
3 of what they've said.
4

5 Q. If it's suggested that you asked these questions in
6 a cold and insensitive manner and with a brusque tone?

7 A. I understand that's what has been alleged and I can
8 say this, and I will say this very publicly in this
9 courtroom, if I did that, I'm very sorry.
10

11 Q. It's suggested that in that same phone call you asked
12 that particular person, [AJ], about another alleged victim
13 of McAlinden's, [AI], who's on that pseudonym list. Would
14 that have been part of your usual approach as at early
15 1993, to do that?

16 A. I don't think I would have asked about another victim.
17 This is again possibly reconstruction.
18

19 Q. Reconstruction by you, at this stage, relying on your
20 usual practice?

21 A. That in fact [AJ] had told me about the other person
22 and perhaps suggested I ring the other person. But I put
23 it no higher than a possible reconstruction.
24

25 Q. By that, you are relying on the way you would have
26 gone about things at that time as opposed to having any
27 actual recollection about what happened?

28 A. Yes.
29

30 Q. In relation to either [AJ] or any other victim of
31 McAlinden that you had any contact with, are you able to
32 recall whether you had any conversations with the bishop at
33 the time, Bishop Clarke, about McAlinden?

34 A. Certainly.
35

36 Q. You certainly had the conversations?

37 A. Oh, I'm sure there were a number of conversations.
38 I can't pinpoint which conversations would have been with
39 Bishop Clarke and which would have been with his
40 vicar general.
41

42 Q. And his vicar general was Monsignor Hart?

43 A. Yes.
44

45 Q. Are you able to assist with which of those two
46 gentlemen, if it was one of those two, who first retained
47 your assistance in relation to McAlinden?

1 A. I can't recall.
2
3 Q. It could have been either?
4 A. Could have been.
5
6 Q. It's your recollection you had conversations with both
7 of them about the matter?
8 A. Yes.
9
10 Q. And did you have conversations with both of them in
11 early 1993?
12 A. If that was the occasion, yes, certainly.
13
14 Q. You're aware, aren't you, that there's also an entry
15 in your 1995 diary to the effect that you were to ring
16 Monsignor Hart regarding McAlinden?
17 A. Yes.
18
19 Q. I just want to pinpoint involvement at that time. Do
20 you recollect whether you in fact rang Father Hart at that
21 time or do you have any recollection of those matters?
22 A. I don't have any recollection of the phone call, but
23 I understand from this material that shortly after the date
24 of that entry, which I think was in the middle of June,
25 a letter was written to the apostolic nuncio making
26 reference to that letter being written partly on my advice.
27 So I'm presuming that the conversation with Monsignor Hart
28 was about the construct of that letter or the strategy that
29 that letter involved.
30
31 Q. You have put that memory together from looking at
32 various documents with the assistance of your legal
33 representatives?
34 A. Yes.
35
36 Q. I'm not being critical about that at all. Do you have
37 any recollection of having dealt with the McAlinden issue
38 in early 1993 and looking at that diary entry in 1995,
39 having any ongoing role in relation to McAlinden's ministry
40 and/or advising the bishop of the diocese or anybody else
41 in the diocese about what to do with him?
42 A. No, no.
43
44 Q. Did you make any plan with Bishop Clarke, to your
45 recollection, as to what should happen with McAlinden after
46 your particular involvement?
47 A. I presume there was some conversation about that, but

1 my best recollection, insofar as it's a recollection at
2 all, is that decisions about what happened to him after
3 I persuaded him to resign rested with the bishop and his
4 advisers.

5
6 Q. In giving that answer, you're relying on your usual
7 practice, are you, as opposed to a recollection about your
8 involvement or otherwise with plans made for the management
9 of McAlinden after he had been persuaded to give up his
10 ministry?

11 A. Yes. The usual practice would have been once the
12 priest had been persuaded to resign, that the ongoing
13 management of all of that was a matter for his bishop.

14
15 Q. You say there would have been conversations with [AJ]
16 or at least a conversation with [AJ] in which you dealt
17 with the subject matter of what was going to happen with
18 McAlinden?

19 A. Yes.

20
21 Q. I just want to get some more clarity on that.

22
23 MR SKINNER: Well, Commissioner --

24
25 MS LONERGAN: I'm using that term very loosely. Let me
26 just clarify it. I understand Mr Skinner's concern.

27
28 MR SKINNER: If my friend rephrases it rather than perhaps
29 "you say that you accept". He accepts some other evidence
30 that he had a conversation.

31
32 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

33
34 MS LONERGAN: I will tidy it up, Commissioner.
35 Mr Skinner's point is well taken.

36
37 Q. I'm not suggesting by the questions I am now going to
38 ask you that you had a particular role in arranging where
39 McAlinden would go or to what country he would be sent or
40 where he would live after your particular conversation with
41 him. What I want to ask you about is any conversations you
42 had with [AJ] where you discussed what your role would be
43 or what the processes would be in relation to you speaking
44 to McAlinden or having anything to do with McAlinden?

45 A. Again this is a reconstruction because I don't recall
46 the conversation, but it would have been - the suggestion
47 is there are two conversations. My reconstruction would be

1 that the first conversation was to tell her that I'd
2 received this message from whoever it was who asked me to
3 ring her, that we would be dealing with McAlinden and
4 moving towards him being removed from ministry. And
5 I suspect that the second conversation was a report back to
6 her that that outcome had been achieved.

7
8 Q. Are you able to state now where McAlinden was located
9 at the time you were first retained to assist?

10 A. The timing of this is confusing in my mind. I know
11 that he had been in Western Australia, he'd been acquitted
12 of charges in Western Australia. At what point the bishop
13 brought him back and the timing in relation to when I then
14 spoke to him, I'm not clear about.

15
16 Q. And you're not clear about that because you have no
17 notes that were made by you at the time to assist you?

18 A. That's right.

19
20 Q. Would you agree with me it would have been helpful if
21 you had some so that you could pinpoint times when things
22 occurred?

23 A. If 20 years later I needed to have that information,
24 it would have been helpful, but at the time I didn't need
25 to know that.

26
27 Q. You have an idea that McAlinden was recalled by his
28 bishop - was that your evidence? - or called by his bishop
29 from Western Australia?

30 A. That's my understanding.

31
32 Q. It's an understanding you've reached from looking at
33 material now as opposed to recalling the situation then?

34 A. Yes.

35
36 Q. Either way, the bishop was able to request or demand
37 that McAlinden return to a certain location; was that the
38 way it worked in the 1990s?

39 A. Yes.

40
41 Q. I suggest to you that in a call after your
42 conversation with McAlinden, you said to [AJ] that
43 McAlinden had made admissions to you about his behaviour;
44 does that ring a bell?

45 A. I don't think I would have said that.

46
47 Q. Why wouldn't you have told an alleged victim of

1 McAlinden's that admissions had been made by him?
2 A. I'm not sure what admissions he made or what detail he
3 gave me.

4
5 Q. I'm not asking you that. I'm asking you a more
6 general question. Why wouldn't you have told an alleged
7 victim if admissions had in fact been made by McAlinden in
8 your conversation with him?

9 A. Well, that's a matter between myself and McAlinden,
10 but I would have told the victim that we had arrived at the
11 outcome the victim wanted, which was his dismissal from
12 priesthood.

13
14 Q. But don't you think acknowledgment on the part of the
15 alleged perpetrator that he had in fact done to her what
16 she said he had done was an important part of her pastoral
17 care?

18 A. That's assuming that he had made that admission about
19 her.

20
21 Q. I want you to assume he made that admission for the
22 purposes of my question. I'm not asking you to acknowledge
23 that that was in fact what occurred or did not occur in the
24 interview. I'm asking you a more theoretical question.
25 Don't you agree that it would have been helpful from
26 a pastoral point of view for the victim to have that
27 acknowledgment that the perpetrator had done to her what
28 she said he had?

29 A. That would be in the normal case, yes.

30
31 Q. What do you mean "That would be in the normal case"?

32 A. Well, if in fact the victim was looking for that
33 acknowledgment, and if in fact the perpetrator had
34 acknowledged the particular allegations of that particular
35 victim.

36
37 Q. Putting aside whether the perpetrator in fact
38 acknowledged it or not, isn't it the case, in your
39 experience, that one thing that victims of sexual abuse
40 crave is an acknowledgment of the truth of what happened to
41 them?

42 A. Yes.

43
44 MS LONERGAN: Would that be a convenient time,
45 Commissioner?

46
47 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Just before we rise, Ms Lonergan.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Q. Father Lucas, you mentioned one of the reasons that you didn't take notes of your interviews with these errant priests as being that priests have a right to silence and right to be cautioned, and so on. But that right exists, doesn't it, just in order to protect people from the possibility of oppression by the state? In other words, that's when you're being spoken to by police officers. That's your understanding, isn't it?

A. Yes, but it also applies in canon law.

Q. I see. And you thought that this was a procedure that, in some way, had canon law applicable to it?

A. I think the general principle is relevant, while this was not a formal canonical process.

Q. It wasn't something in the nature of an employer speaking to an employee? Even though I know that that is not an accurate analogy, one wouldn't expect to have a right to silence in those circumstances, would one?

A. The canon law does speak about not being able to administer an oath to a priest and not being able, in a sense, to force some admission out of him. I acknowledge that that was the process we did adopt and were criticised for it by canon lawyers, but it was to get to the practical outcome of getting him to agree. It was his agreement, if I can explain it this way, to resign from ministry that gave the bishop the wherewithal to be able to deal with it. Otherwise we would be back to where we were before 1988 with an allegation and a denial and an impasse. Particularly - and this is only ever in the context of victims who have chosen not to take the matter to the authorities. That was always the best outcome - if they would take the matter to the authorities. But we're talking in the context where they chose for whatever reason not to do that.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Father Lucas. I will adjourn for 20 minutes.

SHORT ADJOURNMENT

MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, there has been a request from the media for access to various exhibits 132 through 145 inclusive. If those at the Bar table can let those who assist you know by 1.15 whether there is any objection to the release of those documents.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Ms Lonergan.

MS LONERGAN: Q. Father I was asking you some questions regarding phone calls that you had with [AJ]. I appreciate your position is that you don't recollect any specifics of such phone calls, but judging by your usual practice you would have had such phone calls, given that she was a complainant about McAlinden. Are you comfortable with that as the position of the evidence this morning?

A. I certainly don't resile from the fact there were phone calls, yes, certainly.

Q. I suggest to you that you phoned [AJ] after you had spoken to McAlinden and said words to the effect that, "I am just calling to let you know that I've interviewed McAlinden and he has been removed". Does that sound like the sort of thing, judging by your usual practice, you would have advised complainants about McAlinden who you were aware of?

A. Yes.

Q. I suggest to you that you also went on to say, "He has made admissions to me about his behaviour and that he sexually abused [AL] and [AK]" - and a lady who is on the pseudonym list as [AI]?

A. I don't think that would accord with my usual practice, to speak to one victim about the names of other victims.

Q. What about disclosing to a particular victim that the perpetrator had made admissions about his behaviour?

A. Again, that would depend on what exactly the admission was or how specific it was.

Q. If it was a specific admission, would you, judged by your usual practice at the time, tell a victim that admissions had been made?

A. I'd have been cautious about doing that.

Q. You might have been cautious about it, but would you have done it?

A. It would turn on the sort of language I would have used in conveying that. On the one hand you certainly want the victim to feel affirmed. On the other hand specific statements by a perpetrator really belong to that perpetrator. I wouldn't have conveyed those specific

1 statements.

2

3 Q. I'm not talking about specific statements. I'm
4 talking about the effect of what you were told in that
5 meeting by the perpetrator. You understand what an
6 admission is, don't you?

7 A. No.

8

9 Q. You don't understand what an admission is?

10 A. An admission can be a whole range of different sorts
11 of statements.

12

13 Q. Let me help you focus on the word "admission". You
14 have legal training, background legal training?

15 A. Yes.

16

17 Q. You have a degree in law?

18 A. Yes.

19

20 Q. You practised for some years?

21 A. Yes.

22

23 Q. Including attending to some criminal matters?

24 A. Not too many criminal matters, no. I tended in the
25 Childrens Court to prefer to deal with the welfare matters
26 than the criminal matters.

27

28 Q. You studied criminal law at university?

29 A. Yes.

30

31 Q. You understand that you can admit, "I did X"; you
32 understand that as a general proposition?

33 A. Yes.

34

35 Q. And you understand that that is different to, "I deny
36 I did X"?

37 A. Yes.

38

39 Q. In the context of talking to a priest about sexual
40 abuse, it's your position, isn't it, and your experience as
41 at early 1993 that people who have engaged in paedophilic
42 behaviour often deny it, don't they?

43 A. They will either say, "This absolutely never
44 happened", or, "I've never known that person", or, "I was
45 never in that place where that person says something
46 happened", or they might say, "Well, look, actually I do
47 know that person, but I didn't do anything", or, "Something

1 happened that has been misinterpreted by that person as
2 a sexual assault", so you get a whole range of different
3 sorts of statements.

4
5 Q. That range you've just gone through - none of those
6 are admissions of sexually abusing a child, are they, none
7 of those?

8 A. Well, they certainly can lead to some inferences.

9
10 Q. Sure, but none of those are admissions that they
11 sexually abused a child?

12 A. Not in the legal sense.

13
14 Q. But if a priest says, "I admit that I interfered with
15 Miss X", that's an admission, isn't it?

16 A. If that's what he said, yes.

17
18 Q. If that's what he said. I'm asking you to just bear
19 with me.

20 A. Sorry.

21
22 Q. We're examining the word "admission" because you seem
23 to have some difficulty managing or answering questions
24 about that concept, and I understand --

25
26 MR SKINNER: I object. Commissioner, this line of
27 questioning arose when my friend asked something about
28 admissions. The witness paused and said "no", and wasn't
29 allowed to finish the answer, and we've gone from there.
30 In my submission, it is not well founded on the evidence at
31 this point of time that he is having difficulty. My friend
32 can ask about it, but she is not entitled, in my
33 submission, to feed into her question in that way
34 a submission. It is not fair.

35
36 MS LONERGAN: The difficulty arose from not the answer
37 "no", but the fact that the question seemed to be a very
38 simple one regarding admissions, in my respectful
39 submission, and the witness was taking some care in dealing
40 with that particular word, and no doubt, partly related to
41 his legal background, wants things to be very clear in
42 terms of what he is admitting to, if I can put things that
43 way.

44
45 In my respectful submission, it is proper for me to
46 further examine, and the answer did indicate a difficulty -
47 I don't mean an intellectual difficulty; I mean

1 a hesitation in adopting "admission" as a word that could
2 be generally used - and I'm trying to drill down to
3 a particular context to assist.

4

5 THE COMMISSIONER: The context was: did you consider
6 "I interfered with Miss X" to be an admission?

7

8 MS LONERGAN: That's right.

9

10 Q. So the question is if a priest says to you, "I did
11 interfere with Miss X", that's an admission, isn't it?

12 A. It's an admission, yes.

13

14 Q. So you would not have told a bishop of a priest who
15 you had interviewed that the priest admitted to having
16 interfered with a particular person unless that priest had
17 in fact made those admissions, would you?

18 A. Certainly not.

19

20 Q. I beg your pardon?

21 A. Certainly not.

22

23 Q. It was your practice to convey as soon as possible
24 after any conversations you had had with an accused priest,
25 to the bishop, the result of your conversation?

26 A. Yes.

27

28 Q. Was it also part of your practice, soon after your
29 conversation with a particular priest accused of these
30 matters, to phone the complainants and tell them the
31 results of your interview?

32 A. Yes.

33

34 Q. From an earlier answer you gave, can we take it that
35 it wasn't your practice to tell certain complainants about
36 other complainants?

37 A. That's correct.

38

39 Q. If it's suggested by [AJ] that you mentioned that
40 admissions had been made by McAlinden - I'm going to the
41 specifics now - about his behaviour and that he had
42 sexually abused [AL], [AK] and [AI], do you deny that you
43 would have done that?

44 A. That would not be my normal practice.

45

46 Q. That would not be your normal practice, but is it
47 possible that you did it on this occasion?

1 A. I have no recollection.
2
3 Q. I understand you have no recollection, but would you
4 acknowledge that it's possible that you did it on this
5 occasion?
6 A. I'd have to say that if you're asking me on the
7 balance whether I would have said it or would not have said
8 it, I'd have to say I would not have said it.
9
10 Q. I'm not asking you on the balance. I'm asking you
11 whether it's possible?
12 A. I don't think it's possible. I can't put it any
13 higher than that, because I don't recall.
14
15 Q. I suggest to you that you also told [AJ], "McAlinden
16 was puzzled when I put forward your name as he didn't know
17 your name and proceeded to name other people with the same
18 first name"?
19 A. Yes.
20
21 Q. I know you don't recollect the particular
22 conversation; that's your evidence, but what about that as
23 something you would have said to a complainant?
24 A. I don't think I would have mentioned the names of
25 other complainants.
26
27 Q. I suggest to you that [AJ] then said, "You've given
28 him the wrong surname. I have a different name and you
29 didn't give him my maiden name." What do you say about
30 that exchange having taken place?
31 A. I have no recollection of that exchange and if that
32 exchange had have taken place and I was so foolish as to
33 have used the wrong name, that might have been something
34 that would have prompted me, but I don't recall the
35 conversation.
36
37 Q. Do you recall a Mercy nun, Sister Paula Redgrove?
38 A. Yes.
39
40 Q. Do you recall you had some discussions with her about
41 McAlinden in and around 1993?
42 A. She was present at an interview.
43
44 Q. That was the interview with [AL]?
45 A. Yes.
46
47 Q. Did you talk to Sister Redgrove before the interview

1 with [AL] or only as part of that --
2 A. I have no recollection of that.
3
4 Q. No recollection of the interview with [AL]?
5 A. No, I have some; some aspects of the interview with
6 [A], I have an absolutely crystal clear recollection of.
7
8 Q. But no specifics of any conversation you had with
9 Sister Redgrove?
10 A. No.
11
12 Q. The crystal clear recollection in relation to [AL] -
13 does that relate to the meeting that you had with her at
14 which Sister Paula was present?
15 A. Yes.
16
17 Q. What were those crystal clear aspects of your
18 recollection?
19 A. Am I able to mention the relationship?
20
21 Q. No.
22 A. Well, that was a critical aspect. The reason why she
23 told me she didn't want any police aspect was connected
24 with that, and that is a crystal clear recollection.
25
26 Q. And that's to do with the willingness or otherwise to
27 report the matter to the police?
28 A. And the reason she gave me.
29
30 Q. And the reason, all right. Any other aspects of the
31 interview, such as do you recall whether [AL] outlined the
32 abuse that had happened to her in any physical terms or
33 you're not able to say?
34 A. I don't recall that, and I would have been very
35 cautious of allowing her to do that.
36
37 Q. For the reasons you've already outlined?
38 A. And this may have been misguided on my part, but I was
39 always very concerned not to get into detail with victims,
40 partly for the fact of the pain of them having to restate
41 a story, but mostly on the question of putting words in
42 their mouth or running the risk of contaminating what they
43 might say if there were subsequent proceedings.
44
45 Q. So if I suggest to you that [AL] actually described
46 the abuse in physical terms of what McAlinden did to her
47 when she was a little girl, would you say that did not

1 occur or you're just not able to say, given that you have
2 a partial recollection of the meeting?

3 A. I think if there was a detailed description given to
4 me and if, contrary to my practice, I allowed her to do
5 that, that would have been something I would recall.
6

7 Q. If a complainant wishes to describe the abuse, can we
8 take it you wouldn't cut them off and say, "I don't want to
9 hear about that"?

10 A. I probably would have and I would have explained,
11 "I don't need to know from you; you don't have to go into
12 the detail. I don't wish to embarrass you." Particularly
13 with a female victim, who's at the time approximately my
14 own age, I just think it's foolish to allow a victim to go
15 into detail. It's enough for them to acknowledge that they
16 were sexually abused, in euphemistic and plain and general
17 terms. That was enough for my purposes. I would have been
18 very cautious about going into detail because I wouldn't
19 want them to be put in a position of somebody subsequently
20 alleging that when she gave the detail, perhaps in a police
21 interview, that having discussed it with me, some of what
22 she was saying might have been words I put in her mouth.
23

24 Q. You're surmising all of this, aren't you?

25 A. I am surmising that, according to my usual practice,
26 yes.
27

28 Q. You recall Sister Redgrove was present?

29 A. I do. And that was a very unusual event. I'd never
30 had a situation where a support person for a victim was
31 a religious sister and I do recall she was present.
32

33 Q. Did you know Sister Redgrove independent of this?

34 A. No.
35

36 Q. Would you expect a religious sister to tell the truth
37 about what happened in a meeting such as that?

38 A. I'd expect that she would tell the truth to the best
39 of her ability. To what extent her memory is accurate
40 many years later, I have no capacity to comment.
41

42 Q. I'm not suggesting that you would. Euphemisms - you
43 say that you would have expected euphemisms to be used.
44 What do you mean by that?

45 A. I think generally it was enough for a person to say
46 they were sexually molested or they were interfered with or
47 they were inappropriately touched, without going into the

1 precise nature of that activity.

2

3 Q. What was the purpose of your meeting with [AL]?

4 A. I think it was to hear what she wanted done with
5 respect to McAlinden, particularly given the matter I can't
6 speak about.

7

8 Q. If you take an account without interjection or
9 interference from you, there's no risk of contamination of
10 her version of events, is there?

11 A. Well, that would depend on whether that's what's
12 related later on.

13

14 Q. You would take care not to interject, wouldn't you?

15 A. I would, but I wouldn't want someone to draw an
16 inference subsequently that I might have or I might have
17 put words in her mouth. It's best not to go down that road
18 of her giving detail. That was my personal view at the
19 time.

20

21 Q. The fact that you met with this lady at all could lead
22 to suggestions that things were said which, in your view,
23 weren't said, couldn't it?

24 A. It could, but I would like to be put in a position, if
25 someone asks me "Did she go into detail with you?", to be
26 able to say, "No, I didn't allow that to happen."

27

28 Q. One way of dealing with any possible mistake about
29 what occurred in the meeting would have been to take notes
30 of the meeting?

31 A. No, if we needed to have a record of what she said,
32 I would have asked her to write it out in her own
33 handwriting.

34

35 Q. One way to avoid any confusion or difference of
36 account about what happened in the meeting would have been
37 to take notes of what occurred in the meeting, wouldn't it?

38 A. That's one way, but the circumstances of that meeting
39 wouldn't have been conducive to sitting there with a pad
40 open taking notes while a victim of child sexual abuse is
41 saying whatever she's saying.

42

43 Q. We have been across this territory already. You would
44 have been able to make notes after the meeting, wouldn't
45 you, as to what was discussed, in broad terms?

46 A. I would have if I had needed to.

47

1 Q. You decided you didn't need to?
2 A. Yes.
3
4 Q. And why didn't you need to?
5 A. I was reporting back to the bishop and preparing
6 myself to talk to McAlinden.
7
8 Q. You know that a felony is a more serious type of
9 offence than a misdemeanour?
10 A. Yes.
11
12 Q. And you knew that in 1993?
13 A. Yes.
14
15 Q. Taking your mind back to 1993, did you have a view
16 that in terms of sexual abuse, skin-on-skin type of
17 offences were of a more serious or different nature to
18 those that occurred, for example, through clothing?
19 A. Certainly.
20
21 Q. They were of a more serious nature?
22 A. Of course.
23
24 Q. And you knew that from your knowledge of criminal law
25 or from your --
26 A. It's commonsense.
27
28 Q. In terms of the type of sexual abuse conduct with
29 which you were dealing, you knew, didn't you, that the
30 conduct was in the nature of criminal conduct?
31 A. Yes.
32
33 Q. You agree with me, do you, that if you make notes
34 recording allegations of criminal conduct and those notes
35 are kept by you and seen by others later, it could be
36 suggested that those notes amounted to evidence that you
37 knew about criminal conduct, wouldn't they?
38 A. Yes.
39
40 Q. Is that a reason why you didn't keep notes of those
41 matters?
42 A. No.
43
44 Q. Not at all?
45 A. No.
46
47 Q. So you would have been comfortable, would you, having

1 notes of allegations of criminal conduct even though they
2 could have been later accessed by, for example, legal
3 authorities or the police and a suggestion put to you that
4 you had notes recording allegations of criminal conduct?
5 A. Yes.
6
7 Q. You had no difficulty with that?
8 A. No.
9
10 Q. Was any part of your managing of these matters
11 directed by any concern on your part of possible liability
12 on your part for misprision?
13 A. Yes.
14
15 Q. And how did you manage those considerations when
16 dealing with these matters?
17 A. That was a risk we took.
18
19 Q. A risk you took?
20 A. Yes.
21
22 Q. Did you say you took or we took?
23 A. We took.
24
25 Q. Who else took that risk?
26 A. I think Father John Usher, who was part of it, but
27 also this was within the context of broad legal advice
28 about misprision of felony and the circumstances were known
29 to lawyers and this was an issue; it was a well-known and
30 well-understood issue and a predicament. It was a real and
31 serious predicament, on the one hand, to get someone out of
32 ministry, and if it came to the choice of respecting what
33 a victim wanted with respect to police action and a charge
34 of misprision of felony, my view would have been then, and
35 it would be my view today, I'd respect what the victim
36 wanted done.
37
38 Q. One way of managing the risk was to report the matter
39 to the police yourself, wasn't it?
40 A. Not if the victim specifically and for good reason
41 didn't want that done.
42
43 Q. That's a different issue. One way of managing the
44 risk would have been for you to report what you knew to the
45 police, wouldn't it?
46 A. If that involved betraying a victim, I wouldn't do
47 that.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Q. I'm not asking you that. One way of managing the risk would have been for you to report the matter to the police?

A. I could report the matter to the police, but if that involved betraying a victim, that would not be something I would do.

Q. Putting aside your scruples about betraying a victim, you could have phoned the police and said, "This has been alleged about Father X", couldn't you?

A. That was certainly possible, but not practical, in my view.

Q. You had received legal advice by early 1993, had you, as to the law in relation to misprision?

A. There was a formal legal advice given subsequently, but certainly at the time there was informal advice, and certainly given the number of lawyers who had pored over the protocols and who understood the procedure and what was being done, the question of misprision of felony was known about but was not regarded as an issue that affected the way the cases were managed.

Q. In relation to the times where lawyers were poring over protocols, what time frame are you talking about?

A. From early 1991, probably even when the committee was first established.

Q. Did any part of those discussions, to your knowledge, include the suggestion that if the Catholic Church knew about these allegations, they ought to be reported to the police?

A. That was not the understanding at that time in circumstances where a victim specifically didn't want the matter reported.

Q. What I'm asking is a broader question. Putting aside whether the victim wanted it reported or not, was there discussion amongst those lawyers and others who looked at these protocols about the subject of reporting these matters to the police by the clergy, by the people who received these complaints?

A. Generally speaking, the complaints only came to the church, because the victim had chosen not to go to the police. The situation really didn't arise. If a victim wanted the matter to go to the police, the victim would have gone to the police. It was only in circumstances

1 where a victim didn't want to go to the police and came to
2 the church that this dilemma - and it was a serious and
3 well-understood dilemma - arose.
4

5 Q. Would you agree with me that on occasion victims came
6 to the church for support in terms of their own Catholic
7 faith?

8 A. Yes.
9

10 Q. And it's the position, isn't it, that a number of
11 victims came to the church because they considered the
12 church would have immediate power over the priest to do
13 something about what had happened?

14 A. Yes.
15

16 Q. Would you agree with me that prior to the 1996 Towards
17 Healing protocol, there was significant confusion as to
18 obligations or otherwise on the part of bishops or other
19 clergy as to what they should do when these people came
20 forward with these allegations?

21 A. I wouldn't put it as confusion, but there were
22 dilemmas that were difficult to resolve.
23

24 Q. So you see dilemmas as different to confusion?

25 A. Yes.
26

27 Q. Dilemmas being people knew what the options were but
28 didn't know which one to choose?

29 A. They knew what the options were, but would have
30 struggled as to which was the better course of action.
31

32 Q. And in terms of confusion, you understand that to mean
33 they didn't know what to do at all generally?

34 A. Yes.
35

36 Q. Would you agree with me that you were probably in
37 a better position than a number of bishops, because you'd
38 helped to establish the protocols and had your legal
39 background, to understand what the various dilemmas were?

40 A. Yes.
41

42 Q. Would you agree that because the victims of sexual
43 abuse with whom you were dealing were those practising the
44 Catholic faith, they were more likely to go to the police
45 if they had the support of church people?

46 A. That could be the case in some instances, yes.
47

1 Q. Why do you only say it could be the case in some
2 instances?

3 A. It depends whether or not they had a different reason
4 for not going to the police. There would be some for whom
5 some involvement in the church - perhaps embarrassment
6 about revealing something that a priest had done. There
7 would be others who would have different reasons for not
8 wanting to go to the police. My view which I took at the
9 time was to be fairly neutral about that. For a victim to
10 go to the police is a very serious issue that can have
11 quite sometimes adverse consequences for them. I neither
12 encouraged nor discouraged and tended to go along with what
13 the victim indicated was the outcome they were after.
14

15 Q. You recognised at a later point in time that it was
16 more appropriate to encourage rather than be neutral about
17 the issue of going to the police?

18 A. A number of situations arose around about 1995,
19 particularly when there was significant agitation by some
20 victims groups agitating for prosecution for concealment of
21 offences, and then the situation arose as to disputation
22 about what the victim wanted or didn't want. Then the
23 practice arose, which I think is the current practice,
24 requiring victims, very explicitly and in their own
25 handwriting, to indicate if they didn't wish the matter to
26 go to the police, that that's what they wanted.
27

28 Q. I'm asking you a different question. Was it the
29 position that your view altered towards the wisdom or
30 otherwise of encouraging victims of sexual abuse to go to
31 the police as opposed to remaining neutral about it?

32 A. Yes, that would be true.
33

34 Q. That was part of the Towards Healing protocol?

35 A. Yes.
36

37 Q. So you would agree with me that prior to that
38 particular view, the practice or policy of the church was
39 to remain neutral about the question of reporting to the
40 police or not?

41 A. When you say "neutral about reporting to the police",
42 neutral about whether to put pressure on or discourage or
43 encourage a victim to go to the police.
44

45 Q. Yes, yes. You yourself have published at least one
46 paper on the question of how concealing offences might be
47 dealt with in terms of the criminal law, haven't you?

1 A. I'm not able to recall the specific article to which
2 you're referring.
3
4 Q. You agree with me that you have written at least one
5 article on the subject?
6 A. Specifically on --
7
8 Q. That addresses misprision of felony as a crime?
9 A. I didn't know that it was a specific article on that
10 particular topic. It may have been, but I don't recall
11 that, I'm sorry.
12
13 Q. Sorry, I should say within an article that you
14 prepared, there is an addressing of the issue of
15 misprision of felony?
16 A. Oh, yes, I'm sure I would have addressed - yes.
17
18 Q. Including an analysis of section 316 of the Crimes Act
19 which creates an offence if a person who has knowledge of a
20 serious crime fails to disclose this to the authorities
21 without lawful excuse?
22 A. Yes.
23
24 Q. Is it your position now - and then I'll go back to
25 earlier in time - that lawful excuse in the context of that
26 particular offence includes whether or not the victim wants
27 to go to the police?
28 A. Yes.
29
30 Q. So it's your view that if the victim doesn't want to
31 go to the police, that gives a lawful excuse to you, for
32 example, to not report the matter to the police?
33 A. Yes.
34
35 Q. Have you taken advice from others that that's the
36 effect of that particular section of the Crimes Act?
37 A. That's my understanding was the common view of the
38 various lawyers who had discussed this at various times,
39 yes.
40
41 Q. So you discussed that particular view with other
42 lawyers?
43 A. Yes.
44
45 Q. It's your impression that they adhere to that view?
46 A. Yes.
47

1 Q. They're lawyers retained by the Catholic Church, are
2 they?
3 A. And also in other informal situations. These matters
4 were often dealt with in seminars and I think it was
5 a matter probably dealt with at the church law forum in
6 Sydney, which was a group of lawyers who act for churches.
7 I don't have a specific recollection of a specific
8 instance, but certainly in informal conversations with
9 various lawyers, that was my understanding of the position.
10
11 Q. Was that your understanding in 1993 as well or do you
12 have a more sophisticated understanding now?
13 A. I'd have a more sophisticated understanding now. I'm
14 not quite sure when I became explicitly aware of the
15 introduction of section 316. I think it was introduced in
16 1990. When particularly my mind focused on that, I can't
17 recall.
18
19 Q. You agree that you have written that there is a mood
20 in society that failure to report on the part of the
21 Catholic Church when these types of allegations were made
22 to it could well be considered to be an active covering-up
23 of such offences?
24 A. Certainly.
25
26 Q. You gave evidence to the effect that you had a concern
27 in relation to reporting sexual abuse allegations to the
28 police that such a report might have adverse consequences
29 for the victim?
30 A. Yes.
31
32 Q. By that, do you mean having to go through the legal
33 processes?
34 A. I think in 1992/1993 the prosecutorial process was
35 nowhere near as victim sensitive as it is today, in my
36 understanding, and I think there were real issues about the
37 trauma to a victim of prosecutions.
38
39 Q. What about the questions of safety of children from
40 criminal conduct by paedophile priests - was that
41 a consideration?
42 A. That was the number one consideration.
43
44 Q. If that was the number one consideration, wouldn't
45 that have militated more towards reporting the matter to
46 the police rather than not reporting?
47 A. Not necessarily. Even a reporting to the police

1 doesn't necessarily carry through to the safety of
2 children. McAlinden had been reported to the police in
3 Western Australia and had been acquitted. These were parts
4 of the dilemmas we always faced.

5
6 Q. The fact he had been reported for sexual abuse of a
7 child in Western Australia and beat the charge suggests,
8 doesn't it, that there were more than the reports you knew
9 about out there about his behaviour with children?

10 A. I'm not quite sure exactly when I became aware of the
11 Western Australia matter. I think it was in the context of
12 the phone calls with Bishop Clarke, but it certainly
13 aroused my suspicion that the substance of what [AL] may
14 have said and what [AJ] may have said had some basis to it.

15
16 Q. You talk about adverse consequences for the victim.
17 There would have been adverse consequences for the priest
18 and the church as well if the matter was reported to the
19 police, wouldn't there?

20 A. I'm not so much interested in adverse consequences to
21 the church. Obviously there are adverse consequences to
22 the perpetrator, which he deserves.

23
24 Q. There are adverse consequences to the church, because
25 it would bring the reputation of the church into some
26 disrepute, wouldn't it?

27 A. I've heard that, and that is the prevailing narrative.
28 My view, and it's consistent in everything I've written on
29 this subject, is that the reputation of the church is
30 trashed not by some sort of protection of the perpetrator;
31 it is trashed by failing to deal properly and decisively
32 with these allegations and remove the person from harm's
33 way.

34
35 Q. The priest is a representative of the church, isn't
36 he, even one who has been accused of sexually abusing
37 children?

38 A. In my view - and I can only express my personal view -
39 I couldn't care less about the reputation of the priest.
40 My concern was always to ensure that priests who offended
41 against children were removed from that opportunity, and my
42 view on the reputation of the church was that it was
43 precisely the failure to do that that would do most damage
44 to the reputation of the church.

45
46 Q. How is the removal of a priest from ministry
47 published?

1 A. It may or may not be published. Again there's issues
2 of privacy both to him and to his victim, but he would be -
3 and this is a matter still of some contention as to whether
4 his name is put in the official directory of the Catholic
5 Church and in what category. If he was removed from
6 ministry, he would probably be in the list that has "no
7 appointment" or "retired".
8
9 Q. This is some private church list, is it, "no
10 appointment" or "retired"?
11 A. No, there's a published book, the official --
12
13 Q. A published church list?
14 A. Yes, there is a published book, the official directory
15 of the Catholic Church in Australia, and a priest who has
16 had his faculties removed and has been removed from all
17 ministry probably would not appear there.
18
19 Q. Would not appear?
20 A. He may. This is a matter of some contention as to
21 whether he appears as "living privately" or whether he
22 appears as "retired".
23
24 Q. So if it says that he's retired, that would be untrue,
25 wouldn't it, because he had been removed from ministry and
26 had his faculties stripped for being a paedophile? Is that
27 the position?
28 A. He may well have been described as being "retired".
29
30 Q. Unlikely it would have described him as "retired
31 paedophile"?
32 A. We don't generally put labels on people so they walk
33 around saying, "I'm a retired paedophile".
34
35 Q. How are the children protected in terms of this
36 information that appears to remain private to the Catholic
37 Church from somebody who, not long ago or maybe a long time
38 ago, was Father X?
39 A. The answer to that is the fact that he has no
40 parochial appointment. He would be forbidden to engage in
41 any parochial appointment. He ought then to be living
42 somewhere where he is not known as Father X. The
43 difficulty of him living too close to where he is known as
44 Father X is that people will put pressure on him and ask
45 him to do a wedding or funeral or, worse still, he will
46 still have friendships and ingratiate himself with those
47 families.

1
2 Q. You know, don't you, that McAlinden walked around in
3 his priest's outfit for some time after his faculties were
4 removed?
5 A. I understood that and I understood the bishop
6 reprimanded him about that.
7
8 Q. Do you know that he celebrated his golden jubilee in
9 the United Kingdom some years after he had had his
10 faculties removed?
11 A. Yes. He would have done that, of course, quite
12 unlawfully.
13
14 Q. Unlawfully?
15 A. Yes.
16
17 Q. Again, what steps, as you understood it, did the
18 church put in place to ensure that people knew that this
19 person had had his faculties removed and should not be
20 performing any trusted accesses as a priest?
21 A. Sorry, are you asking me what circumstances would have
22 arisen to prevent him acting as a priest?
23
24 Q. I'll withdraw that question.
25 A. Sorry.
26
27 Q. I will try again. How would it become publicly known
28 that this person who had had his faculties removed for
29 paedophile behaviour - how would it be published to members
30 outside the church, people outside the church, that this
31 man was no longer a priest and known to have committed
32 paedophile acts?
33 A. I think it goes the other way. It's not that you tell
34 the entire world that he's a paedophile, but you make sure
35 he is not in a position where someone can think that he is
36 a priest.
37
38 Q. But he could go to a playground and hand out lollies
39 and continue to be a risk to the community, couldn't he?
40 A. Theoretically that's possible, but it's the
41 relationship of being a priest that generally is the
42 biggest risk.
43
44 Q. The relationship, or the fact of a person being
45 a priest gives him more access in a trusted situation to
46 children, doesn't it?
47 A. Yes.

1
2 Q. But it doesn't prevent him accessing other children in
3 the community outside of that priestly relationship, does
4 it?
5 A. No.
6
7 Q. Do you agree with me from your criminal law training
8 and knowledge from your law degree that one of the aims of
9 the criminal law is to punish?
10 A. Yes.
11
12 Q. And it's to prevent crimes of the same nature being
13 committed by others?
14 A. Yes.
15
16 Q. By way of making examples of persons who engage in
17 such crimes being publicly put on trial for them and
18 publicly punished?
19 A. Yes.
20
21 Q. You mentioned in one of your answers to one of my
22 questions that there was a theoretical risk in terms of
23 a priest having been removed from ministry being able to
24 access children in the community not as a priest. But the
25 risk is more than theoretical, isn't it, because the risk
26 associated with this person is that he is a paedophile; the
27 risk isn't associated with him being a priest?
28 A. I think the substantial risk is precisely that he's
29 a priest, that he's trusted, that he can ingratiate himself
30 with families, that he's working in situations where he has
31 intimate contact with children. Otherwise, he's like any
32 member of the public, and the risk is no different. He can
33 come out of gaol and the same predicament can exist.
34
35 Q. Would you agree with me that if a priest is put on
36 trial for paedophile offences, it would attract
37 a significant amount of publicity?
38 A. It would.
39
40 Q. And that publicity has the effect of warning people
41 that a particular priest has been accused of paedophilia?
42 A. Oh, only in the most broad sense.
43
44 Q. What do you mean "only in the most broad sense"?
45 A. Well, people who see the trial in one place may know
46 something, but on the other side of the country, they may
47 not know anything about that trial.

1
2 Q. Yes, and isn't that always the more reason why
3 a priest shouldn't be cut loose and sent to another
4 location where he can find a fresh batch of children to
5 interfere with?
6 A. No, I wouldn't agree with that proposition at all.
7 I understand the point of the question. It's the nature of
8 the relationship that, in our mind, was most significant.
9 Ideally, you would certainly want the priest to be
10 prosecuted, but when you have a situation of victims who
11 explicitly and for good reason don't want that to happen,
12 we have this very dilemma, and that dilemma ultimately was
13 able to be resolved in our conversations with the
14 NSW Police that came a few years later.
15
16 Q. Let's just study that. You didn't have any
17 conversations with the NSW Police regarding McAlinden going
18 to gaol, did you?
19 A. No.
20
21 MR SKINNER: I object. The witness clearly didn't mean
22 his answer in that sense.
23
24 MS LONERGAN: The witness can answer my question, then.
25
26 Q. Did you have any conversations with the NSW Police to
27 the effect that McAlinden had been accused of sexually
28 abusing children?
29 A. I didn't, no.
30
31 Q. You've published a view that you held in 1988 and
32 maybe subsequently as well that paedophiles are chronic
33 liars?
34 A. Yes.
35
36 Q. Do you have any doubt in your mind that McAlinden was
37 a paedophile?
38 A. No.
39
40 Q. While McAlinden was in gaol - this is a theoretical
41 example - he would be no risk to children, would he?
42 A. That's true.
43
44 Q. The situation where - we'll use McAlinden as the
45 example - his faculties were removed would not prevent him
46 from reinventing himself as a school teacher or assistant
47 at a school?

1 A. I think we're talking about a 70-year-old man.
2 I think we're past that.
3
4 Q. So are you saying men over 70 are past employment?
5 A. I would have thought that someone wanting to employ
6 a person 70 years of age would make inquiries as to his
7 background.
8
9 Q. You're hoping?
10 A. I think commonsense would suggest that's a prudent
11 thing to do.
12
13 Q. Was that the position in 1993, that people would make
14 inquiries as to people's background, working with children
15 checks, and that sort of situation - was that in place in
16 1993?
17 A. The working with children checks weren't in place.
18 But in terms of church law, if we simply focus on him
19 wanting to practise as a priest somewhere else, one of the
20 most fundamental principles of clergy management is that
21 you have to be incardinated somewhere and you have to be in
22 good standing and you can't work as a priest unless someone
23 makes the appropriate inquiries.
24
25 Q. I understand that. My questions are based on the
26 assumption that the priest has had his faculties removed
27 and is thus holding himself out to be nothing more than
28 a person and, for example, may be volunteering to do work
29 around children. How would having removed his faculties
30 protect children from that kind of behaviour potentially?
31 A. As I said, in terms of him being a man in the
32 community, like any other man in the community, that
33 element of risk is there. Our focus was on the fact that,
34 as a priest, it would give him greater access to children
35 and that's what we wanted to remove.
36
37 Q. You've suggested that you personally didn't care about
38 a priest having his reputation damaged by going through
39 a process where it was revealed that he was a paedophile.
40 Is that the way I understand your evidence?
41 A. Certainly.
42
43 Q. This concept of bringing scandal on the church - you
44 know that appears in various canon law edicts?
45 A. Yes.
46
47 Q. Is there an obligation on the part of you as

1 a representative of the archdiocese of Sydney to avoid
2 bringing scandal on the church?

3 A. I would take the view that if something is done that's
4 wrong, it's done and it's wrong, and the impact by way of
5 scandal on the church is irrelevant.

6
7 Q. Irrelevant, so you don't see any obligation on
8 anything you did in relation to McAlinden to have been
9 governed by any requirement for you to avoid scandal being
10 brought on the church?

11 A. No, my view of scandal on the church comes from the
12 fact that if you don't deal with these people decisively
13 and appropriately, that's what creates the scandal.

14
15 Q. Do you agree with me that a priest cut loose from the
16 church norms and protection and supervision means that that
17 person poses a greater risk to children than if he was
18 being observed or supervised by other clergy?

19 A. The preference would be that he would be in some
20 circumstance or situation of supervision or care to the
21 extent to which that's possible.

22
23 Q. Would you agree with me that one of the aims of
24 criminal law in relation to prosecuting offences of this
25 nature is both specific and general deterrence to others?

26 A. I have no quibble with the fact that the very best
27 outcome for these complaints is that the person be
28 prosecuted.

29
30 Q. And would you agree with me that a person can't be
31 prosecuted if he is not reported to the police?

32 A. He can't be prosecuted if there's not a victim willing
33 to go to the police.

34
35 Q. Well, he can't be prosecuted if he is not reported to
36 the police. Don't worry about who reports.

37 A. That's true.

38
39 Q. He can't be prosecuted if the first step isn't taken
40 and this person's conduct isn't referred to the police?

41 A. That's true.

42
43 Q. Do you have your affidavit in the witness box with
44 you? Attached to your affidavit is, first of all, a 1988
45 document headed "Clergy and child sexual assault", and it's
46 annexure B. I'm going to get you to pause when you get to
47 it.

1 A. Yes.
2
3 Q. There's one other question I should have asked about
4 your meeting with [AL] and Sister Redgrove.
5 A. Yes.
6
7 Q. Do you recall making a phone call to Sister Redgrove
8 after your interview with McAlinden?
9 A. I don't recall it, but it's likely, yes.
10
11 Q. Why is it likely?
12 A. I would have reported back what the outcome was after
13 I met with McAlinden.
14
15 Q. Why would you have reported it to Sister Redgrove?
16 A. I understood her to be the support person for [AL].
17 I would have passed the message to her to pass to [AL].
18
19 Q. You didn't ring [AL] yourself?
20 A. I don't recall that I did. I don't recall ringing
21 Sister Paula, but that would be my practice.
22
23 Q. I appreciate you say you don't recall your
24 conversation with Father McAlinden as he then was, but can
25 I suggest to you that you stated to Sister Redgrove after
26 your conversation with McAlinden that he had cracked and he
27 was the hardest nut you had ever had to crack. Does that
28 ring a bell?
29 A. It doesn't ring a bell, but that could well be the
30 case.
31
32 Q. Is that the sort of language you may have used about
33 priests at that time?
34 A. It doesn't sound like my sort of language, but not
35 recalling, I don't deny it. It doesn't sound like the sort
36 of language I would have used quite that crudely.
37
38 Q. But you don't deny that you may have said that?
39 A. I would have said something to that effect, possibly,
40 yes.
41
42 Q. I'm just going to show you a photograph of McAlinden.
43
44 I only have one copy, Commissioner, to show to the
45 witness at this stage. We can make copies for others at
46 a later point in time.
47

1 Commissioner, you may well have seen this photograph.

2
3 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

4
5 MS LONERGAN: Q. I am instructed that that is a photo of
6 McAlinden. Does looking at that photo assist you in terms
7 of your recollection of having met the person that appears
8 in that photo?

9 A. No, I've seen that photo on television for many weeks,
10 and having seen that photo and the images of him, sorry, it
11 doesn't jog my memory.

12
13 MS LONERGAN: I tender that photograph.

14
15 THE COMMISSIONER: The photocopy of a photograph of
16 Denis McAlinden will be admitted and marked exhibit 146.

17
18 **EXHIBIT #146 PHOTOCOPY OF PHOTOGRAPH OF DENIS MCALINDEN**

19
20 MS LONERGAN: Q. I've asked you to have a look at
21 annexure B to your affidavit.

22 A. Yes.

23
24 Q. Have you read your affidavit and the material attached
25 to it in preparation for giving evidence today?

26 A. I have, but not in the last day or so.

27
28 Q. Your lawyers were provided with seven volumes of
29 material relevant to this part of the terms of reference of
30 this Special Commission.

31 A. Yes.

32
33 Q. Did you review that material yourself?

34 A. Yes.

35
36 Q. All of the seven volumes?

37 A. I don't say that I read every word of every document,
38 because some documents obviously were not relevant to me,
39 but I did read a fair bit of the material.

40
41 Q. Did you take care to read documents that appeared to
42 relate to your involvement in matters?

43 A. Yes.

44
45 Q. I'm not at all being critical: did you spend some
46 time to ensure that you had read all the material that
47 related to you?

1 A. Yes.
2
3 Q. Just looking at annexure B to your affidavit, do you
4 see that's a note prepared by you?
5 A. Yes.
6
7 Q. In April 1988 for the Australian Catholic Bishops
8 Conference?
9 A. Yes.
10
11 Q. It's marked confidential. Why is it marked
12 confidential?
13 A. I think it would have been given to the bishops for
14 their own personal use. It was a tentative opinion on my
15 part. I wouldn't have wanted this published or to have
16 gone beyond the bishops to whom it was circulated.
17
18 Q. You mention under the heading "1.1 Criminal
19 Proceedings":
20
21 *These may be instigated if the police have*
22 *sufficient evidence. It is likely that the*
23 *investigation will result from a complaint*
24 *from a victim or victim's family.*
25
26 You make that observation?
27 A. Yes.
28
29 Q. Down the bottom of that part of the document you make
30 this observation:
31
32 *Bishops and major superiors and other*
33 *church officials must be careful not to*
34 *hamper police inquiries, act as accessories*
35 *or attempt to cover-up an offence.*
36
37 A. Yes.
38
39 Q. What do you mean by "act as accessories"?
40 A. That would be to do something that - I'm trying to
41 think of what an example would be in this context - somehow
42 or another to - I'm trying to think of what an example
43 would be. Presumably it would be some way in which you
44 facilitated the offence or did something to destroy
45 evidence or something of that sort, could have been what
46 I think I would have had in mind, yes.
47

1 Q. When you say "or attempt to cover up an offence",
2 would you agree with me that failing to take notes of an
3 interview with a priest who has been accused of sexual
4 abuse could be seen to be an attempt at covering up the
5 offence?

6 A. That would never have been in my mind.

7

8 Q. I'm not saying that it was in your mind. I'm asking
9 you theoretically, in a situation where a priest is
10 interviewed and no notes taken of that particular
11 interview, would you agree with me that that could be seen
12 to be attempting to cover up the offence?

13

14 MR SKINNER: I object, Commissioner. By a fair-minded
15 person or a malevolent person?

16

17 MS LONERGAN: By Father Lucas. I'm sorry, I should have
18 made that absolutely clear.

19

20 THE WITNESS: No, I would never have regarded that as
21 a cover-up.

22

23 MS LONERGAN: Q. And why not?

24 A. I think cover-up is to destroy evidence or hide some
25 facts that need exposure in some circumstances where
26 there's not some reasonable grounds for doing that.

27

28 Q. Facts that need exposure - would facts that need
29 exposure include a priest having admitted to sexually
30 abusing a child?

31 A. Again in the context in which this interview was
32 taking place, you have these competing values. On the one
33 hand, you are not going to get him to say anything if he
34 thinks that what he says is going to be reported.

35

36 Q. I'm only talking theoretically or asking you
37 theoretically, Father Lucas. Would you agree with me that
38 a fact that would need exposure is the fact, or a fact,
39 that a priest had admitted to sexually abusing a child?

40 A. I don't think I can answer, with due respect, the
41 question in that form, for this reason, that the
42 circumstances in which that fact comes to be known are very
43 relevant to the ability one has to reveal that fact to the
44 authorities.

45

46 Q. So is it your position that if a priest makes an
47 admission to having sexually abused a child in

1 a conversation with another official of the Catholic
2 Church, there is no obligation to reveal that fact to
3 anyone outside the two persons involved in the
4 conversation?

5 A. That may well be the case, depending again on the
6 particular situation in which that statement is made.

7
8 Q. Even if the admission made is an admission that
9 a person has sexually abused a child?

10 A. If the person makes that statement in the context
11 where there is some reasonable expectation on their part
12 that, if they say that, it will be reported, then they
13 won't say it.

14
15 Q. But what about a position where the person has in fact
16 made the admission?

17 A. If they make the admission in some broad sense in
18 which there is no issue about the circumstances of that
19 particular meeting, that's a different set of
20 circumstances. I mean, if a person has direct knowledge of
21 some offence, that's obviously a matter to be reported.
22 But in the context of the sorts of conversations we're
23 talking about, if the perpetrator understood that anything
24 that was going to be said was going to be reported to the
25 police, the simple fact of the matter is that they wouldn't
26 say anything, and then we're faced with this predicament,
27 which was the impasse of the past, where there's an
28 allegation and a denial. A better way forward, in my view,
29 was to encourage the person to get engaged in conversation
30 about what's happened and agree to resign.

31
32 Q. You say that it's your view that if you said to the
33 alleged perpetrator that things are going to be reported to
34 the police, they wouldn't say anything, but you don't know
35 that that's the position of a particular individual, do
36 you? You're just assuming that?

37 A. You know fairly quickly whether the person is coming
38 along to make some full disclosure, and I gave an example
39 where that happened in another case. They can sometimes do
40 that, and then they will go to the court and they will
41 plead guilty, and many that I dealt with did that.

42
43 Q. Is it your position that, because of the special
44 nature of the conversations you had with, in this case
45 McAlinden, you had no individual obligation to report any
46 admissions he made to you, if he made them, to the police?

47 A. There's two aspects to that. One is the relationship

1 with him, that the absolutely prevailing issue in that
2 particular case, in my mind, was the desire of [AL] that
3 the matter not go to the police, for the very good reasons
4 that she gave me that we can't speak about.

5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Q. Did you tell [AL] that McAlinden had made admissions to you that he had sexually abused her?

A. I don't recall that I had such a conversation.

Q. You may well have told her if he had made such an admission, or you're not able to say?

A. I'm not sure whether, after I spoke with McAlinden, I spoke directly with [AL] or again or spoke to her through Sister Paula.

Q. In conducting your special issues interviews with priests in the way that you have outlined, you were prepared to take the risk of potentially committing the offence of misprision?

A. Yes.

MS LONERGAN: Is that a convenient time, Commissioner?

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. 2 o'clock. Thank you.

LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT

1 **UPON RESUMPTION**

2
3 MS LONERGAN: Q. Father, just before the luncheon
4 adjournment, I was asking you some questions about
5 misprision of felony. Do you recall that?

6 A. Yes.

7
8 Q. You agreed with the position that you were prepared to
9 go about church business in such a way that there was
10 a risk that you may be misprizing of a felony?

11 A. Yes.

12
13 Q. You've written papers on that particular subject
14 matter, haven't you?

15 A. Yes.

16
17 Q. In those papers - and I'll show you an example of one
18 shortly - you have floated the view that one way of
19 avoiding any sort of accusation of misprision is not to
20 acquire the knowledge in the first place?

21 A. Yes.

22
23 Q. One way of looking like the knowledge hasn't been
24 acquired is to not make a record of it; isn't that right?

25 A. I wouldn't accept that as a proposition, as though
26 that's some sort of deliberate attempt for that purpose.
27 The real reason for not taking notes comes back to the fact
28 that the person talking to you simply won't talk to you.

29
30 Q. What I'm suggesting to you is a broader proposition,
31 though, that one way of not being able to be accused of
32 misprision of felony is not to make any record of any
33 circumstances where such an accusation could arise; that's
34 the position, isn't it?

35 A. I wouldn't accept that as something that I would ever
36 want to deliberately do.

37
38 Q. I wasn't suggesting that you personally would do it.
39 I'm speaking theoretically. In terms of your own
40 particular practice, which we can move to now, you
41 wouldn't, would you, pursue a policy of calculated
42 ignorance so that you couldn't be accused of misprision?

43 A. The turning of the blind eye is not something that
44 I would countenance as some form of deliberate strategy to
45 pervert the course of justice or interfere in the processes
46 of justice, but these dilemmas arose and we had these
47 conflicting values, and that was always the dilemma and the

1 difficulty.

2

3 Q. Did you consider that the church's processes, in the
4 way they dealt with priests who were accused of sexually
5 abusing children, were more important than the criminal law
6 processes in this state of dealing with persons accused of
7 sexually abusing children?

8 A. Never.

9

10 Q. Given your answer is "never", did you on any occasion
11 report personally a priest to the police for sexually
12 abusing children?

13 A. Cases that I dealt with involved either victims not
14 wanting to go to the police, or police involvement - on
15 a number of occasions I encouraged priests to go to the
16 police and they pleaded guilty.

17

18 Q. Did you, yourself, ever report a person accused of
19 sexually abusing children to the police, yourself?

20 A. That situation never arose for me.

21

22 Q. You never did it?

23 A. No.

24

25 Q. When you say the situation never arose, you're not
26 suggesting, are you, that you weren't party to information
27 which, if reported to the police, may well have led to
28 a police investigation for sexual abuse of children - are
29 you?

30 A. That certainly could have happened, but it would have
31 been against some conflictual situation where there would
32 have been a good reason not to do that.

33

34 Q. A good reason in your mind for not doing that; is that
35 the position?

36 A. Well, not simply as a subjective decision of mine.
37 That would have been against the background of suitable
38 advice.

39

40 Q. Have you on occasion taken legal advice specifically
41 as to whether you should report a priest who had been
42 accused of sexually abusing a child to the police?

43 A. On a specific instance, I have no recollection.

44

45 Q. So you don't recollect any occasion where you
46 personally have sought legal advice as to whether you
47 should report a particular person to the police or not for

1 sexually abusing children or allegations relating to
2 sexually abusing children?
3 A. I don't have that recollection.
4
5 Q. When you say you don't have that recollection, are you
6 suggesting that you may have done so, sought advice of that
7 nature, but you just don't remember doing so?
8 A. My recollection is that there was very general advice
9 on these dilemmas with respect to section 316 and
10 misprision of felony. I can't recall specific advice on
11 a specific instance.
12
13 Q. That you sought yourself?
14 A. Yes.
15
16 Q. Do you recall writing an article in 1996 for the Canon
17 Law Society of Australia and New Zealand titled "Are our
18 archives safe?"
19 A. Yes.
20
21 Q. You remember the article, do you?
22 A. Yes.
23
24 Q. I'll give you a copy of it, because there's a few
25 things in there that we will go to.
26 A. Yes.
27
28 Q. I'll hand you a copy now just so that there's no
29 unfairness to you. Have you read that again recently?
30 A. Not for some weeks, as far as I can recall.
31
32 Q. Not for some weeks?
33 A. Yes.
34
35 Q. When you say that, does that mean that you read it
36 a few weeks ago?
37 A. Yes, I did.
38
39 Q. Did you read it in preparation for giving evidence at
40 this Commission?
41 A. Yes.
42
43 Q. The title, "Are our archives safe?" - was that a title
44 you designed?
45 A. Yes.
46
47 Q. Safe from what?

1 A. The subtitle is "an ecclesial view of search
2 warrants".
3
4 Q. So is the question you are raising there - and correct
5 me if this isn't the right interpretation - are our
6 archives safe from being reviewed by members of the police
7 force of New South Wales?
8 A. And also particularly issues to do with material that,
9 for example, could involve the privacy of individuals.
10 This was - if I can perhaps explain the context --
11
12 Q. Actually, I will cut across you there and we'll come
13 to a broader explanation shortly. I am zeroing in on the
14 question of, safe from what? The question I posed to you
15 is: safe from the New South Wales Police Force? You would
16 agree with me that the only organisation that can execute
17 search warrants is the police force?
18 A. That's true.
19
20 Q. So your article is directed at keeping --
21
22 MR SKINNER: I don't know if that's quite correct,
23 actually.
24
25 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I don't know if it is.
26
27 MS LONERGAN: Q. Apparently that's not correct.
28 I withdraw the question. I'm terribly sorry, Father Lucas,
29 I didn't mean to mislead you. That shows my ignorance.
30 Excuse me. I should have put the question this way: the
31 only organisations or persons that can execute search
32 warrants are the police or other investigative agencies
33 that operate outside the Catholic Church?
34 A. Yes.
35
36 Q. Father, in those circumstances, your article is
37 directed at the question of keeping safe from seizure
38 church records, and that is seizure by organisations or
39 investigative bodies that operate outside the church?
40 A. I think the way in which that word "safe" is used is
41 not so much to seek to prevent the execution of a search
42 warrant. I think perhaps the last paragraph of the article
43 gives the proper context to what "safe" means as I used it.
44
45 Q. We'll come to that. Under the heading "Introduction",
46 you have raised as a rhetorical question, I suggest:
47

1 *To shred or not to shred - is that the*
2 *question?*

3
4 A. Yes. Could I perhaps just explain?

5
6 Q. I will let you explain in a minute. All right, I'll
7 let you explain now.

8 A. This was a talk given rather than a written article,
9 so obviously there were some elements of rhetoric involved
10 in giving a talk to a group of people, to attract their
11 attention. So, "To shred or not to shred", I said, "is
12 that the question?"

13
14 Q. So it's a Shakespearean reference - that's right?

15 A. I'm not that familiar with Shakespeare, I'm sorry.

16
17 Q. It's from Hamlet.

18 A. Is it?

19
20 Q. Yes.

21 A. Can I say that I didn't know it was from Hamlet and
22 I'm pleased that Shakespeare and I are able to be of one
23 mind.

24
25 Q. "To be, or not to be, that is the question." You have
26 no doubt, do you, that although a jocular reference, "To
27 shred or not to shred", would pique the interest of those
28 present at the paper you were giving, to raise in their
29 mind whether documents should be kept or not?

30 A. And I think this article argues, as I recall it now,
31 very persuasively that shredding is not a solution to
32 anything.

33
34 Q. Does it say that in the article somewhere?

35 A. I'd have to go and reread it, but I think that was the
36 general tenor, and I think I gave some examples that you
37 might think you're destroying a document, but there will be
38 some reference to it somewhere else.

39
40 Q. What about situations where no document is created at
41 all; there's no need to shred then, is there?

42 A. I think that's a matter of general practical prudence,
43 as people manage their affairs.

44
45 Q. Not to make notes or keep documents about certain
46 subjects?

47 A. In circumstances where that's regarded as prudent and

1 appropriate, yes.

2

3 Q. Did you regard it as prudent and appropriate not to
4 create documents regarding admissions obtained from priests
5 regarding sexual abuse of children?

6 A. I think I've said it several times - to take such
7 notes means that the person to whom you're speaking simply
8 won't talk.

9

10 Q. I'm asking a slightly different question.
11 I appreciate we've covered that broader ground and you've
12 given that answer to that effect a number of times today.
13 What I'm asking is did you have a view that to not take
14 notes of interviews conducted with priests who had been
15 accused of sexually abusing children was prudent?

16 A. In some circumstances, it would be. There would be
17 others when it wouldn't be.

18

19 Q. Who was this particular conference attended by? Was
20 it only clerics?

21 A. No, this is the Canon Law Society of Australia and
22 New Zealand. About 10 or 15 per cent would be clerics.
23 The rest would be other laypeople members of that
24 association.

25

26 Q. Do you recollect how many attended this particular
27 conference, in broad terms? Are we talking about hundreds
28 or a smaller group?

29 A. It would be a hundred or so, I think.

30

31 Q. Do you know whether this paper was provided to any
32 Australian Catholic bishops?

33 A. I have no idea - it was then published in the
34 proceedings. It would be available to anyone who wanted
35 it.

36

37 Q. The views that you express in this paper - were they
38 views that you held prior to the time at which the paper
39 was presented, which is October 1996? I've asked that.
40 Let me start again. The views expressed in this paper,
41 which appears to have been published in October 1996 - were
42 they views you had held for some period prior to preparing
43 the paper, so did you hold those views in 1993, or were
44 they newly minted views, or are you unable to say?

45 A. I really couldn't say. I'd have to look at which
46 particular view and whether this was a maturing of thinking
47 or it was something I had a strong view on earlier.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Q. On the page of this paper that's numbered 52 down in the bottom-middle of the page, there's a heading number 3, "The Code of Canon Law".

A. Yes.

Q. Do you see you've outlined certain canon law provisions that relate to the requirement to keep documents and records?

A. Yes.

Q. And do you see on page 53 there is a comment about canon 489 requiring:

... a secret archive where documents to be kept under secrecy are to be most carefully guarded.

A. Yes.

Q. Did you research this for the purposes of this particular paper - these provisions of canon law - or did you already know them?

A. I'm sorry, I can't answer that.

Q. That's fine, but you're not a canon law student?

A. No.

Q. But you were preparing this for the benefit of the Canon Law Society?

A. Yes. What this paper essentially was doing, and I think from my recollection the reason I was asked to present this was a circumstance that arose with respect to access in marriage tribunal cases, and I probably raised more questions than gave specific answers.

Q. You mentioned in the middle of the page:

Other canons specify documents to be deposited in the secret archive ...

Then you've set out a number of canons, one of which is canon 1719, which provides:

... for the acts relating to a penal investigation to be deposited in this archive if a penal process does not follow

1 *the investigation.*

2

3 A. Yes.

4

5 Q. Just directing your mind back to the tasks that you
6 carried out for the archdiocese and your discussions with
7 particular priests, did you consider them to be in any way
8 a penal investigation?

9 A. No.

10

11 Q. And penal investigation means a particular canon law
12 process that's a very formal process?

13 A. Yes, yes.

14

15 Q. Does it need a judge appointed and all those sorts of
16 things?

17 A. Yes.

18

19 Q. You didn't see yourself as a judge at canon law?

20 A. Certainly not.

21

22 Q. On page 54, you have continued to outline various
23 canons relating to documents. In the bottom two paragraphs
24 on that page you deal with the question of admission of
25 guilt. I had better let you read that whole page. In
26 fact, I should probably let you read the whole section
27 dealing with the canon law, because I don't want to be
28 unfair to you.

29 A. No, I'm reasonably familiar. If you direct me to
30 a particular paragraph, I'll do my best to deal with it.

31

32 Q. What I'm directing your attention to is the last two
33 paragraphs on page 54 where you say this:

34

35 *A greater risk is that admission of guilt*
36 *of a criminal offence by a party, either in*
37 *marriage cases or a canonical penal*
38 *process, could be used in the civil forum.*

39

40 Do you see that?

41 A. Yes.

42

43 Q.

44 *This is of serious concern if the person*
45 *felt induced to make the admission on the*
46 *basis of a promise of confidentiality.*

47

1 A. Yes.
2
3 Q. As I understand your evidence you are suggesting the
4 processes you engaged in were not canonical processes?
5 A. No.
6
7 Q. But your evidence is to the effect that there should
8 be some limit in the use of any admissions made to you,
9 because you gave a promise of confidentiality in your
10 meetings with various priests; is that your position?
11 A. Yes.
12
13 Q. Yes?
14 A. Yes.
15
16 Q. As I understand your evidence, you don't recollect
17 your conversation with McAlinden?
18 A. True.
19
20 Q. You don't recollect McAlinden at all, the person?
21 A. In terms of a visual --
22
23 Q. The visual appearance?
24 A. No.
25
26 Q. But you recollect certain circumstances surrounding
27 him?
28 A. Yes.
29
30 Q. You say you have a crystal clear recollection of one
31 particular aspect of the meeting you had with [AL] about
32 McAlinden?
33 A. A few aspects of that.
34
35 Q. One we have to leave to one side that's to do with her
36 particular relationship --
37 A. Yes.
38
39 Q. -- to McAlinden. The other is that she did not want
40 to go to the police?
41 A. Yes.
42
43 Q. And that's bound up with that relationship question?
44 A. And another very critical part of that is the reason
45 why she didn't want to go to the police that she
46 articulated to me.
47

1 Q. That's bound up with her particular relationship?
2 A. Yes, yes.
3
4 Q. Was there anything else that's crystal clear in terms
5 of recollection from that meeting with [AL]?
6 A. That Sister Paula was present.
7
8 Q. That's the only other thing that you remember from
9 that meeting?
10 A. That immediately comes to mind, yes.
11
12 Q. I'm sorry if I've asked you this question already, but
13 it's your recollection, is it, that there was no other
14 church official present at that meeting, or you're just not
15 sure?
16 A. That was my initial recollection. I'm aware of
17 suggestions to the contrary and it has caused doubt in my
18 mind with respect to one of those suggestions, and I'm
19 clearer with respect to the other suggestion.
20
21 Q. Father Usher was somebody that you often met other
22 victims of sexual abuse in the company of?
23 A. Yes.
24
25 Q. You're aware that Father Usher is someone who is
26 suggested as having been present at this meeting with [AL]?
27 A. Yes.
28
29 Q. Is it the possible that you just don't recollect him
30 being there, but he may have been there?
31 A. No, I'm more confident that he wasn't there, partly
32 because in the context of some other inquiries that were
33 made prior to this Commission, when I sought to refresh my
34 memory, I asked him did he recall being present or having
35 an involvement with McAlinden, and he didn't have that
36 recollection.
37
38 Q. But he may be mistaken about that?
39 A. He may be, yes.
40
41 Q. In terms of Monsignor Hart, do you remember him having
42 been present or not?
43 A. I didn't have a recollection that he was, but it's
44 more likely perhaps that he was, as the person who
45 introduced the meeting. I think I would form a view that
46 to have three clerics present in that sort of interview
47 would be contrary to my ordinary practice.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Q. But your ordinary practice, on occasion, involved two clerics being present?

A. Normally that would be with a conversation with an offender.

Q. Oh, I understand, you and the offender?

A. No, no. If there was a conversation with an offender, it was very common that John Usher and I would deal with that together. But a conversation with a victim, I rarely was involved in. That tended to be something where John Usher was more skilled and more competent, and generally through Centacare would be where victims would engage with the church.

Q. So it is your evidence that your understanding is that John Usher would do them by himself, generally?

A. Or with a counsellor from Centacare or something of that sort.

Q. Did you see yourself, in relation to this paper that we have been looking at, as setting out some guidelines for any clergy present as to how they should manage documents?

A. I think it was an academic paper raising questions for canon lawyers to further reflect on and discuss. It certainly had no authority to it. I was not in a position to make any authoritative recommendations other than to raise questions that I thought were relevant for their further reflection.

Q. One of the questions that you raised was the question of destruction of documents in accordance with canon 489, and that's mentioned on page 53, where they were documents of criminal cases concerning moral matters. It's just below the halfway mark on page 53.

A. Yes, that sets out what that canon says.

Q. Did you have any experience yourself as to whether bishops that you were associated with followed that canon and destroyed documents of criminal cases concerning moral matters?

A. I'd have to reread the article, but I have a feeling that I might have queried the prudence of that particular canon.

Q. I'm sorry, I wasn't asking about your view about it but whether you had any experience, in a practical sense,

1 of knowing that any bishops that you worked with followed
2 that particular canon in terms of destruction?
3 A. I've not had that experience.
4
5 Q. You raised the question of the wisdom or otherwise of
6 creating documents in the first place that relate to church
7 business, on pages 70 to 71. I'll just give you a moment
8 to read that, from heading "5. Our policy for documents",
9 in particular the material that occurs at the top of
10 page 71.
11 A. Yes.
12
13 Q. You direct attention to the question of the
14 appropriateness or otherwise of creation, retention and
15 destruction of documents?
16 A. Yes.
17
18 Q. And you raise the question: why it is that we wish to
19 create a particular document?
20 A. Yes.
21
22 Q. Is that a question that you posed to yourself on
23 occasion when you were carrying out the business of the
24 archdiocese, in particular relating to interviewing priests
25 accused of sexual abuse?
26 A. I don't recall that I directed my attention in that
27 way.
28
29 Q. "Why do we wish to retain it?", is another question,
30 and the third question is, "Why are we destroying it?"
31 A. Yes.
32
33 Q. Was this paper written to deal with any suggestion
34 that documents relevant to church activities were being
35 destroyed?
36 A. No.
37
38 Q. So why have you raised that particular question there?
39 A. The problem archivists have is the sheer size of the
40 material and what sort of retention and destruction policy
41 should exist. I think perhaps the third paragraph on that
42 page may give some answer to that question.
43
44 Q. That's the "In practice, however"?
45 A. Yes.
46
47 Q. The bit about:

1
2 *... the need for an historical archive*
3 *would prohibit total destruction even after*
4 *a period of time.*
5

6 A. Yes, and then the limits on space probably mean it's
7 impractical that everything be kept, so you have to have
8 some policy as to what's relevant, what's kept and what's
9 not kept. And I set out then in the fifth paragraph that
10 selection based on certain reasons could involve adverse
11 inferences, and so on.
12

13 Q. But would you agree with me that if documents have
14 been selected and destroyed, then they can't be gathered by
15 a search warrant process?

16 A. And I think I've argued there that that's a very
17 dangerous thing to do.
18

19 Q. You mention in your paper that selective culling of
20 all the incriminating material will be likely to be
21 discovered?

22 A. Yes.
23

24 Q. Have you had experience of that happening, that there
25 has been selective culling of incriminating material and
26 then it was subsequently discovered?

27 A. I've never had that experience.
28

29 Q. But you're just identifying that that may well happen?

30 A. I think I was expressing some caution that if you
31 think you are going to get away with some sort of selective
32 destruction, the sophistication of the process will mean
33 that you will be caught.
34

35 Q. A higher level of sophistication would be, would it
36 not, never to create documents in the first place?

37 A. That could be a policy decision, depending on the
38 circumstances of whether it's prudent to create the
39 document. One of the difficulties, of course, was
40 documents that intrude upon the privacy of individuals, and
41 in the context of marriage cases there were issues about
42 that.
43

44 Q. Would you agree with me that in the context of
45 marriage cases that have to go to the particular tribunals,
46 there's a canon law requirement that certain documents are
47 created?

1 A. Yes.
2
3 Q. So we're talking about documents not being created at
4 all, not documents that are created and have to be kept
5 confidential?
6 A. Yes.
7
8 Q. On the next page, page 72, you deal with the question
9 of documents that involve allegations of misconduct and the
10 need for those to be considered as a separate category.
11 A. Sorry, which paragraph?
12
13 Q. I'm sorry, page 72, paragraph 6.
14 A. Yes.
15
16 Q. You make this observation:
17
18 *If the allegations are admitted then the*
19 *retention of the complaint is irrelevant.*
20 *All that may need to be retained is the*
21 *evidence of the admission, and then only if*
22 *there is some further purpose for this.*
23
24 A. Yes.
25
26 Q. Applying your statement there to your situation in
27 1993 with McAlinden if he made an admission, is this not
28 suggesting that evidence of the admission ought to be kept?
29 A. No, because I've said it many, many times: if I take
30 notes of what he's saying to me, he will not talk to me,
31 and if he thinks there's going to be some permanent record
32 of what he says to me, he's not going to talk to me.
33
34 Q. In terms of canon law requirements, I think you've
35 given evidence to the effect that a caution ought to be
36 given if there's a canon law process going on?
37 A. If there's a canon law process, it's a whole different
38 approach to documentation completely.
39
40 Q. And it includes requiring a caution of the particular
41 person that you would be dealing with?
42 A. I'm not quite sure of the precise process of that.
43
44 Q. But you weren't following a canon law process, were
45 you?
46 A. No.
47

1 Q. You don't have a recollection of your conversation
2 with McAlinden, do you?
3 A. No.
4
5 Q. So you don't know whether you induced him to tell you
6 things on the basis of a promise that you wouldn't reveal
7 what he told you to anyone, do you?
8 A. I don't have a recollection of the context of the
9 conversation.
10
11 Q. So you may well have not given him any inducement at
12 all?
13 A. I'd be very confident that there was a very serious
14 inducement to persuade him to resign from priesthood.
15
16 Q. Oh, I understand that. I'm sorry, because you can't
17 recollect any conversation with McAlinden, you couldn't
18 give evidence to the effect that you told him that you
19 wouldn't tell anybody what he told you?
20 A. I think I would have said to him, "Look, this
21 conversation is between us and the bishop."
22
23 Q. You're surmising now, aren't you?
24 A. Yes.
25
26 Q. Because you don't recollect the conversation?
27 A. That's my surmising, yes. That would be my normal
28 practice.
29
30 Q. But you may well not have engaged in your normal
31 practice?
32 A. That's quite possible, but normally you do normally
33 engage in your normal practice.
34
35 Q. Normally you do, but there's always an exception,
36 isn't there, otherwise it would be your invariable
37 practice?
38 A. Well, it might have been my invariable practice. If
39 you put it to me in those terms, my practice was fairly
40 consistent so far as I can recall it.
41
42 Q. Because you can't recollect your conversation with
43 McAlinden, he may well have sat down and admitted to
44 a number of abuses with no inducement whatsoever from you?
45 A. I think I - if that was the case, because that's not
46 so common, I'd have a recollection.
47

1 Q. But you don't have any recollection of your
2 conversation with McAlinden at all, do you?
3 A. That's true.
4
5 Q. You don't even recollect where it was?
6 A. Yes.
7
8 Q. And you've reconstructed from other documents when it
9 happened?
10 A. Yes.
11
12 Q. Otherwise, you have no memory of any kind that it had
13 ever occurred; is that the position?
14 A. That's the position.
15
16 Q. A perpetrator would have no knowledge as to whether
17 the bishop might make a permanent record of what you tell
18 the bishop, would he?
19 A. That's probably the case, yes.
20
21 Q. Given that situation, from a confidentiality point of
22 view, there is no reason why you ought not make a permanent
23 record as well?
24 A. It's not so much from the confidentiality point of
25 view; it's the conversation you're having with him would
26 not take place if he believed that I was taking notes. And
27 what he would understand, again according to the normal
28 practice, would be that I would report back to the bishop
29 the outcome but wouldn't need to go into whatever details
30 of conversation he had with me.
31
32 Q. Given your child protection background, the fact that
33 a priest made an admission to you regarding having sexually
34 abused a number of children, if he did make that admission,
35 was a significant one to bear in mind for child protection
36 issues, wasn't it?
37 A. Certainly.
38
39 Q. And the bishop would need to know that a person
40 accused of sexually abusing children admitted he'd done
41 that, wouldn't he?
42 A. Not necessarily. All that the bishop needed to know
43 was that he had agreed to resign from ministry and the
44 bishop would draw his conclusions as to why that was, and
45 then the child protection comes from the fact that he has
46 been removed from ministry.
47

1 Q. But a priest agreeing to withdraw from ministry may
2 have done that simply because he felt strong-armed; isn't
3 that right?
4 A. He certainly felt strong-armed.
5
6 Q. That is a very different thing, feeling strong-armed
7 out of priestly ministry, to admitting sexually abusing
8 children, isn't it?
9 A. Well, some will make some admissions in varying
10 degrees. I've had a situation of an absolute denial but
11 still an agreement to withdraw from ministry.
12
13 Q. I understand that, but what I'm asking you to accept
14 as a proposition is accepting a withdrawal from ministry,
15 having been encouraged to do so by your particular
16 processes, is a very different thing to saying, "Yes, I'll
17 get out of ministry", and, "Yes, I abused those three or
18 four children sexually", isn't it?
19 A. It would depend on the context of the conversation.
20
21 Q. Why does it depend on the context of the conversation?
22 I've just outlined a conversation for you. We've got
23 a situation where a priest says, "Yes, I'll step out of
24 ministry because I feel you've strong-armed me out of it",
25 and a different priest saying, "I actually sexually abused
26 children A, B, C and D, I'll get out of ministry." They're
27 very different situations?
28 A. I'm sorry, I've misunderstood your question,
29 I apologise.
30
31 Q. They are very different situations, aren't they?
32 A. Yes.
33
34 Q. Isn't it important for the bishop to know that the
35 second priest we talked about has held up his hand and
36 said, "Yes, and I sexually abused child A, B, C and D"?
37 A. I don't think he needs to know A, B, C and D. I think
38 he just needs to know that this is the circumstance of the
39 agreement to resign from ministry.
40
41 Q. He needs to know that the priest has admitted engaging
42 in that behaviour, doesn't he?
43 A. I don't think he does.
44
45 Q. Doesn't a bishop of a diocese need to know that
46 a priest has engaged in that behaviour so that a priest who
47 at that stage is still incardinated to his diocese is not

1 let have access to children, having admitted that he
2 engaged in that kind of behaviour?
3 A. No. The bishop would know that he can't ever work as
4 a priest again, on the basis of the agreement that he would
5 resign. The details of names of particular victims or
6 particular details, the bishop wouldn't necessarily need to
7 know that to fulfil his child protection obligations.
8
9 Q. The important piece of information isn't the names of
10 the children; it's the fact that a priest has admitted that
11 he sexually abused children. Isn't that the important
12 fact?
13 A. That was taken for granted in the entire context.
14
15 Q. It doesn't have to be taken for granted just because
16 a priest holds up his hand and says, "All right I'll
17 withdraw from ministry"?
18 A. I think that's the inference in the context of these
19 conversations.
20
21 Q. Would you agree with me "the inference" is a very
22 different thing from a stated admission of conduct
23 involving sexually abusing children?
24 A. It is.
25
26 Q. Were you trying to protect the bishop from a potential
27 misprision of felony by shielding him from that particular
28 specific information?
29 A. No, I'm sorry, this is the first time I've ever had
30 that suggestion put to me. That never occurred to me.
31
32 Q. So can we take it from your answer that you weren't?
33 A. No, certainly not.
34
35 Q. Doesn't the bishop need to know from a pastoral care
36 point of view that a priest has admitted to having sexually
37 abused A, B, C or D child?
38 A. From the point of view of the pastoral care of the
39 priest?
40
41 Q. No, the pastoral care of the children who may now be
42 adults?
43 A. Obviously, the pastoral care of the children. They
44 had already made their contact with the diocese. The
45 bishop knew who they were.
46
47 Q. But doesn't the bishop need to know that not only were

1 the complaints made but that the perpetrator admits he did
2 it? Doesn't the bishop need to know that so he can have an
3 appropriate pastoral engagement with those adults who were
4 sexually abused as children?
5 A. In the sense of affirming those children's complaints.
6
7 Q. Yes.
8 A. I don't think there's any dispute about that.
9
10 Q. What is there no dispute about that?
11 A. The need to give proper pastoral care to the people
12 who have been - who have made complaints and to affirm them
13 in that situation.
14
15 Q. Don't you think part of a proper pastoral care in
16 a situation where a priest has admitted that he sexually
17 abused these people was to tell those people that that
18 admission had been made?
19 A. On an individual basis.
20
21 Q. Yes, you're agreeing with me?
22 A. Certainly.
23
24 Q. For that to have been carried out, the bishop would
25 need to know, wouldn't he?
26 A. Well, the bishop's delegate or the Centacare, or
27 whoever is caring for those people, yes.
28
29 Q. You didn't always contact the complainants
30 individually after you had spoken to a priest in question,
31 did you?
32 A. Always.
33
34 Q. Oh, you always did?
35 A. Or some person on their behalf. As I said, with [AL],
36 it may have been that I spoke to Sister Paula as her
37 support person. I don't recall that. But it would
38 certainly be my practice always to give feedback to
39 a complainant about the outcome of the conversation with
40 the priest.
41
42 Q. My question was, though, that you didn't always do it
43 yourself direct to the complainant, did you?
44 A. Yes.
45
46 Q. You're saying yes, but you've just given an example
47 where you didn't?

1 A. Sorry. No, no, there may have been an instance where
2 there was a support person who the complainant wanted me to
3 talk to instead of directly back to the complainant, yes.
4

5 Q. So in that case, you told Sister Redgrove certain
6 things?

7 A. Yes.
8

9 Q. It was within the power of the bishop to report the
10 perpetrator to the police, wasn't it?

11 A. It certainly would have been within his power, but we
12 would have had this even worse dilemma with the victim, who
13 doesn't want the matter to go to the police, being even
14 further embarrassed by the bishop reporting it to the
15 police.
16

17 Q. To be in a position to make the decision as to whether
18 he ought to report this criminal conduct to the police that
19 had been admitted to, the bishop would need to know the
20 details, wouldn't he?

21 A. I don't think that situation ever arose, to be honest.
22

23 Q. A priest who admits to abusing 40 children as opposed
24 to admitting one or two - does he pose a greater risk than
25 the one who only admits to abusing one or two children?

26 A. A greater risk into the future?
27

28 Q. A greater risk in terms of abusing, yes, into the
29 future?

30 A. That would depend, again, on how long it was ago. I'd
31 be more concerned about the priest who abused one child
32 yesterday than a very, very elderly priest who hasn't
33 abused a child for 20 years but did abuse 40 children
34 before that.
35

36 Q. In terms of knowledge as to whether a priest hadn't
37 abused a child for 20 or 30 years, you would be relying on
38 that priest's information about that, wouldn't you?

39 A. And whatever other circumstances surrounded the
40 situation, yes.
41

42 Q. But that would be one factor you would rely on?

43 A. Yes.
44

45 Q. You've published material to the effect that
46 paedophiles are chronic liars, haven't you?

47 A. Yes.

1
2 Q. So how could you rely on a priest saying that?
3 A. You can't rely on anything the priest says. You've
4 got to make some prudential judgment about the
5 circumstances and the context of the conversation.
6
7 Q. So obtaining details of admitted activity by a priest
8 suspected of paedophilia is important, isn't it?
9 A. If you can get it.
10
11 Q. Yes, if you can get it, and it's important in terms of
12 risk evaluation?
13 A. Yes.
14
15 Q. And the risk being evaluated is the risk that that
16 priest will sexually abuse other children?
17 A. Yes.
18
19 Q. The person with the responsibility of the relevant
20 risk evaluation isn't you in these circumstances, is it?
21 A. Ultimately the responsibility will be with the bishop.
22
23 Q. So that's why the bishop needs to know the details of
24 what conduct has been acknowledged or admitted to and the
25 details associated with that conduct?
26 A. I think the information that is most helpful to the
27 bishop is the willingness of the priest to take himself out
28 of ministry and after that - I mean, I think this is fairly
29 black and white, in my mind. There are not really degrees
30 of risk. If he has to be taken out of ministry, he has to
31 be taken out of ministry, and --
32
33 Q. Isn't that a very small-minded approach to the
34 problem, that is, focusing only on removal of this criminal
35 person from ministry as opposed to keeping children safe
36 from his paedophile behaviour?
37 A. The best way to keep children safe from the paedophile
38 behaviour of a priest is to take him out of priestly
39 ministry.
40
41 Q. What if a priest doesn't properly cooperate with the
42 arrangement made that he is to extract himself from
43 priestly ministry?
44 A. There's a limit to what you're able to do, depending
45 on the constraints that are there with respect to taking
46 further action.
47

1 Q. There's a limit to what you can do as a representative
2 of the Catholic Church, isn't there?
3 A. Yes.
4
5 Q. And in terms of criminal behaviour, there is an
6 obvious other step, isn't there, and that is reporting the
7 perpetrator to the police?
8 A. Provided you're in a position where you are able to do
9 that without other constraints upon you.
10
11 Q. The constraints you've outlined are your understanding
12 that some people feel they don't want to go to the police;
13 is that the position?
14 A. It's more than they feel they don't want to go to the
15 police. There are some people who are just absolutely
16 completely and utterly unwilling to go to the police.
17
18 Q. You would agree with me, wouldn't you, that on
19 occasion people who are utterly and completely unwilling to
20 go to the police change their mind and become willing to go
21 to the police?
22 A. And that's a good idea and --
23
24 Q. And it happens, doesn't it?
25 A. Yes.
26
27 Q. And you've seen it? You've seen it happen?
28 A. I expect I have.
29
30 Q. After you had attended to your particular duties in
31 relation to McAlinden in early 1993, you didn't have any
32 ongoing role with management of him, did you?
33 A. Not that I'm aware of, other than the phone call in
34 1995.
35
36 Q. Put that to one side. Did you know that a plan had
37 been made for him to go and live with a relative in the
38 United Kingdom?
39 A. Yes.
40
41 Q. When did you become aware of that plan?
42 A. I don't know.
43
44 Q. Were you part of making that plan for him?
45 A. No.
46
47 Q. Do you know who made that plan for him?

1 A. I expect that was the authorities in the diocese of
2 Maitland.

3

4 Q. Have you on any other occasion made particular plans
5 regarding where a priest should be physically located after
6 he has had a conversation with you?

7 A. My general practice would be that he would go back to
8 his bishop. I would have reported that he's now willing to
9 resign from ministry, and then the circumstances and where
10 he'd live or whatever would be taken up between himself and
11 the bishop.

12

13 Q. That paper we've just been looking at, I have a couple
14 more matters to raise with you about it. On page 74, which
15 is the last page, you're still addressing the question of
16 overall policy for documents, and you raise this question:

17

18 *If, through a tribunal process, it comes to*
19 *light that a person is abusing children,*
20 *might it not be argued that the greater*
21 *good would be served by disclosing this*
22 *concern to the authorities. Is this*
23 *a higher value than the value of preserving*
24 *the confidentiality of the church process?*
25 *This is a matter that is at least worth*
26 *discussing.*

27

28 As at October 1996, what was your view on that question you
29 posed: is reporting a matter to the authorities, outside
30 the church, of higher value than preserving the
31 confidentiality of the church process?

32 A. That will depend on the nature of the information and
33 the circumstances of the confidentiality.

34

35 Q. Let's assume this: the nature of the information is
36 that a priest is accused of sexually abusing a number of
37 children.

38 A. Sorry, this is through a tribunal process.

39

40 Q. Sorry?

41 A. The context of this is a tribunal process.

42

43 Q. So are you saying that the process you performed has
44 no relationship whatsoever with a tribunal process?

45 A. Yes.

46

47 Q. None whatsoever?

1 A. Yes.
2
3 Q. You're looking at and assessing accusations that
4 a priest has sexually abused children, aren't you, in your
5 process?
6 A. Yes.
7
8 Q. And you're confronting the perpetrator with the
9 allegations in your process?
10 A. Yes.
11
12 Q. You're not making any notes about the process, though,
13 are you?
14 A. No.
15
16 Q. Aren't there at least some parallels to the tribunal
17 process you're referring to here?
18 A. There's a parallel, but the particular context of that
19 paragraph is the general confidentiality of marriage cases
20 and --
21
22 Q. We're not talking about marriage cases. You're
23 talking there about it having come to light that a person
24 is abusing children?
25 A. There is a marriage case, someone is giving evidence
26 in the marriage case and making some allegation about some
27 child abuse.
28
29 Q. I understand, all right.
30 A. Then the question is whether the greater good would be
31 served by disclosing that concern to the authorities or
32 preserving the confidentiality of the church process.
33
34 Q. Doesn't that question apply by way of a parallel to
35 the situation where it comes to light that a priest is
36 abusing children? Might it not be argued that the greater
37 good would be served by disclosing this concern to the
38 authorities? Don't you agree there is a parallel there?
39 A. I'm sorry, I misunderstood where you're coming from.
40 I apologise. There's a clear analogy because you've got
41 the same dilemma.
42
43 Q. So you agree that the dilemma you're referring to
44 there is the dilemma that arises in your processes with
45 a conversation with a priest who has been accused of
46 sexually abusing children?
47 A. It was a very clear, well known and well understood

1 and very difficult dilemma.

2

3 Q. What's your view about the dilemma? Is there a higher
4 value than the value of preserving the confidentiality of -
5 sorry, is it a higher value, that is, disclosing to the
6 outside authorities, than the value of preserving any
7 church process, situation, status quo?

8 A. No, the situation I'm involved in is not preserving
9 the confidentiality of the church process. It's preserving
10 the confidentiality of the victim who doesn't want the
11 matter taken to the police.

12

13 Q. So is it your position that the most important value
14 in the equation of the matters that you have dealt with is
15 a victim's request that the matter not be reported to the
16 police?

17 A. I think that's a very significant value.

18

19 Q. Is that the most important value?

20 A. I don't think you can say that one is more important
21 when you have conflicting values. That's the whole point
22 of a dilemma. I don't think you can say one, in a sense,
23 is more important or less important. You have a dilemma.
24 Whatever you do is going to be a problem.

25

26 Q. It doesn't fix the problem, does it, to simply remove
27 the man from ministry?

28 A. In terms of the total problem, there is no solution to
29 that problem in any fashion. There are only really three
30 outcomes of a complaint about child sexual assault. The
31 first is the police process, and that has its limits. The
32 second is a formal church process, and that has even more
33 limits. And the third is some informal process to at least
34 take him out of ministry, which goes a long way towards
35 protecting children into the future.

36

37 Q. When did you become aware that McAlinden had been
38 charged with sexually abusing a child in Western Australia?

39 A. I presume at some stage after he had been acquitted in
40 the context of these conversations.

41

42 Q. At the time you were having the conversation with him
43 in early 1993, were you aware of that?

44 A. Yes, he had been acquitted already. That was partly
45 what brought the whole matter to light.

46

47 Q. So you knew that at the time you were speaking to [AL]

1 and [AJ]?
2 A. Yes, that's what made them angry - that he had been
3 acquitted.
4
5 Q. You don't recollect your conversations with [AJ] at
6 all, do you?
7 A. No.
8
9 Q. So you are unable to state what her attitude was
10 regarding reporting her allegations to the police?
11 A. No, I think I came to the understanding that she
12 didn't want the matter reported to the police, from the
13 information I was given before I spoke to her.
14
15 Q. You say you don't recollect any conversation with
16 [AJ]?
17 A. Yes.
18
19 Q. So the information can't have come from her?
20 A. No.
21
22 Q. Who do you say that information came from?
23 A. It would have been - and I don't recall now whether it
24 was Bishop Clarke or Monsignor Hart who gave me the phone
25 number to ring [AJ]. I don't recall which it was, but I'd
26 be very confident that in the course of being told that it
27 would be good to ring her to tell her what we're doing
28 about McAlinden, it would have been certainly my
29 understanding that there was no police process involved.
30
31 Q. Sorry, there was no police process involved?
32 A. Involved or contemplated, yes.
33
34 Q. Let's clarify that. There was no police process
35 involved, so you knew the police hadn't been told yet?
36 A. Yes.
37
38 Q. What information was conveyed to you that [AJ] did not
39 want the police involved?
40 A. I don't remember any particular words, but if I'd been
41 led to believe that she may have wanted to go to the
42 police, I would have been very reluctant to engage with her
43 at that time until after she had been to the police.
44
45 Q. So from that, you're assuming, are you, that [AJ]
46 didn't want to go to the police?
47 A. Yes.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Q. Is there any reason why there couldn't be a combination of processes to deal with any particular paedophile, that is, the church process and the police also being informed?

A. That was eventually the solution we came to.

Q. Anonymised reporting to the police was an idea that was floated?

A. Yes.

Q. Are you able to say what year that came up?

A. I forget when the idea first came up. Certainly the implementation, in my conversations with various police officers in I think 1996 and into 1997, put in place that established anonymised reporting protocol.

MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, I tender the paper authored by Father Lucas to the Canon Law Society, dated October 1996.

THE COMMISSIONER: Father Lucas's paper will be admitted and marked exhibit 147.

**EXHIBIT #147 PAPER AUTHORED BY FATHER LUCAS TO THE
CANON LAW SOCIETY, DATED OCTOBER 1996**

MS LONERGAN: Q. Do you still have open in front of you volume 2 of the material? At tab 152, that's a document that looks like notes titled "Child Sexual Abuse"?

A. Yes.

Q. It's attributed to you and John Usher and dated 12 April 1988?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you prepare this document?

A. No, I think that's John Usher's document. That's not my typescript, and it's the same date as my document, which is in my statement.

Q. So is it your position that you prepared none of this material?

A. I have no recollection now whether I saw it or - this looks like, given the content of it, this would have been the presentation John Usher gave to the bishops on the same occasion that I gave my presentation.

1 Q. And you were present for it?

2 A. Yes.

3

4 Q. Could you turn to the second page of the document,
5 headed "Confidentiality of Church Process".

6 A. Yes.

7

8 Q. There's a statement:

9

10 *Secret archives may not be exempted from*
11 *civil law.*

12

13 A. Yes.

14

15 Q. You agree with that?

16 A. Yes.

17

18 Q. And:

19

20 *Instruct the diocesan solicitor and give*
21 *him the documentation which then*
22 *becomes ...*

23

24 And there's a word missing and inverted commas. Are you
25 able to say what that was referring to and whether the word
26 may well have been "privileged"?

27 A. Yes, that's likely. One of the issues that had
28 arisen, and I think I make a reference to it also in my
29 paper - in a canonical process, what can you do to preserve
30 the confidentiality and privacy of witnesses? They're not
31 privileged the way they would be privileged in the civil
32 law system. A suggestion that had come from some canonists
33 was that to protect those witnesses, victims or others who
34 were giving evidence in a church process, it may be
35 possible to construct it in a way that would give rise to
36 legal professional privilege.

37

38 MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, did I tender the document
39 behind tab 153, which was the witness's April 1988 notes?

40

41 THE COMMISSIONER: It is part of exhibit 142, being
42 annexure B to Father Lucas's affidavit.

43

44 MS LONERGAN: Q. Father, you've given some evidence to
45 the effect that you had some involvement in the structuring
46 of a protocol for dealing with allegations of criminal
47 behaviour for the benefit of the Australian Catholic

1 Bishops Conference?
2 A. Yes.
3
4 Q. You've annexed to your statement a protocol dated
5 April 1992?
6 A. Yes.
7
8 Q. That's annexure C to your statement. Is that the
9 protocol that you are referring to?
10 A. Referring to where?
11
12 Q. Or were you referring to an earlier version of the
13 same protocol?
14 A. Sorry, I'm not sure.
15
16 Q. Annexure C to your affidavit.
17 A. Yes.
18
19 Q. My question is, in the text of your affidavit you've
20 referred to annexure C in the very long paragraph that
21 appears on page 3, in the second paragraph on page 3, that
22 this is a draft protocol dated April 1992? Is that the way
23 I should read that paragraph?
24 A. Yes.
25
26 Q. You had a role in drafting this particular protocol?
27 A. I was part of the committee, yes.
28
29 Q. In terms of the title "Special Issues", which is
30 referred to in the definition section on page 3, who came
31 up with that title?
32 A. That was a title that came up with the - are you
33 talking about the special issues resource group?
34
35 Q. Just the words "special issues".
36 A. It was a title that was used by the insurance company.
37
38 Q. Is it a reference to sexual abuse behaviour by clergy
39 or something more wide?
40 A. It's wider than that. It would include - it's really
41 a subcategory of public liability claims that were of the
42 nature of molestation claims, perhaps orphanage claims,
43 forced adoption claims, adult boundary violation claims -
44 that general broad category of misconduct.
45
46 Q. And misconduct that includes criminal misconduct?
47 A. Yes.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Q. On the second page of the document, under the heading "Preamble", it says in the fifth paragraph:

It is understood that this protocol in no way affects any rights and obligations, arising from canon law either universal or particular ...

Do you see that?

A. Yes.

Q. Is that a savings provision in relation to canon law requirements; is that the way that should be read?

A. I think this particular protocol was not intended to be a formal canonical process.

Q. What I'm asking you is something different, though. Is that paragraph there stating that canon law processes can still be conducted?

A. Yes.

Q. Is it your position that this protocol operates entirely outside canon law?

A. It can't operate entirely outside canon law, because there would be certain aspects of canon law that may be relevant to it, but this was not intended to be a canonical process.

Q. And it is not a substitution for canon law?

A. No.

Q. In terms of the protocol set out in this document - and I'll give you a moment to read it again, if you need to, but I take it you're well across it in broad terms.

A. I'm very happy for you to take me to a particular paragraph.

Q. I will if I need to, but did this protocol inform your activities in February 1993 with McAlinden?

A. Broadly, yes.

Q. What were you doing in reference to this protocol? Were you the preliminary investigation?

A. No.

Q. Where is the bit that refers to what you were doing?

1 A. I'm not quite sure you'd find it in those words.
2 I think to some extent the protocol had been concertinaed
3 into a conversation with McAlinden to induce his
4 resignation from priesthood. The more elaborate processes
5 here and all of the different policies and principles
6 enunciated here to some extent were taken for granted and
7 short-circuited.
8
9 Q. Why was it appropriate for you to short-circuit these
10 documented processes and policies and go straight for the
11 conversation?
12 A. Because that was the best outcome.
13
14 Q. Who told you that that's how it should be conducted?
15 A. This was not a common practice but a reasonable
16 practice that John Usher and I had adopted within the
17 spirit of this protocol but without necessarily going
18 through every particular part of a process if the
19 circumstances were such that you could induce his
20 resignation from ministry.
21
22 Q. Doesn't this protocol talk about the need for
23 documentation of different parts of the process?
24 A. If there is a process in place, yes.
25
26 Q. To that extent, your special conversation didn't
27 follow that requirement, did it?
28 A. No, it wasn't possible to document it because he
29 wouldn't talk to you if you documented it.
30
31 Q. You don't know that?
32 A. I do know that.
33
34 Q. How do you know that?
35 A. Because that was a very common practice and experience
36 that a priest who's being talked to in that context is not
37 going to talk if you pull out the notepad and say, "Now,
38 I'm going to write down everything you say."
39
40 Q. But you didn't know McAlinden before your
41 conversation?
42 A. I could be very confident that he would not speak to
43 me if he knew that I was going to take notes of what he
44 said.
45
46 Q. You are assuming that?
47 A. I am assuming it from experience.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Q. You don't know it?

A. I could never be a hundred per cent certain if he is the one exception who is prepared to speak frankly and openly, within reason, and have everything taken down. He might be the one exception. I never came across a priest who ever did that.

Q. Given the answer you have just provided, there is no reason, is there, that you couldn't have made notes after your discussion?

A. I've said many times there is no reason not to, but it wasn't necessary to.

Q. It wasn't necessary to because you were proceeding on the basis that you would always remember the conversation, were you?

A. No, I'd report the conversation immediately to the bishop.

THE COMMISSIONER: I'm sorry to interrupt, Ms Lonergan. It has just reminded me of something that I would like to clear up.

Q. Father, some time ago in your evidence, perhaps half an hour ago, you said that you would be very confident there was a very serious inducement to persuade McAlinden to resign from the priesthood. Although you don't remember the conversation, what was the nature of the inducement that you are likely to have offered him?

A. If he doesn't resign from priesthood, there are people making these accusations; they will continue to make those accusations. They don't want him to be a priest. And there's no future, given the circumstances and history of what seems to have happened, that the bishop will ever give him an appointment, so better for him and for everybody to formally resign from ministry.

Q. Might it ever have been an inducement that the police authorities would be advised if he didn't resign?

A. I think that would be taken as an obvious outcome. I should say, by the victims who perhaps - who were simply wanting him out, and if he refused to get out, they may well have changed their mind, which would have been the best outcome for everyone.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, father. Thank you,

1 Ms Lonergan.

2

3 * MS LONERGAN: Q. So is it fair to say that the
4 processes that you were engaged in were offered as an
5 inducement to avoid a situation where these crimes would be
6 reported to the police?

7 A. No, I think that's --

8

9 MR SKINNER: I object to that. The witness has just given
10 an answer where he has made it quite plain that there were
11 several steps to that end. It is not fair to put it like
12 that.

13

14 THE COMMISSIONER: Not directly stated.

15

16 MR SKINNER: Yes, night following day.

17

18 MS LONERGAN: I didn't say that night followed day.
19 I didn't say it came from the question that you asked,
20 Commissioner. I'm putting the proposition, which the
21 witness can accept or reject, as a highly educated, clearly
22 intelligent person.

23

24 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

25

26 MS LONERGAN: Q. You have rejected it, as I understand
27 your answer?

28 A. I was about to answer the question when my counsel
29 stood up. Perhaps if I could have the question again, I'd
30 prefer to give a better answer?

31

32 Q. Thank you. Could the question be read, please?

33 A. I don't mean to make it difficult, but I don't now
34 remember the question.

35

36 Q. No, it's not that you're being difficult. I should
37 remember it, and I don't, I'm sorry.

38

39 (Question marked * read)

40

41 THE WITNESS: No, I would reject that because the reason
42 these crimes weren't reported to the police was because of
43 the desire of the victims that they not be reported to the
44 police.

45

46 MS LONERGAN: Q. In the protocol document that I have
47 just taken you to, you say that your particular processes

1 didn't follow chapter and verse this protocol; that's the
2 position, isn't it?

3 A. Yes.

4

5 Q. But did your processes at least follow in broad terms
6 the values to be promoted?

7 A. Yes.

8

9 Q. The values to be promoted appear on page 5 of the
10 document, and they are listed as:

11

12 *In dealing with allegations of criminal*
13 *behaviour against the accused, the*
14 *competent ecclesial authority is obliged to*
15 *take into account and preserve various*
16 *values.*

17

18 A. Yes.

19

20 Q. In the context of your particular process, you were
21 the ecclesial authority, in effect, weren't you?

22 A. No.

23

24 Q. Not in the special terms as set out here but in terms
25 of the requirement to act in a certain way consistent with
26 the values of this protocol document?

27 A. I would have personally wanted to act according to
28 those values, but I wasn't in any sense ever the competent
29 church authority.

30

31 Q. But you were acting as a church authority in the sense
32 that you were engaging in a process that was requiring
33 another priest to cooperate with a particular interview
34 that was going to have potentially a lasting effect on his
35 ability to continue to practise as a priest?

36 A. Yes.

37

38 Q. As to the values - first is:

39

40 *To act with justice, mercy and charity.*

41

42 A. Yes.

43

44 Q. Second is:

45

46 *To respect the civil law and not obstruct*
47 *or pervert the process of justice.*

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

A. Yes.

Q. Third:

To show pastoral solicitude for the welfare of any complainant, victim, victim's family or accused.

A. Yes.

Q. The fourth is:

To not call into question the good reputation of any person whether complainant, victim or accused and their right to privacy.

A. Yes.

Q. In relation to the one I've just read out, 4.1.4, can you assist the Commissioner with how it is that in interviewing a priest regarding allegations of sexual abuse, the good reputation of a priest would not be called into question?

A. That's about making that information public, and you wouldn't make public the fact that this interview occurred.

Q. That requirement to not call into question the good reputation of any person - does that include an embargo on reporting to the police that that person had been accused of sexually abusing children?

A. Nothing to do with reporting to the police.

Q. A later version of this particular protocol - and I'll take you to it because it's convenient to do so - is in volume 2 of the material. I'm sorry to have you jumping around, but it will save time in the long run. Tab 173.

A. Is this page 300?

Q. Yes, and if you wouldn't mind turning to page 304?

A. Yes.

Q. You'll see from having a glance at the front page of this particular version of the protocol, it appears to be an earlier version than the one we've just been looking at?

A. Yes.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Q. Do you see 4.1.4 on page 304 mentions the need to:
... safeguard the good name of the Church as a whole and act to prevent or remedy scandal.

Do you see that?

A. Yes.

Q. So this one occurs about three years before the version we've just been looking at? The other one is April 1992.

A. I think, I'm not sure that that document - that would have been in May 1990. Two years.

Q. Say again?

A. I think this was two years before.

Q. Yes, I see, this one is late 1989.

A. No, it's in fact - yes, this was presented in May 1990, I'm sorry, yes.

Q. You get that date from?

A. From the covering note:

... proposes to move at the 1990 Conference for the acceptance in principle of the strategy outlined in the protocol ...

So this, at this stage, is a draft document.

Q. The version that we were looking at before the one you currently have in front of you does not have that rider that they:

... must safeguard the good name of the Church as a whole and act to prevent or remedy scandal.

A. Yes.

Q. Can you assist with the origin of that particular phrase, what it means and its importance or otherwise?

A. I can't, I'm sorry.

Q. You have no idea where it comes from?

1 A. The words - the words? I'm sorry, I'm not sure which
2 words.
3
4 Q. The part I read about attempting to deal with the
5 matter so as to avoid bringing --
6
7 THE COMMISSIONER: "To prevent or remedy scandal".
8
9 MS LONERGAN: Q. Yes.
10 A. "Prevent or remedy scandals" is a common canon law
11 expression.
12
13 Q. Do you know why that was removed from the later
14 version of the protocol?
15 A. No, it's in there. It's 4.1.5:
16
17 *To act so as to prevent or remedy scandal.*
18
19 Q. So why was that then moved to be a separate
20 consideration, do you know?
21 A. I have no idea, I'm sorry.
22
23 Q. What does it mean?
24 A. It would be a situation, for example, where suppose
25 somebody in a parish makes allegations about the priest.
26 Let's hypothesise those allegations are unfounded. There's
27 controversy and whatever in the parish. There would be the
28 need to do something to remedy that and also to deal in
29 a way that doesn't allow, for example, that sort of gossip
30 around a parish that creates scandal.
31
32 Q. Do you agree that a bishop reporting a priest to the
33 police for sexually abusing a child would create scandal?
34 A. It would probably, to the contrary, prevent scandal,
35 if that's the method used to prevent harm to people in the
36 future.
37
38 Q. So there would be nothing in 4.1.5 that would prevent
39 a bishop reporting a priest to the police for sexually
40 abusing a child?
41 A. No.
42
43 Q. You were asked to prepare an affidavit or a statutory
44 declaration in relation to the activities of a company
45 known as Encompass Australasia Limited?
46 A. Yes.
47

1 Q. You prepared a statutory declaration that addressed
2 searches that had been made to see whether either
3 Denis McAlinden or James Fletcher had been dealt with by
4 the Encompass organisation?

5 A. Yes.

6

7 Q. I will provide to you a copy of your statutory
8 declaration and ask you whether it's true and correct? Can
9 you outline just in very general terms the operation of
10 Encompass Australasia and the purpose of it being
11 established?

12 A. Yes, in about 1996, from recollection, the bishops
13 sought to put in place a therapy program to deal with
14 people in the church who may benefit from some form of
15 therapy connected with psychosexual disorders and other
16 psychological problems - depression, anxiety, alcoholism
17 and the like.

18

19 Q. It was wound up at some point?

20 A. It was.

21

22 Q. Why was it?

23 A. They ran out of customers.

24

25 MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, I tender the statutory
26 declaration, which is dated 30 April 2013.

27

28 THE COMMISSIONER: The statutory declaration of
29 Father Lucas will be admitted and marked exhibit 148.

30

31 **EXHIBIT #148 STATUTORY DECLARATION OF FATHER LUCAS, DATED**
32 **30/04/2013**

33

34 MS LONERGAN: Q. Did you satisfy yourself personally,
35 Father Lucas, that there was no material within the records
36 relating to Encompass that touched on Fathers McAlinden or
37 Fletcher?

38 A. I did. Twice.

39

40 Q. What was the year that the Encompass organisation
41 ceased operation? 2008 it ceased operation?

42 A. That sounds correct, yes.

43

44 Q. Are you suggesting from your answer that, as from
45 2008, no priest had any psychological or psychosexual or
46 alcohol-related problem?

47 A. No, of course not. But this particular program, which

1 was a very expensive program, didn't have the critical mass
2 to conduct that sort of program. The therapists who were
3 engaged in it were then willing to continue in a private
4 capacity and they dealt with what cases arose after the
5 program was wound down, and the other matters were dealt
6 with in other psychiatric facilities.

7
8 Q. As at February and March 1993, had you put together
9 a particular way in which you would approach these
10 particular conversations that you had with priests?

11 A. Between ourselves, John Usher and myself had a broad
12 methodology, but it certainly wasn't documented.

13
14 Q. It wasn't documented as a procedure or a protocol that
15 you and Father Usher used?

16 A. No.

17
18 Q. Prior to McAlinden - and I appreciate you don't
19 remember your actual conversation with him - are you able
20 to say how many of these conversations you had conducted?

21 A. I wouldn't remember now, no.

22
23 MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, could I have a five-minute
24 break to take some instructions on a particular matter?

25
26 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, certainly.

27
28 **SHORT ADJOURNMENT**

29
30 MS LONERGAN: Thank you for that time, Commissioner.
31 I was able to shortcut various other matters I was to go
32 to.

33
34 THE COMMISSIONER: Very well, Ms Lonergan.

35
36 MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, there has been a request from
37 the media for access to copies of exhibits 142 to 148. If
38 those at the Bar table could let those who assist you know
39 by 4.15pm if there is any objection to the release of those
40 documents.

41
42 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

43
44 MS LONERGAN: Q. Father Lucas, you've given evidence to
45 the effect that you have a crystal clear recollection of
46 certain things that happened in 1993.

47 A. Yes.

1
2 Q. One of those things is certain aspects of your meeting
3 with [AL]?
4 A. Yes.
5
6 Q. The crystal clear recollection includes Sister Paula
7 Redgrove being present as the support person?
8 A. Yes.
9
10 Q. And a crystal clear recollection that Ms [AL] didn't
11 want to go to the police and the reasons associated with
12 it?
13 A. Yes.
14
15 Q. But it's the situation, is it, that you cannot recall
16 McAlinden at all?
17 A. Yes.
18
19 Q. And you cannot recall meeting with McAlinden in
20 circumstances where he had escaped conviction in Western
21 Australia for child sexual abuse allegations or charges?
22 A. I was aware of that.
23
24 Q. And you can't remember McAlinden, even though you saw
25 him not that long after the establishment of the special
26 issues group of which you were a member?
27 A. That's correct.
28
29 Q. He would have been one of your first half dozen, would
30 he, priests that you interviewed?
31 A. I can't recall. And remember, not only were there
32 priests involved, there were also religious brothers, and
33 so forth, yes.
34
35 Q. You've said that over the period of about six to
36 eight years, there were about 35 that you dealt with?
37 A. And that's a figure I can't stand by as - it was my
38 best estimate from trying to be more accurate from
39 a question put to me once before.
40
41 Q. I understand that. Once you were given this special
42 role with the special issues group, was there a flood of
43 incidents where you had to go and interview priests and
44 persons associated with the Catholic Church for
45 paedophile-related offences?
46 A. I'm not sure how we define what a "flood" is, but this
47 was a time in 1992/1993 where there was significant

1 publicity.

2

3 Q. You suggested that you recollect or at least
4 acknowledge that Sister Redgrove may well have been told by
5 you that McAlinden was a hard nut to crack?

6 A. Yes, that doesn't sound like my language, but words to
7 that effect is quite likely.

8

9 Q. You have also given evidence to the effect that
10 a paedophile, to your experience, rarely admits that they
11 had engaged in child sexual abuse?

12 A. Some do, but most don't.

13

14 Q. You still maintain the position, do you, that you have
15 absolutely no recollection of your meeting with McAlinden?

16 A. Yes.

17

18 Q. You're aware, aren't you, from reading the bundles of
19 material prepared for this Commission, that McAlinden wrote
20 to Bishop Clarke and, in his letters in 1995, mentioned his
21 interface with you?

22 A. Yes.

23

24 Q. You have read those letters with some care, haven't
25 you?

26 A. Yes.

27

28 Q. If I could show them to you again, the first is behind
29 tab 264 in volume 3. It is also exhibit 68. You're aware,
30 aren't you, father, that McAlinden, in this and at least
31 one other letter, states that he had made admissions
32 regarding his conduct with children to you?

33 A. Yes.

34

35 Q. The relevant part of this letter in terms of its
36 reference to you is in the third paragraph on the first
37 page, where he says:

38

39 *Incidentally, the word "confidential" has*
40 *a very hollow ring as far as Maitland is*
41 *concerned: Brian Lucas convinced me,*
42 *against my better judgment, to accept that*
43 *the information I gave him would be held in*
44 *strict confidence by the Bishop; yet within*
45 *a few weeks, the same as mentioned above,*
46 *was able to repeated on the testimony of*
47 *[a certain person].*

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Were you informed by Bishop Clarke about having received this particular letter?

A. No.

Q. Do you see in the paragraph above the one I've just read to you, it refers to McAlinden having received correspondence in the Philippines?

A. Yes.

Q. So it's clear, isn't it, that McAlinden went overseas and lived a life independent of the diocese in the Philippines?

A. I understand that's the case.

Q. Do you understand also that McAlinden, whilst he was in the Philippines, pretended to be a priest?

A. I've heard that suggestion. I find that quite extraordinary, that the bishops in the Philippines wouldn't have followed the most fundamental and basic of church rules and checked him out and allowed him to function as a priest.

Q. Did you find out whether those in the Maitland-Newcastle diocese had bothered to inform the bishops in the Philippines about McAlinden's offending background?

A. The way things work, you don't need to inform them. There is nothing more fundamental than the rules about incardination of priests, that no-one should ever be allowed to minister without him producing his celebret, and there's no way in the world McAlinden would have had a celebret, and there's no way in the world a bishop should have ever allowed him to have worked as a priest without ensuring that he was a priest in good standing.

Q. Was that the position in 1995?

A. It has been the position since the day I was ordained, when I got my first celebret.

Q. What's a celebret?

A. A celebret is a document that priests will take with them when they travel, generally in Latin, signed by the bishop, sealed by the bishop, a fairly elaborate, fancy-looking document that you can use if you are travelling. For example, you may wish to join a priest in a parish for a Sunday mass. Prudence would dictate that he

1 would ask you for that. We had a number of instances, when
2 I was on the staff at St Mary's Cathedral, where people
3 would turn up, in a sense, pretending to be a priest, and
4 that's the way of ensuring that no priest can function -
5 and the celebret is merely for the purposes of travelling.
6 If someone is looking for a position by way of ministry
7 that's beyond just something very casual, it's absolutely
8 fundamental that the church authority would check that he
9 is in good standing, which is done by a simple process.

10
11 Q. It wasn't done in this case, you assume?

12 A. Apparently not. I have no idea, but apparently not.

13
14 Q. You know, don't you, that McAlinden was able to, in
15 pretending to be a priest, access children in the
16 Philippines?

17 A. I have no knowledge of that.

18
19 Q. Could the witness be shown exhibit 78. Just before
20 you have a look at that document, were you satisfied, after
21 your role in dealing with McAlinden, that appropriate steps
22 had been taken from a child protection point of view?

23 A. I think it was probably the best that was on offer at
24 the time.

25
26 Q. Would you agree with me that the best that was on
27 offer at the time wasn't very good, was it?

28 A. It's hard to put a value on that. As I said, I would
29 never have foreseen in 1992 that any priest could work
30 anywhere in the world without a local bishop checking him
31 out. I would never have foreseen that. This is the most
32 extraordinary behaviour by the Philippine bishop.

33
34 Q. Did you inquire of the bishop at Maitland-Newcastle
35 what sort of background McAlinden had so that you could
36 properly assess whether the job you were doing for the
37 bishop was going to be enough to keep children safe from
38 McAlinden?

39 A. I was confident, because I understood the church law
40 and the policies and processes, that once he was taken out
41 of ministry, that was as far as we could go. Ideally if
42 the victims had wanted the matter prosecuted, and assuming
43 a successful prosecution, that would have been a better
44 outcome, but that wasn't the outcome that was available.

45
46 Q. Did you ask Bishop Clarke or anybody from the diocese
47 what was known about McAlinden's history of offending, if

1 there was any, in addition to the particular people you
2 were dealing with or had heard of?
3 A. I don't recall, I don't recall that. I think I took
4 on face value whatever either Bishop Clarke or
5 Monsignor Hart told me.
6
7 Q. At that time, did you have a practice as part of your
8 processes to inquire as to whether there were any other
9 historical complaints of sexual abuse by a particular
10 priest you were having a conversation with?
11 A. I presumed what they told me was what they wanted to
12 tell me.
13
14 Q. The question I'm asking is a little different. Did
15 you have a practice where you actually asked them what else
16 was known about a particular priest by way of historical
17 complaint?
18 A. I would have wanted to know what was the general
19 understanding of who this person was, what were the
20 complaints and what was known, yes.
21
22 Q. You would have expected that to be conveyed to you
23 without you asking?
24 A. Yes, certainly.
25
26 Q. Have a look at the first page of the letter. It's
27 apparently a letter from McAlinden to Bishop Malone?
28 A. Yes.
29
30 Q. It's dated 5 December 1995. Have you seen this letter
31 before today?
32 A. If it was in the bundle of papers, I may have read it.
33 I don't specifically recall it, but --
34
35 Q. It wasn't in the bundle of papers. It was tendered
36 later.
37 A. I've never seen the document.
38
39 Q. It commences with "To whom it may concern" on the
40 following page, and then there are some handwritten notes
41 under the heading "Canon 1044". Do you see that?
42 A. Yes.
43
44 Q. On numbered page 2, which has number 87 in the middle
45 of the page, there is a reference, right down the bottom of
46 the page, to some years in Papua New Guinea, where he had:
47

1 *... no problems whatsoever, even though*
2 *I was called on to do regular clinical work*
3 *before we got a permanent nurse ...*

4
5 A. Yes.

6
7 Q. On the next page:

8
9 *On the various occasions when things did go*
10 *wrong, I never for a moment tried to*
11 *minimise my guilt by blaming some*
12 *uncontrollable tendency - always making*
13 *sure of receiving the Sacrament of Penance*
14 *before offering Mass.*

15
16 Do you see that?

17 A. Yes.

18
19 Q. And:

20
21 *Likewise when I visited a qualified*
22 *psycho-analyst some years ago in*
23 *Castle Hill, after 5 or 6 consultations, he*
24 *assured me he found nothing in the nature*
25 *of an aberration.*

26
27 Do you see that?

28 A. Yes.

29
30 Q. Did you know anything about McAlinden having been
31 psychoanalysed by someone in Castle Hill?

32 A. I don't think I was ever told that. I think that
33 would be something I would remember.

34
35 Q. That would have been information that would have
36 assisted you in your processes, or not?

37 A. Marginally, perhaps. I don't know.

38
39 Q. It would have been relevant for you to know, though,
40 whether there was any psychological disorder?

41 A. Yes.

42
43 Q. Then on the next page, page 4, under "Canon 277", you
44 get a mention in this statement:

45
46 *Yes, here I have failed miserably in*
47 *observation of "perfect and perpetual*

1 *continence" ...*

2

3 Do you see that?

4 A. Yes.

5

6 Q. You know that canon 277 is regarding perfect and
7 perpetual continence, is it?

8 A. Yes.

9

10 Q. He goes on to say:

11

12 *... in relation to my vow of Chastity in*
13 *matters about which I have been accused and*
14 *of which I have accused myself, though some*
15 *of the individual cases mentioned by*
16 *Father Lucas (1993) did not occur, most of*
17 *all that concerning [AK] --*

18

19 And then he goes on to make some comments about [AK] --

20

21 *neither did the case happen that was*
22 *brought to court in WA in 1992.*

23

24 Do you agree with me that that paragraph indicates that
25 there has been some admission - I'm not saying to whom - on
26 the part of McAlinden that some individual cases that he
27 has been accused of did occur?

28 A. I don't know that that follows - the fact that he has
29 said individual cases did not occur, one might assume that
30 there were individual cases that did occur, but I don't
31 know that.

32

33 Q. You don't draw that from that paragraph?

34 A. It's a possible inference.

35

36 Q. You don't draw that inference?

37 A. I haven't given the matter consideration.

38

39 Q. We might ask you to do so overnight. Now, two
40 paragraphs down:

41

42 *However, as I explained to ...*

43

44 I'm sorry, I should let you read the intervening paragraph:

45

46 *I have seen in these failures the fact that*
47 *I allowed my spiritual life to become*

1 *weakened with the excuse of being too*
2 *busy - barely "fitting in" prayers of*
3 *obligation such as Divine Office, though*
4 *managing a daily Rosary.*

5
6 Do you see that?

7 A. Yes.

8
9 Q. Under that:

10
11 *However, as I explained to Father Lucas in*
12 *'93, that, by the grace of God and the help*
13 *of Our Blessed Lady, I had already become*
14 *completely free from all such wrong-doings,*
15 *in fact regard such as an abomination.*

16
17 Then he sets out a number of practices that "have been ever
18 so effective". Do you see that?

19 A. Yes.

20
21 Q. From your knowledge of paedophilia, is it the position
22 that paedophiles generally become completely free from that
23 particular disorder?

24 A. Not of the type of paedophilia that I think we're
25 associating with McAlinden.

26
27 Q. I will ask you to read this letter overnight to see if
28 there are any other matters you could assist us with, but
29 at the bottom paragraph on page 90 there is a reference
30 again to you. The paragraph commences:

31
32 *Fortunately, at a very early age, I'd been*
33 *taught the power of prayer, and now feel*
34 *I can claim to be a living example of that*
35 *power. So much so, that when I spoke to*
36 *Father Lucas, about 3 years ago, I assured*
37 *him I had no worry or fear of falling back*
38 *into the problems of the past. In fact, no*
39 *way would I have opened up and confessed so*
40 *freely to Father Lucas, admitting my past*
41 *failings, had I not been convinced that*
42 *this was a thing of the past.*

43
44 A. Yes.

45
46 Q. Would you agree with me that that, read at face value,
47 appears to be confirming that McAlinden admitted to you

1 incidences of past failings?
2 A. Assuming he's telling the truth there.
3
4 Q. Assuming he's telling the truth, that he admitted to
5 you past failings?
6 A. Assuming he's telling the truth.
7
8 Q. Yes. And in the context of your conversation with
9 him, "past failings" must be a reference to allegations of
10 sexually abusing children?
11 A. Yes.
12
13 Q. Does that prompt a memory of McAlinden in your mind,
14 given the references to prayer and the way in which he uses
15 language or speaks about his particular predicament?
16 A. No.
17
18 Q. In the next paragraph, would you agree with me there
19 is apparently an admission of failing miserably regarding
20 canon 277, and that means a failing in relation to
21 perpetual and perfect continence?
22 A. Yes.
23
24 Q. That's a reference to inappropriate sexual behaviour
25 or sexual behaviour?
26 A. Yes, yes.
27
28 Q. Do you see on page 7, McAlinden refers to having had
29 some months at San Pablo --
30 A. Yes.
31
32 Q. -- Colleges Complex. Do you see that?
33 A. Sorry, at the Cathedral of San Pablo, at the top.
34
35 Q. Thank you very much. Yes, he had been posted to the
36 Cathedral of San Pablo. I'm sorry, we had better check
37 that from the page before. McAlinden claims, in the last
38 paragraph on page 91, that Bishop Bantigue had asked him
39 to:
40
41 *... undertake the position of Chaplain to*
42 *the San Pablo Colleges Complex where there*
43 *was an enrolment of over 7,500 pupils,*
44 *ranging from kindergarten through primary,*
45 *secondary, teachers college, University and*
46 *including Medical College.*
47

1 Do you see that?

2 A. Yes.

3

4 Q. McAlinden claims that he:

5

6 *... made a point of explaining my situation*

7 *and past history to the good Bishop, and*

8 *advised him why my Faculties had been*

9

withdrawn.

10

11 And do you see that, on the next page, McAlinden refers to
12 having heard "no less than 10 thousand Confessions"? Do
13 you see that?

14 A. Yes.

15

16 THE COMMISSIONER: In six months, Ms Lonergan.

17

18 MS LONERGAN: Q. Yes, in six months - 10,000 confessions
19 in six months. Would you agree that that must have
20 entailed access to a number of children, in that statistic?

21 A. As I read that, I think this is a fantasy.

22

23 Q. Albeit as a priest associated with a school that has
24 children ranging from kindergarten, there is a high
25 likelihood, is there not, that McAlinden accessed children,
26 had access to children?

27 A. As I said, I am absolutely staggered and completely
28 and utterly appalled that any bishop would allow anyone to
29 work in that situation. I think, if you're asking me for
30 an opinion on this on face value, he has dreamt up this
31 fantasy for the purposes of justifying his canonical
32 position.

33

34 Q. You know as a matter of fact that McAlinden did work
35 in the diocese of San Pablo, don't you?

36 A. That seems to be the situation, yes. As I said,
37 I find it extraordinary that he was allowed to do that.

38

39 Q. That he was able to go overseas, work in another
40 diocese in a foreign country and conduct confessions with
41 people, including children?

42 A. As I said, that staggers me and shocks me, that the
43 bishops could have been so appallingly careless in
44 following the fundamentals of church policy.

45

46 Q. What it shows, doesn't it --

47 A. Could I just say this: that's what he says he's

1 doing. I don't know the extent to which what he says he's
2 doing in fact he did do.

3

4 Q. You know from documents you've read in the bundles
5 that he did work in the diocese of San Pablo?

6 A. Yes.

7

8 Q. You know that?

9 A. Yes, but I don't know that that necessarily involved
10 any misconduct.

11

12 Q. I'm not suggesting that, but you know that he worked
13 as a priest in the San Pablo diocese from the documents
14 you've read?

15 A. That's what I'm saying; that is what I find quite
16 staggering.

17

18 Q. You were working on the basis that the processes that
19 you had engaged in would mean that McAlinden would not have
20 this privilege and this access, acting as a priest?

21 A. Certainly.

22

23 Q. By your "processes", I mean the conversation with
24 McAlinden in 1993 where his removal of faculties was
25 negotiated.

26 A. Yes.

27

28 Q. You understand that, don't you; that's the process I'm
29 talking about?

30 A. Yes.

31

32 Q. So would you agree with me that the process failed in
33 terms of preventing McAlinden from acting as a priest?

34 A. In this particular instance, it did, yes.

35

36 MS LONERGAN: Would that be a convenient time,
37 Commissioner?

38

39 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, thank you very much, Ms Lonergan.
40 I will adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow.

41

42 **AT 4PM THE COMMISSION WAS ADJOURNED**
43 **TO WEDNESDAY, 25 JULY 2013 AT 10AM**

44

45

46

47

#	1556:11, 1556:12, 1556:24, 1558:29, 1560:46, 1561:17, 1590:30, 1610:31, 1612:44, 1615:7, 1645:33, 1646:39 1989 [2] - 1555:23, 1654:20 1989/1990 [1] - 1582:41 1990 [5] - 1568:32, 1605:16, 1654:15, 1654:22, 1654:27 1990s [1] - 1588:38 1991 [5] - 1560:21, 1560:37, 1560:46, 1561:14, 1601:26 1992 [11] - 1560:24, 1568:44, 1574:38, 1575:5, 1575:16, 1577:8, 1647:5, 1647:22, 1654:13, 1661:29, 1664:22 1992/1993 [3] - 1579:35, 1605:34, 1658:47 1993 [29] - 1555:11, 1574:24, 1574:38, 1575:5, 1575:17, 1577:8, 1581:45, 1582:14, 1582:32, 1585:15, 1586:11, 1586:38, 1592:41, 1595:41, 1599:12, 1599:15, 1601:14, 1605:11, 1611:13, 1611:16, 1624:43, 1632:27, 1640:31, 1643:43, 1648:40, 1657:8, 1657:46, 1664:16, 1668:24 1995 [8] - 1568:33, 1586:15, 1586:38, 1603:18, 1640:34, 1659:20, 1660:37, 1662:30 1995/1996 [2] - 1568:36, 1582:43 1996 [11] - 1568:33, 1583:7, 1602:16, 1621:16, 1624:39, 1624:41, 1641:28, 1645:15, 1645:19, 1645:25, 1656:12 1997 [1] - 1645:15 1999 [1] - 1555:14	1556:42, 1557:15, 1656:26, 1668:43 222 [1] - 1562:1 223 [1] - 1559:29 23(2) [1] - 1550:10 24 [1] - 1549:29 25 [2] - 1556:25, 1668:43 26 [3] - 1557:36, 1558:16, 1558:19 26/10/1987 [1] - 1558:23 264 [1] - 1659:29 277 [3] - 1663:43, 1664:6, 1666:20	8 87 [1] - 1662:44 9 9 [1] - 1561:47 90 [1] - 1665:29 91 [1] - 1666:38	1630:25, 1638:33, 1639:16, 1642:27, 1647:38, 1653:24, 1658:21, 1659:11, 1662:9 abused [22] - 1556:29, 1564:10, 1577:28, 1591:25, 1593:11, 1594:42, 1597:16, 1616:47, 1617:9, 1618:7, 1634:34, 1635:17, 1635:25, 1635:36, 1636:11, 1636:37, 1637:4, 1637:17, 1638:31, 1638:33, 1638:37, 1642:4 abuses [3] - 1558:37, 1558:38, 1633:44 abusing [30] - 1565:43, 1593:6, 1606:36, 1610:28, 1616:30, 1616:39, 1620:5, 1620:7, 1620:12, 1620:19, 1620:42, 1621:1, 1621:2, 1624:15, 1634:40, 1635:7, 1636:23, 1638:23, 1638:25, 1638:28, 1641:19, 1641:36, 1642:24, 1642:36, 1642:46, 1643:38, 1653:32, 1655:33, 1655:40, 1666:10 abusive [2] - 1565:3, 1569:46 academic [1] - 1629:24 accept [7] - 1565:30, 1571:7, 1619:25, 1619:35, 1635:13, 1651:21, 1659:42 accept" [1] - 1587:29 acceptance [1] - 1654:28 accepted [1] - 1578:41 accepting [1] - 1635:14 accepts [1] - 1587:29 access [11] - 1590:44, 1608:45, 1609:24, 1611:34, 1625:34, 1636:1, 1657:37, 1661:15, 1667:20, 1667:26, 1668:20 accessed [2] - 1600:2, 1667:25 accesses [1] - 1608:20 accessing [1] - 1609:2 accessories [2] - 1615:34, 1615:39 accompanied [1] - 1569:7 accord [1] - 1591:27 accordance [1] - 1629:32 according [3] - 1597:25, 1634:27, 1652:27 account [4] - 1568:16, 1598:8, 1598:36, 1652:15
1	2	A	3	
'93 [1] - 1665:12 1 [1] - 1549:25 1.1 [1] - 1615:18 1.15 [1] - 1590:46 10 [7] - 1559:29, 1577:38, 1577:40, 1577:45, 1624:22, 1667:12, 1668:40 10,000 [1] - 1667:18 10.20am [2] - 1549:29, 1550:7 1044" [1] - 1662:41 10AM [1] - 1668:43 11 [2] - 1556:42, 1557:15 11/03/2013 [1] - 1557:19 12 [1] - 1645:33 132 [1] - 1590:44 138 [2] - 1557:26, 1557:35 142 [7] - 1557:16, 1558:25, 1561:19, 1561:23, 1561:28, 1646:41, 1657:37 143 [1] - 1557:31 144 [1] - 1558:20 145 [2] - 1561:25, 1590:44 146 [1] - 1614:16 147 [1] - 1645:22 148 [2] - 1656:29, 1657:37 15 [2] - 1549:30, 1624:22 152 [1] - 1645:28 153 [1] - 1646:39 1719 [1] - 1625:43 173 [1] - 1653:38 1974 [2] - 1550:33, 1550:46 1975 [2] - 1550:46, 1551:4 1978 [1] - 1553:40 1979 [1] - 1551:9 1980 [2] - 1550:26, 1554:19 1980s [1] - 1554:14 1983 [1] - 1555:6 1985 [1] - 1555:3 1986 [1] - 1554:22 1987 [4] - 1556:1, 1556:10, 1558:16, 1558:19 1988 [17] - 1555:11, 1555:14, 1555:29, 1556:1, 1556:2, 1556:11, 1556:12, 1556:24, 1558:29, 1560:46, 1561:17, 1590:30, 1610:31, 1612:44, 1615:7, 1645:33, 1646:39 1989 [2] - 1555:23, 1654:20 1989/1990 [1] - 1582:41 1990 [5] - 1568:32, 1605:16, 1654:15, 1654:22, 1654:27 1990s [1] - 1588:38 1991 [5] - 1560:21, 1560:37, 1560:46, 1561:14, 1601:26 1992 [11] - 1560:24, 1568:44, 1574:38, 1575:5, 1575:16, 1577:8, 1647:5, 1647:22, 1654:13, 1661:29, 1664:22 1992/1993 [3] - 1579:35, 1605:34, 1658:47 1993 [29] - 1555:11, 1574:24, 1574:38, 1575:5, 1575:17, 1577:8, 1581:45, 1582:14, 1582:32, 1585:15, 1586:11, 1586:38, 1592:41, 1595:41, 1599:12, 1599:15, 1601:14, 1605:11, 1611:13, 1611:16, 1624:43, 1632:27, 1640:31, 1643:43, 1648:40, 1657:8, 1657:46, 1664:16, 1668:24 1995 [8] - 1568:33, 1586:15, 1586:38, 1603:18, 1640:34, 1659:20, 1660:37, 1662:30 1995/1996 [2] - 1568:36, 1582:43 1996 [11] - 1568:33, 1583:7, 1602:16, 1621:16, 1624:39, 1624:41, 1641:28, 1645:15, 1645:19, 1645:25, 1656:12 1997 [1] - 1645:15 1999 [1] - 1555:14	3 [6] - 1625:3, 1647:21, 1647:30, 1659:29, 1665:36 30 [2] - 1638:37, 1656:26 30/04/2013 [1] - 1656:32 300 [1] - 1653:39 304 [2] - 1653:41, 1654:2 316 [3] - 1604:18, 1605:15, 1621:9 35 [3] - 1568:28, 1577:38, 1658:36 4 [1] - 1663:43 4.1.4 [2] - 1653:21, 1654:2 4.1.5 [2] - 1655:15, 1655:38 4.15pm [1] - 1657:39 40 [2] - 1638:23, 1638:33 489 [2] - 1625:13, 1629:32 4PM [1] - 1668:42 5 [4] - 1630:8, 1652:9, 1662:30, 1663:23 52 [1] - 1625:2 53 [3] - 1625:12, 1629:33, 1629:35 54 [2] - 1626:22, 1626:33 6 [2] - 1632:13, 1663:23 68 [1] - 1659:29 7 [1] - 1666:28 7,500 [1] - 1666:43 70 [3] - 1611:4, 1611:6, 1630:7 70-year-old [1] - 1611:1 71 [2] - 1630:7, 1630:10 72 [2] - 1632:8, 1632:13 74 [1] - 1641:14 78 [1] - 1661:19	aberration [1] - 1663:25 ability [3] - 1597:39, 1616:43, 1652:35 able [38] - 1555:35, 1559:7, 1559:45, 1560:5, 1562:47, 1567:42, 1573:24, 1573:34, 1582:32, 1582:37, 1583:1, 1585:31, 1585:45, 1588:8, 1588:36, 1590:21, 1590:22, 1590:28, 1596:19, 1596:33, 1597:1, 1598:26, 1598:44, 1604:1, 1609:23, 1610:13, 1618:11, 1619:31, 1623:22, 1639:44, 1640:8, 1645:12, 1646:25, 1657:19, 1657:31, 1659:46, 1661:14, 1667:39 abomination [1] - 1665:15 absolute [2] - 1572:3, 1635:10 absolutely [13] - 1565:30, 1567:10, 1568:10, 1570:31, 1577:18, 1592:43, 1596:6, 1616:18, 1618:1, 1640:15, 1659:15, 1661:7, 1667:27 Abuse [1] - 1645:29 ABUSE [1] - 1549:15 abuse [45] - 1551:29, 1554:2, 1554:11, 1554:16, 1556:22, 1558:30, 1565:8, 1569:26, 1570:4, 1571:28, 1572:22, 1574:8, 1574:26, 1574:40, 1577:41, 1578:2, 1578:9, 1584:24, 1584:28, 1589:39, 1592:40, 1596:32, 1596:46, 1597:7, 1598:40, 1599:16, 1599:28, 1602:43, 1603:30, 1605:27, 1606:6, 1616:4, 1620:28, 1624:5, 1628:22,		
1	2	A	3	

accounts [1] - 1564:33
accurate [13] - 1563:44, 1570:45, 1575:35, 1578:23, 1579:27, 1580:8, 1580:12, 1580:24, 1581:21, 1582:18, 1590:19, 1597:39, 1658:38
accurately [4] - 1559:8, 1567:18, 1567:20, 1576:15
accusation [2] - 1619:19, 1619:33
accusations [6] - 1574:47, 1575:4, 1577:4, 1642:3, 1650:32, 1650:33
accused [39] - 1558:27, 1559:11, 1560:36, 1561:24, 1561:32, 1561:37, 1562:3, 1563:12, 1564:36, 1565:43, 1568:42, 1569:45, 1570:3, 1576:38, 1578:15, 1594:24, 1594:29, 1606:36, 1609:41, 1610:27, 1616:3, 1619:31, 1619:42, 1620:4, 1620:6, 1620:18, 1620:42, 1624:15, 1630:25, 1634:40, 1641:36, 1642:45, 1652:13, 1653:8, 1653:16, 1653:31, 1664:13, 1664:14, 1664:27
ACCUSED [1] - 1561:27
achieve [1] - 1576:5
achieved [1] - 1588:6
acknowledge [5] - 1589:22, 1590:24, 1595:4, 1597:15, 1659:4
acknowledged [3] - 1589:34, 1589:38, 1639:24
acknowledgment [5] - 1580:23, 1589:14, 1589:27, 1589:33, 1589:40
acquire [1] - 1619:20
acquired [1] - 1619:24
acquitted [5] - 1588:11, 1606:3, 1643:39, 1643:44, 1644:3
Act [3] - 1550:10, 1604:18, 1604:36
act [11] - 1578:31, 1578:33, 1605:6, 1615:34, 1615:39, 1652:25, 1652:27, 1652:40, 1654:5, 1654:38, 1655:17
ACT [1] - 1583:15
acting [4] - 1608:22, 1652:31, 1668:20, 1668:33
action [4] - 1563:37, 1600:33, 1602:30, 1639:46
active [1] - 1605:22
activities [3] - 1630:34, 1648:40, 1655:44
activity [2] - 1598:1, 1639:7
ACTS [1] - 1561:28
acts [7] - 1559:11, 1560:36, 1561:24, 1561:32, 1576:37, 1608:32, 1625:45
acts" [1] - 1558:28
actual [3] - 1584:2, 1585:27, 1657:19
addition [1] - 1662:1
address [1] - 1564:8
addressed [2] - 1604:16, 1656:1
addresses [1] - 1604:8
addressing [2] - 1604:14, 1641:15
adhere [1] - 1604:45
adjoorn [2] - 1590:39, 1668:40
ADJOURNED [1] - 1668:42
adjournment [1] - 1619:4
ADJOURNMENT [3] - 1590:41, 1618:26, 1657:28
administer [1] - 1590:22
admissible [2] - 1580:2, 1580:43
admission [35] - 1565:3, 1565:22, 1571:12, 1589:18, 1589:21, 1590:23, 1591:33, 1591:36, 1592:6, 1592:9, 1592:10, 1593:15, 1593:22, 1594:1, 1594:6, 1594:11, 1594:12, 1616:47, 1617:8, 1617:16, 1617:17, 1618:11, 1626:24, 1626:35, 1626:45, 1632:21, 1632:27, 1632:28, 1634:33, 1634:34, 1636:22, 1637:18, 1664:25, 1666:19
admission" [1] - 1592:13
admissions [23] - 1571:13, 1576:27, 1577:27, 1578:8, 1588:43, 1589:1, 1589:2, 1589:7, 1591:24, 1591:32, 1591:38, 1593:6, 1593:10, 1593:28, 1593:38, 1594:17, 1594:40, 1617:46, 1618:6, 1624:4, 1627:8, 1635:9, 1659:31
admit [4] - 1577:9, 1577:40, 1592:31, 1593:14
admits [4] - 1637:1, 1638:23, 1638:25, 1659:10
admitted [28] - 1551:11, 1551:14, 1557:15, 1558:19, 1561:25, 1565:13, 1571:11, 1576:24, 1578:2, 1594:15, 1614:16, 1616:29, 1616:39, 1632:18, 1633:43, 1634:40, 1635:41, 1636:1, 1636:10, 1636:36, 1637:16, 1638:19, 1639:7, 1639:24, 1645:21, 1656:29, 1665:47, 1666:4
admitting [6] - 1577:15, 1593:42, 1635:7, 1638:24, 1665:40
adolescent [2] - 1553:45, 1554:7
adopt [1] - 1590:24
adopted [1] - 1649:16
adopting [3] - 1579:43, 1579:46, 1594:1
adoption [1] - 1647:43
adult [4] - 1556:23, 1556:30, 1567:47, 1647:43
adults [2] - 1636:42, 1637:3
advantageous [1] - 1571:38
adverse [10] - 1578:21, 1581:1, 1603:11, 1605:28, 1606:16, 1606:17, 1606:20, 1606:21, 1606:24, 1631:10
advice [20] - 1559:3, 1570:15, 1570:16, 1570:21, 1570:24, 1579:12, 1581:7, 1581:21, 1586:26, 1600:27, 1601:14, 1601:16, 1601:17, 1604:35, 1620:38, 1620:40, 1620:46, 1621:6, 1621:8, 1621:10
advise [1] - 1555:37
advised [3] - 1591:19, 1650:40, 1667:8
advisers [1] - 1587:4
advising [1] - 1586:40
advocate [1] - 1562:10
affairs [1] - 1623:43
affect [1] - 1556:28
affected [2] - 1553:2, 1601:21
affects [1] - 1648:6
affidavit [15] - 1556:40, 1556:42, 1557:6, 1557:12, 1557:14, 1557:21, 1612:44, 1614:21, 1614:24, 1615:3, 1646:42, 1647:16, 1647:19, 1655:43
AFFIDAVIT [1] - 1557:18
affirm [1] - 1637:12
affirmed [1] - 1591:45
affirming [1] - 1637:5
age [3] - 1597:14, 1611:6, 1665:32
agencies [2] - 1554:45, 1622:32
agitating [1] - 1603:20
agitation [1] - 1603:19
ago [8] - 1607:37, 1607:38, 1621:36, 1638:30, 1650:25, 1650:26, 1663:22, 1665:36
agree [48] - 1553:33, 1561:30, 1562:18, 1564:4, 1564:22, 1565:19, 1567:19, 1580:46, 1581:16, 1581:22, 1582:17, 1582:22, 1588:20, 1589:25, 1590:26, 1599:33, 1602:5, 1602:16, 1602:36, 1602:42, 1603:37, 1604:4, 1605:19, 1609:7, 1609:35, 1610:6, 1612:15, 1612:23, 1612:30, 1616:2, 1616:11, 1616:37, 1617:30, 1622:16, 1631:13, 1631:44, 1636:21, 1640:18, 1642:38, 1642:43, 1646:15, 1655:32, 1661:26, 1664:24, 1665:46, 1666:18, 1667:19, 1668:32
agreed [7] - 1571:16, 1575:38, 1575:45, 1576:19, 1576:47, 1619:8, 1634:43
agreeing [8] - 1571:22, 1576:43, 1577:15, 1581:4, 1635:1, 1637:21
agreement [6] - 1561:41, 1571:20, 1590:27, 1635:11, 1635:39, 1636:4
AI [3] - 1585:13, 1591:26, 1594:42
aid [1] - 1551:6
aims [2] - 1609:8, 1612:23
AJ [24] - 1573:5, 1573:28, 1584:15, 1584:17, 1584:31, 1584:36, 1585:12, 1585:21, 1585:30, 1587:15, 1587:16, 1587:42, 1588:42, 1591:14, 1594:39, 1595:15, 1595:27, 1606:14, 1644:1, 1644:5, 1644:16, 1644:38, 1644:45
AJ [3] - 1573:3, 1591:5, 1644:25
AK [4] - 1591:25, 1594:42, 1664:17, 1664:19
AI [1] - 1596:6
AL [22] - 1591:25, 1594:42, 1595:44, 1596:1, 1596:4, 1596:12, 1596:31, 1596:45, 1598:3, 1606:13, 1613:4, 1613:19, 1618:2, 1618:6, 1618:13, 1627:31, 1628:5, 1628:26, 1637:35, 1643:47, 1658:3, 1658:10
ALJ [2] - 1613:16, 1613:17
albeit [1] - 1667:23
alcohol [1] - 1656:46
alcohol-related [1] - 1656:46
alcoholism [1] - 1656:16
allegation [6] - 1574:30, 1584:41, 1584:42, 1590:30, 1617:28, 1642:26
ALLEGATIONS [1] - 1549:15
allegations [30] - 1555:25, 1564:46, 1565:8, 1567:38, 1567:39, 1567:43, 1568:5, 1569:26, 1570:38, 1589:34, 1599:34, 1600:1, 1600:4, 1601:31, 1602:20, 1605:21, 1605:27, 1606:32, 1621:1, 1632:9, 1632:18, 1642:9, 1644:10, 1646:46, 1652:12, 1653:23, 1655:25, 1655:26, 1658:21, 1666:9
alleged [33] - 1564:31, 1566:6, 1567:30, 1567:34, 1567:35, 1569:25, 1571:10, 1572:25, 1573:26, 1574:7, 1574:8, 1575:29, 1576:2, 1576:17, 1576:22, 1576:23, 1576:37, 1577:2, 1577:8, 1581:9, 1581:36, 1582:40, 1583:20, 1583:21, 1583:39, 1585:2, 1585:7, 1585:12, 1588:47, 1589:6, 1589:15, 1601:10, 1617:33
alleging [1] - 1597:20

allocated [1] - 1570:14
allow [6] - 1564:19, 1580:29, 1597:14, 1598:26, 1655:29, 1667:28
allowed [10] - 1553:6, 1553:13, 1580:37, 1593:29, 1597:4, 1660:21, 1660:31, 1660:34, 1664:47, 1667:37
allowing [1] - 1596:35
almost [1] - 1583:35
altered [1] - 1603:29
amount [1] - 1609:37
amounted [1] - 1599:36
analogy [2] - 1590:19, 1642:40
analysis [1] - 1604:18
analyst [1] - 1663:22
angry [1] - 1644:2
annexed [2] - 1557:1, 1647:4
annexure [7] - 1612:46, 1614:21, 1615:3, 1646:42, 1647:8, 1647:16, 1647:20
anonymised [2] - 1645:8, 1645:16
answer [24] - 1561:38, 1566:15, 1569:39, 1570:40, 1587:6, 1593:29, 1593:36, 1593:46, 1594:34, 1607:39, 1610:22, 1610:24, 1616:40, 1620:10, 1624:12, 1625:24, 1630:42, 1636:32, 1650:9, 1651:10, 1651:27, 1651:28, 1651:30, 1656:44
answering [1] - 1593:23
answers [2] - 1609:21, 1625:35
anxiety [1] - 1656:16
anyway [1] - 1580:3
apologise [3] - 1550:1, 1635:29, 1642:40
apostolic [1] - 1586:25
appalled [1] - 1667:28
appalling [1] - 1667:43
appear [3] - 1607:17, 1607:19, 1652:9
appearance [1] - 1627:23
appeared [1] - 1614:41
applicable [1] - 1590:13
applies [1] - 1590:10
apply [1] - 1642:34
applying [1] - 1632:26
appointed [2] - 1568:46, 1626:15
appointment [6] - 1574:27, 1607:7, 1607:10, 1607:40, 1607:41, 1650:36
appreciate [5] - 1584:2, 1591:6, 1613:23, 1624:11, 1657:18
approach [7] - 1561:33, 1561:35, 1561:36, 1585:14, 1632:38, 1639:33, 1657:9
appropriate [10] - 1563:16, 1571:14, 1571:28, 1603:16, 1611:23, 1624:1, 1624:3, 1637:3, 1649:9, 1661:21
appropriately [1] - 1612:13
appropriateness [1] - 1630:14
April [10] - 1556:2, 1556:11, 1556:12, 1615:7, 1645:33, 1646:39, 1647:5, 1647:22, 1654:12, 1656:26
Archdiocese [1] - 1550:23
archdiocese [8] - 1555:3, 1558:12, 1570:6, 1583:10, 1583:12, 1612:1, 1626:6, 1630:24
archive [4] - 1625:15, 1625:40, 1625:47, 1631:2
archives [4] - 1621:18, 1621:43, 1622:6, 1646:10
archivists [1] - 1630:39
ARE [1] - 1561:27
area [3] - 1556:35, 1562:6, 1583:30
argue [2] - 1578:44, 1578:47
argued [3] - 1631:16, 1641:20, 1642:36
argues [1] - 1623:30
arise [3] - 1553:16, 1601:45, 1619:33
arisen [2] - 1608:22, 1646:28
arises [1] - 1642:44
arising [1] - 1648:7
armed [4] - 1635:2, 1635:4, 1635:6, 1635:24
arose [12] - 1593:27, 1593:36, 1602:3, 1603:18, 1603:21, 1603:23, 1619:46, 1620:20, 1620:25, 1625:33, 1638:21, 1657:4
aroused [1] - 1606:13
arrangement [3] - 1572:10, 1572:13, 1639:42
arranging [1] - 1587:38
arrive [1] - 1562:7
arrived [1] - 1589:10
article [13] - 1604:1, 1604:5, 1604:9, 1604:13, 1621:16, 1621:21, 1622:20, 1622:36, 1622:42, 1623:8, 1623:30, 1623:34, 1629:42
articled [1] - 1550:42
articulated [1] - 1627:46
aside [4] - 1563:26, 1589:37, 1601:8, 1601:37
aspect [9] - 1552:37, 1552:38, 1554:1, 1564:42, 1572:21, 1584:11, 1596:22, 1596:23, 1627:31
aspects [11] - 1561:39, 1561:43, 1566:45, 1570:19, 1596:5, 1596:17, 1596:30, 1617:47, 1627:33, 1648:26, 1658:2
assault [6] - 1558:2, 1567:3, 1573:18, 1593:2, 1612:45, 1643:30
assess [1] - 1661:36
assessing [1] - 1642:3
assist [18] - 1552:42, 1555:24, 1556:18, 1559:46, 1560:15, 1562:23, 1569:44, 1582:23, 1585:45, 1588:9, 1588:17, 1590:46, 1594:3, 1614:6, 1653:22, 1654:43, 1657:38, 1665:28
assistance [7] - 1560:8, 1560:17, 1562:45, 1563:5, 1565:36, 1585:47, 1586:32
assistant [1] - 1610:46
assisted [4] - 1560:45, 1561:13, 1582:28, 1663:36
assisting [1] - 1576:12
Assisting [1] - 1549:36
associated [8] - 1551:33, 1609:26, 1609:27, 1629:39, 1639:25, 1658:11, 1658:44, 1667:23
associating [1] - 1665:25
association [1] - 1624:24
assume [4] - 1589:21, 1641:35, 1661:11, 1664:29
assuming [9] - 1589:18, 1617:36, 1644:45, 1649:46, 1649:47, 1661:42, 1666:2, 1666:4, 1666:6
assumption [2] - 1561:8, 1611:26
assured [2] - 1663:24, 1665:36
AT [2] - 1668:42, 1668:43
attached [3] - 1556:1, 1612:44, 1614:24
attempt [5] - 1559:33, 1615:35, 1616:1, 1616:4, 1619:26
attempting [2] - 1616:12, 1655:4
attended [3] - 1624:19, 1624:26, 1640:30
attending [3] - 1581:19, 1583:18, 1592:23
attention [4] - 1623:11, 1626:32, 1630:13, 1630:26
attitude [1] - 1644:9
attract [2] - 1609:36, 1623:10
attributed [1] - 1645:32
August [1] - 1550:26
Australasia [2] - 1655:45, 1656:10
Australia [14] - 1561:34, 1562:7, 1562:19, 1588:11, 1588:12, 1588:29, 1606:3, 1606:7, 1606:11, 1607:15, 1621:17, 1624:21, 1643:38, 1658:21
Australian [8] - 1552:41, 1555:15, 1556:7, 1560:7, 1563:5, 1615:7, 1624:32, 1646:47
authored [1] - 1645:18
AUTHORED [1] - 1645:24
authoritative [1] - 1629:27
authorities [12] - 1590:33, 1590:34, 1600:3, 1604:20, 1616:44, 1641:1, 1641:22, 1641:29, 1642:31, 1642:38, 1643:6, 1650:40
authority [7] - 1567:25, 1629:26, 1652:14, 1652:21, 1652:29, 1652:31, 1661:8
available [6] - 1560:41, 1561:4, 1575:31, 1575:32, 1624:34, 1661:44
avoid [5] - 1598:35, 1612:1, 1612:9, 1651:5, 1655:5
avoiding [1] - 1619:19
award [1] - 1554:26
awarded [1] - 1554:46
aware [20] - 1554:10, 1557:10, 1572:37, 1573:5, 1581:39, 1582:3, 1582:6, 1586:14, 1591:20, 1605:14, 1606:10, 1628:16, 1628:25, 1640:33, 1640:41, 1643:37, 1643:43, 1658:22, 1659:18, 1659:29

B

Bachelor [1] - 1554:18
background [10] - 1558:37, 1592:14, 1593:41, 1602:39, 1611:7, 1611:14, 1620:37, 1634:32, 1660:27, 1661:35
backwards [1] - 1582:39
balance [2] - 1595:7, 1595:10
Bantigue [1] - 1666:38
Bar [3] - 1553:30, 1590:45, 1657:38
barely [1] - 1665:2
barrister [2] - 1551:12, 1551:15
based [3] - 1574:35, 1611:25, 1631:10
basic [12] - 1660:20
basis [12] - 1560:20, 1572:2, 1575:43, 1577:39, 1578:35, 1606:14, 1626:46, 1633:6, 1636:4, 1637:19, 1650:16, 1668:18
batch [1] - 1610:4
batteries [1] - 1550:3
bear [2] - 1593:18, 1634:35
beat [1] - 1606:7
became [2] - 1605:14, 1606:10
become [7] - 1608:27, 1640:20, 1640:41, 1643:37, 1664:47, 1665:13, 1665:22
becomes [1] - 1646:22
beg [1] - 1594:20
begin [1] - 1560:18
beginning [1] - 1550:46
behalf [1] - 1637:35
behaviour [30] - 1555:25, 1562:3, 1563:12, 1565:3, 1569:46, 1570:4, 1570:5, 1570:7, 1572:2, 1588:43, 1591:24, 1591:32, 1592:42, 1594:41, 1606:9, 1608:29, 1611:30, 1635:42, 1635:46, 1636:2, 1639:36, 1639:38, 1640:5, 1646:47, 1647:38, 1652:13, 1661:32, 1666:24, 1666:25
behind [3] - 1561:23, 1646:39, 1659:28
bell [3] - 1588:44, 1613:28, 1613:29
belong [1] - 1591:46
below [1] - 1629:35
beneficial [1] - 1564:22

benefit [9] - 1555:19, 1556:41, 1557:23, 1562:31, 1562:44, 1579:23, 1625:29, 1646:47, 1656:14
best [16] - 1555:45, 1567:8, 1572:40, 1572:42, 1587:1, 1590:33, 1597:38, 1598:17, 1612:26, 1626:30, 1639:37, 1649:12, 1650:45, 1658:38, 1661:23, 1661:26
betraying [3] - 1600:46, 1601:5, 1601:8
better [12] - 1564:1, 1571:40, 1572:4, 1602:30, 1602:37, 1617:28, 1626:25, 1650:36, 1651:30, 1659:42, 1661:43, 1666:36
between [9] - 1555:3, 1558:37, 1558:43, 1559:2, 1571:22, 1589:9, 1633:21, 1641:10, 1657:11
beyond [2] - 1615:16, 1661:7
biggest [1] - 1608:42
Bill [1] - 1569:18
Bishop [13] - 1585:33, 1585:39, 1586:44, 1606:12, 1644:24, 1659:20, 1659:44, 1660:2, 1661:46, 1662:4, 1662:27, 1666:38, 1667:7
bishop [87] - 1555:40, 1562:9, 1565:16, 1565:24, 1566:2, 1566:5, 1566:8, 1566:11, 1566:25, 1566:44, 1572:10, 1572:15, 1572:16, 1575:10, 1575:24, 1575:30, 1575:45, 1575:46, 1576:4, 1576:11, 1576:12, 1576:16, 1576:18, 1576:19, 1576:21, 1576:26, 1576:29, 1576:32, 1576:34, 1576:38, 1576:44, 1578:5, 1578:7, 1578:9, 1580:29, 1580:38, 1585:32, 1586:40, 1587:3, 1587:13, 1588:12, 1588:28, 1588:36, 1590:28, 1594:14, 1594:25, 1599:5, 1608:5, 1633:21, 1634:17, 1634:18, 1634:28, 1634:39, 1634:42, 1634:44, 1635:34, 1635:45, 1636:3, 1636:6, 1636:26, 1636:35, 1636:45, 1636:47, 1637:2, 1637:24, 1638:9, 1638:14, 1638:19, 1639:21, 1639:23, 1639:27, 1641:8, 1641:11, 1650:19, 1650:35, 1655:32, 1655:39, 1660:33, 1660:44, 1661:30, 1661:32, 1661:34, 1661:37, 1667:28
bishop's [3] - 1576:1, 1583:19, 1637:26
Bishops [9] - 1552:41, 1555:15, 1556:8, 1556:21, 1558:7, 1559:23, 1560:17, 1615:7, 1647:1
bishops [33] - 1552:43, 1555:24, 1555:38, 1555:43, 1555:46, 1556:13, 1559:14, 1559:22, 1560:7, 1560:18, 1561:33, 1561:36, 1562:6, 1562:19, 1565:36, 1566:20, 1569:43, 1570:8, 1571:39, 1578:1, 1602:18, 1602:37, 1615:13, 1615:16, 1615:32, 1624:32, 1629:39, 1630:1, 1645:45, 1656:12, 1660:19, 1660:26, 1667:43
bit [3] - 1614:39, 1630:47, 1648:47
black [1] - 1639:29
blaming [1] - 1663:11
Blessed [1] - 1665:13
blind [1] - 1619:43
Bob [1] - 1569:17
bodies [1] - 1622:39
bold [1] - 1560:1
book [2] - 1607:11, 1607:14
born [1] - 1555:44
bothered [1] - 1660:25
bottom [6] - 1562:27, 1615:29, 1625:3, 1626:23, 1662:45, 1665:29
bottom-middle [1] - 1625:3
bound [2] - 1627:43, 1628:1
boundary [1] - 1647:43
boundless [1] - 1550:3
box [2] - 1573:4, 1612:43
breach [2] - 1578:15, 1578:29
breached [1] - 1578:43
break [1] - 1657:24
Brian [4] - 1550:5, 1550:16, 1557:14, 1659:41
BRIAN [3] - 1550:7, 1557:18, 1557:33
brief [1] - 1560:21
bring [1] - 1606:25
bringing [3] - 1611:43, 1612:2, 1655:5
broad [11] - 1584:40, 1598:45, 1600:27, 1609:42, 1609:44, 1617:17, 1624:27, 1647:44, 1648:35, 1652:5, 1657:11
broader [4] - 1601:37, 1619:30, 1622:13, 1624:11
broadly [3] - 1561:30, 1577:41, 1648:41
brothers [1] - 1658:32
brought [4] - 1588:13, 1612:10, 1643:45, 1664:22
brusque [1] - 1585:6
bundle [4] - 1559:30, 1562:1, 1662:32, 1662:35
bundles [3] - 1553:29, 1659:18, 1668:4
Burston [2] - 1569:19, 1569:34
business [4] - 1554:36, 1619:9, 1630:7, 1630:23
busy [1] - 1665:2
BY [3] - 1550:14, 1561:28, 1645:24

C

calculated [1] - 1619:41
Canada [1] - 1555:33
Canadian [9] - 1559:18, 1559:19, 1559:21, 1559:33, 1559:44, 1560:1, 1560:19, 1563:3, 1563:7
cannot [5] - 1552:31, 1579:26, 1584:38, 1658:15, 1658:19
CANON [1] - 1645:25
canon [49] - 1570:10, 1570:15, 1570:16, 1570:18, 1570:24, 1570:32, 1570:33, 1570:35, 1570:36, 1570:41, 1570:43, 1571:1, 1571:3, 1571:8, 1571:14, 1590:10, 1590:13, 1590:21, 1590:25, 1611:44, 1625:7, 1625:13, 1625:22, 1625:26, 1625:43, 1626:11, 1626:19, 1626:27, 1629:25, 1629:32, 1629:36, 1629:39, 1629:44, 1630:2, 1631:46, 1632:34, 1632:36, 1632:37, 1632:44, 1648:7, 1648:13, 1648:19, 1648:24, 1648:25, 1648:26, 1648:30, 1655:10, 1664:6, 1666:20
Canon [7] - 1621:16, 1624:21, 1625:4, 1625:30, 1645:19, 1662:41, 1663:43
canonical [15] - 1563:22, 1563:23, 1563:26, 1570:23, 1571:6, 1571:17, 1572:16, 1572:17, 1590:15, 1626:37, 1627:4, 1646:29, 1648:16, 1648:27, 1667:31
canonists [1] - 1646:32
canons [3] - 1625:39, 1625:42, 1626:23
capacity [2] - 1597:40, 1657:4
Cardinal [3] - 1556:3, 1556:4, 1556:5
care [18] - 1553:45, 1554:8, 1562:35, 1575:34, 1589:17, 1593:39, 1598:14, 1606:39, 1611:37, 1612:20, 1614:41, 1636:35, 1636:38, 1636:41, 1636:43, 1637:11, 1637:15, 1659:24
career [1] - 1568:17
careful [1] - 1615:33
carefully [2] - 1562:14, 1625:16
careless [1] - 1667:43
caring [1] - 1637:27
carried [4] - 1575:3, 1577:9, 1626:6, 1637:24
carry [2] - 1551:15, 1606:1
carrying [3] - 1570:31, 1576:1, 1630:23
case [25] - 1554:31, 1564:37, 1565:14, 1566:13, 1568:10, 1568:12, 1573:25, 1589:29, 1589:31, 1589:38, 1602:46, 1603:1, 1613:30, 1617:5, 1617:39, 1617:44, 1618:2, 1633:45, 1634:19, 1638:5, 1642:25, 1642:26, 1660:14, 1661:11, 1664:21
cases [22] - 1552:8, 1555:30, 1565:7, 1567:23, 1568:11, 1569:3, 1575:23, 1601:22, 1620:13, 1625:34, 1626:37, 1629:34, 1629:40, 1631:41, 1631:45, 1642:19, 1642:22, 1657:4, 1664:15, 1664:26, 1664:29, 1664:30
Castle [2] - 1663:23, 1663:31
casual [1] - 1661:7
category [5] - 1558:45, 1577:35, 1607:5, 1632:10, 1647:44
Cathedral [3] - 1661:2, 1666:33, 1666:36
CATHOLIC [1] - 1549:15
Catholic [30] - 1550:20, 1550:29, 1552:35, 1552:41, 1552:43, 1554:19, 1555:6, 1555:15, 1555:37, 1555:38, 1556:8, 1556:20, 1558:7, 1560:7, 1560:17, 1601:30, 1602:6, 1602:44, 1605:1, 1605:21, 1607:4, 1607:15, 1607:36, 1615:7, 1617:1, 1622:33, 1624:32, 1640:2, 1646:47, 1658:44
caught [1] - 1631:33
caused [1] - 1628:17
caution [3] - 1631:30, 1632:35, 1632:40
cautioned [2] - 1581:1, 1590:5
cautious [8] - 1567:26, 1579:2, 1579:4, 1585:1, 1591:39, 1591:41, 1596:35, 1597:18
ceased [2] - 1656:41
celebrated [1] - 1608:8
celebret [6] - 1660:31, 1660:33, 1660:39, 1660:41, 1660:42, 1661:5
cent [2] - 1624:22, 1650:3
Centacare [4] - 1558:16, 1629:13, 1629:18, 1637:26
central [1] - 1561:41
certain [17] - 1562:13, 1565:13, 1583:35, 1588:37, 1594:35, 1623:45, 1625:7, 1627:26, 1631:10, 1631:46, 1638:5, 1648:26, 1650:3, 1652:25, 1657:46, 1658:2, 1659:47
CERTAIN [1] - 1549:15
certainly [50] - 1554:3, 1556:26, 1558:31, 1558:47, 1561:10, 1568:2, 1570:16, 1570:34, 1571:7, 1571:33, 1573:17,

1573:21, 1574:10, 1575:38, 1576:13, 1578:33, 1584:21, 1585:34, 1585:36, 1586:12, 1591:11, 1591:12, 1591:44, 1593:8, 1594:18, 1594:21, 1599:19, 1601:11, 1601:17, 1601:18, 1605:8, 1605:24, 1606:12, 1610:9, 1611:41, 1620:30, 1626:20, 1629:26, 1634:37, 1635:4, 1636:33, 1637:22, 1637:38, 1638:11, 1644:28, 1645:13, 1657:12, 1657:26, 1662:24, 1668:21

certificate [3] - 1551:1, 1551:2, 1554:39

cetera [1] - 1559:36

change [2] - 1557:9, 1640:20

changed [1] - 1650:44

Chaplain [1] - 1666:41

chapter [1] - 1652:1

character [1] - 1584:39

charge [2] - 1600:33, 1606:7

charged [1] - 1643:38

charges [2] - 1588:12, 1658:21

charity [1] - 1652:40

Chastity [1] - 1664:12

chats [1] - 1566:1

check [3] - 1569:16, 1661:8, 1666:36

checked [1] - 1660:21

checking [1] - 1661:30

checks [2] - 1611:15, 1611:17

child [32] - 1554:8, 1558:1, 1558:30, 1567:46, 1593:6, 1593:11, 1598:40, 1606:7, 1612:45, 1616:30, 1616:39, 1616:47, 1617:9, 1620:42, 1634:32, 1634:35, 1634:45, 1635:36, 1636:7, 1636:37, 1638:31, 1638:33, 1638:37, 1642:27, 1643:30, 1643:38, 1645:29, 1655:33, 1655:40, 1658:21, 1659:11, 1661:22

CHILD [1] - 1549:15

children [82] - 1551:20, 1551:24, 1551:28, 1551:33, 1554:2, 1556:22, 1556:29, 1558:38, 1564:11, 1565:9, 1565:44, 1571:29, 1571:35, 1571:44, 1572:4, 1576:24, 1577:10, 1605:39, 1606:2, 1606:9, 1606:37, 1606:41, 1607:35, 1608:46, 1609:2, 1609:24, 1609:31, 1610:4, 1610:28, 1610:41, 1611:14, 1611:17, 1611:29, 1611:30, 1611:34, 1612:17, 1620:5, 1620:7, 1620:12, 1620:19, 1620:28, 1621:1, 1621:2, 1624:5, 1624:15, 1634:34, 1634:40, 1635:8, 1635:18, 1635:26, 1636:1, 1636:10, 1636:11, 1636:23, 1636:41, 1636:43, 1637:4, 1638:23, 1638:25, 1638:33, 1639:16, 1639:35, 1639:37, 1641:19, 1641:37, 1642:4, 1642:24, 1642:36, 1642:46, 1643:35, 1653:32, 1659:32, 1661:15, 1661:37, 1666:10, 1667:20, 1667:24, 1667:25, 1667:26, 1667:41

children's [1] - 1637:5

Childrens [4] - 1551:6, 1551:19, 1551:20, 1592:25

choice [1] - 1600:32

choose [1] - 1602:28

chose [1] - 1590:35

chosen [2] - 1590:32, 1601:44

chronic [2] - 1610:32, 1638:46

church [60] - 1553:21, 1554:36, 1554:44, 1555:26, 1559:14, 1563:23, 1567:24, 1601:44, 1602:2, 1602:6, 1602:11, 1602:12, 1602:45, 1603:5, 1603:38, 1605:5, 1606:18, 1606:21, 1606:24, 1606:25, 1606:29, 1606:35, 1606:42, 1606:44, 1607:9, 1607:13, 1608:18, 1608:30, 1611:18, 1611:43, 1612:2, 1612:5, 1612:10, 1612:11, 1612:16, 1615:33, 1619:9, 1622:38, 1622:39, 1628:14, 1629:14, 1630:6, 1630:34, 1641:24, 1641:30, 1641:31, 1642:32, 1643:7, 1643:9, 1643:32, 1645:4, 1646:34, 1652:29, 1652:31, 1656:14, 1660:20, 1661:8, 1661:39, 1667:44

Church [15] - 1549:25, 1552:35, 1601:30, 1605:1, 1605:21, 1607:5, 1607:15, 1607:37, 1617:2, 1622:33, 1640:2, 1646:5, 1654:4, 1654:38, 1658:44

church's [1] - 1620:3

churches [1] - 1605:6

Churchill [1] - 1554:45

circuit [1] - 1649:9

circuited [1] - 1649:7

circulated [1] - 1615:16

circumstance [4] - 1578:10, 1612:20, 1625:33, 1635:38

circumstances [52] - 1552:23, 1553:14, 1553:16, 1563:14, 1563:19, 1563:31, 1563:37, 1564:3, 1564:5, 1564:38, 1565:27, 1565:44, 1566:27, 1566:41, 1566:46, 1567:6, 1571:10, 1571:30, 1571:37, 1571:39, 1571:41, 1575:37, 1576:33, 1579:17, 1580:42, 1583:36, 1584:8, 1590:20, 1598:38, 1600:28, 1601:34, 1601:47, 1608:21, 1616:25, 1616:42, 1617:18, 1617:20, 1619:33, 1622:36, 1623:47, 1624:16, 1627:26, 1631:38, 1638:39, 1639:5, 1639:20, 1641:9, 1641:33, 1649:19, 1650:34, 1658:20

civil [6] - 1554:31, 1562:39, 1626:38, 1646:11, 1646:31, 1652:46

claim [1] - 1665:34

claims [8] - 1550:9, 1647:41, 1647:42, 1647:43, 1666:37, 1667:4

Clancy [3] - 1556:3, 1556:4, 1556:5

clarify [3] - 1566:45, 1587:26, 1644:34

clarity [1] - 1587:21

Clarke [9] - 1585:33, 1585:39, 1586:44, 1606:12, 1644:24, 1659:20, 1660:2, 1661:46, 1662:4

clear [18] - 1584:11, 1588:14, 1588:16, 1593:41, 1596:6, 1596:12, 1596:17, 1596:24, 1616:18, 1627:30, 1628:4, 1642:40, 1642:47, 1650:23, 1657:45, 1658:6, 1658:10, 1660:11

clearer [1] - 1628:19

clearly [4] - 1558:42, 1584:7, 1610:21, 1651:21

CLERGY [1] - 1561:27

clergy [17] - 1558:9, 1558:12, 1558:27, 1559:11, 1560:36, 1561:24, 1561:32, 1561:37, 1563:11, 1579:24, 1601:41, 1602:19, 1611:20, 1612:18, 1612:45, 1629:23, 1647:38

cleric [9] - 1562:3, 1563:40, 1563:42, 1564:1, 1564:9, 1564:37, 1564:40, 1565:2, 1565:13

cleric's [1] - 1564:45

clerical [4] - 1562:10, 1571:23, 1571:31, 1572:19

clerics [6] - 1565:8, 1568:42, 1624:20, 1624:22, 1628:46, 1629:3

clerk [1] - 1550:42

client [1] - 1550:9

clients [2] - 1552:5, 1552:12

clinical [1] - 1663:2

close [1] - 1607:43

clothing [1] - 1599:18

Code [1] - 1625:4

cold [1] - 1585:6

collar [1] - 1572:8

collected [1] - 1557:22

College [2] - 1550:47, 1666:46

college [1] - 1666:45

Colleges [2] - 1666:32, 1666:42

Columba's [1] - 1550:47

columnist [1] - 1555:6

combination [1] - 1645:3

comfortable [2] - 1591:9, 1599:47

comfortably [1] - 1561:12

coming [2] - 1617:37, 1642:39

commas [1] - 1646:24

commencement [1] - 1555:29

commences [2] - 1662:39, 1665:30

comment [4] - 1562:28, 1579:10, 1597:40, 1625:12

commentary [7] - 1559:17, 1559:20, 1559:31, 1559:39, 1559:44, 1560:3, 1560:43

comments [3] - 1572:37, 1581:1, 1664:19

commercial [2] - 1550:43, 1550:45

COMMISSION [2] - 1549:11, 1668:42

Commission [8] - 1556:41, 1556:47, 1557:24, 1581:40, 1614:30, 1621:40, 1628:33, 1659:19

COMMISSIONER [29] - 1550:12, 1557:14, 1557:31, 1558:18, 1561:19, 1561:23, 1581:29, 1587:32, 1589:47, 1590:38, 1591:2, 1594:5, 1614:3, 1614:15, 1618:24, 1622:25, 1645:21, 1646:41, 1650:21, 1650:47, 1651:14, 1651:24, 1655:7, 1656:28, 1657:26, 1657:34, 1657:42, 1667:16, 1668:39

Commissioner [28] - 1549:33, 1550:1, 1550:9, 1553:31, 1557:12, 1557:28, 1558:15, 1561:17, 1561:21, 1581:24, 1587:23, 1587:34, 1589:45, 1590:43, 1593:26, 1613:44, 1614:1, 1616:14, 1618:22, 1645:18, 1646:38, 1651:20, 1653:22, 1656:25, 1657:23, 1657:30, 1657:36, 1668:37

committed [2] - 1608:31, 1609:13

committee [19] - 1552:45, 1555:15, 1555:20, 1555:21, 1555:23, 1555:29, 1555:37, 1556:15, 1560:18, 1560:29, 1561:5, 1562:22, 1569:16, 1569:18, 1569:19, 1569:20, 1569:24, 1601:26, 1647:27

committing [1] - 1618:18

common [8] - 1562:7, 1567:10, 1604:37, 1629:9, 1633:46, 1649:15, 1649:35, 1655:10

commonsense [2] - 1599:26, 1611:10
communication [1] - 1554:39
community [6] - 1555:38, 1608:39, 1609:3, 1609:24, 1611:32
company [4] - 1569:4, 1628:22, 1647:36, 1655:44
compared [1] - 1559:47
compel [1] - 1579:25
compelled [1] - 1579:14
competent [3] - 1629:12, 1652:14, 1652:28
competing [1] - 1616:32
complainant [13] - 1566:42, 1567:1, 1573:26, 1591:9, 1595:23, 1597:7, 1637:39, 1637:43, 1638:2, 1638:3, 1653:7, 1653:16
complainant's [1] - 1568:14
complainants [13] - 1566:21, 1566:28, 1566:30, 1567:11, 1572:34, 1574:16, 1574:40, 1591:19, 1594:30, 1594:35, 1594:36, 1595:25, 1637:29
complaining [1] - 1567:11
complaint [13] - 1567:15, 1567:18, 1567:23, 1567:24, 1567:26, 1568:10, 1572:26, 1572:29, 1572:44, 1615:23, 1632:19, 1643:30, 1662:17
complaints [21] - 1566:12, 1566:21, 1566:27, 1566:33, 1566:37, 1567:45, 1572:22, 1572:24, 1572:36, 1572:38, 1572:45, 1581:36, 1601:42, 1601:43, 1612:27, 1637:1, 1637:5, 1637:12, 1662:9, 1662:20
completed [8] - 1550:30, 1550:33, 1553:37, 1553:40, 1554:18, 1554:29, 1559:6, 1565:35
completely [6] - 1632:38, 1640:16, 1640:19, 1665:14, 1665:22, 1667:27
Complex [2] - 1666:32, 1666:42
compliant [1] - 1572:13
comply [1] - 1570:32
concealing [1] - 1603:46
concealment [1] - 1603:20
concept [3] - 1553:12, 1593:24, 1611:43
concern [9] - 1587:26, 1600:11, 1605:26, 1606:40, 1626:44, 1641:22, 1642:31, 1642:37, 1662:39
concerned [4] - 1581:40, 1596:39, 1638:31, 1659:41
concerning [3] - 1629:34, 1629:40, 1664:17
concertinaed [1] - 1649:2
Conclusion [1] - 1559:31
conclusions [1] - 1634:44
conductive [1] - 1598:39
conduct [20] - 1568:43, 1571:12, 1577:9, 1583:19, 1599:28, 1599:30, 1599:34, 1599:37, 1600:1, 1600:4, 1605:40, 1612:40, 1636:22, 1638:18, 1639:24, 1639:25, 1657:2, 1659:32, 1667:40
conducted [5] - 1554:13, 1624:14, 1648:20, 1649:14, 1657:20
conducting [2] - 1564:24, 1618:16
Conference [10] - 1552:42, 1555:15, 1556:8, 1556:21, 1558:8, 1559:23, 1560:17, 1615:8, 1647:1, 1654:27
conference [4] - 1564:23, 1576:16, 1624:19, 1624:27
conferences [1] - 1552:37
confessed [1] - 1665:39
confession [1] - 1552:27
confessional [2] - 1552:31, 1554:30
confessionals [1] - 1552:36
Confessions [1] - 1667:12
confessions [2] - 1667:18, 1667:40
confidence [1] - 1659:44
confident [8] - 1576:34, 1584:27, 1628:31, 1633:13, 1644:26, 1649:42, 1650:26, 1661:39
confidential [5] - 1554:35, 1615:11, 1615:12, 1632:5, 1659:39
confidentiality [22] - 1562:37, 1575:44, 1578:16, 1578:30, 1578:35, 1578:43, 1584:9, 1626:46, 1627:9, 1634:21, 1634:24, 1641:24, 1641:31, 1641:33, 1642:19, 1642:32, 1643:4, 1643:9, 1643:10, 1646:5, 1646:30
confidently [1] - 1560:5
confine [1] - 1566:22
confined [1] - 1570:6
confirming [1] - 1665:47
confirms [1] - 1558:1
conflicting [2] - 1619:47, 1643:21
conflictual [1] - 1620:31
confront [3] - 1567:34, 1567:37, 1573:25
confronted [1] - 1565:8
confronting [5] - 1564:31, 1564:46, 1568:6, 1569:25, 1642:8
confusing [1] - 1588:10
confusion [5] - 1598:35, 1602:17, 1602:21, 1602:24, 1602:32
congregational [1] - 1555:24
conjunction [1] - 1569:31
connected [2] - 1596:23, 1656:15
conscious [3] - 1572:41, 1573:20, 1574:12
consequences [8] - 1580:26, 1603:11, 1605:28, 1606:16, 1606:17, 1606:20, 1606:21, 1606:24
consider [4] - 1557:1, 1594:5, 1620:3, 1626:7
consideration [7] - 1560:21, 1560:22, 1605:41, 1605:42, 1605:44, 1655:20, 1664:37
considerations [1] - 1600:15
considered [3] - 1602:11, 1605:22, 1632:10
consistency [2] - 1562:19, 1562:24
consistent [3] - 1606:28, 1633:40, 1652:25
constant [1] - 1565:32
constitutes [1] - 1577:36
constraints [3] - 1639:45, 1640:9, 1640:11
construct [3] - 1582:10, 1586:28, 1646:35
consultation [1] - 1560:23
consultations [1] - 1663:23
contact [6] - 1575:28, 1584:36, 1585:31, 1609:31, 1636:44, 1637:29
contacted [1] - 1569:43
contain [1] - 1554:9
contaminating [2] - 1573:19, 1596:42
contamination [3] - 1585:2, 1598:9
contemplated [1] - 1644:32
contemplation [1] - 1562:30
content [1] - 1645:44
contention [2] - 1607:3, 1607:20
context [29] - 1590:31, 1590:35, 1592:39, 1594:3, 1594:5, 1600:27, 1604:25, 1606:11, 1615:41, 1616:31, 1617:10, 1617:22, 1622:10, 1622:43, 1628:32, 1631:41, 1631:44, 1633:8, 1635:19, 1635:21, 1636:13, 1636:18, 1639:5, 1641:41, 1642:18, 1643:40, 1649:36, 1652:20, 1666:8
continence [3] - 1664:1, 1664:7, 1666:21
continue [5] - 1553:6, 1608:39, 1650:32, 1652:35, 1657:3
continued [1] - 1626:22
continues [1] - 1572:14
contradiction [1] - 1562:8
contrary [4] - 1597:4, 1628:17, 1628:47, 1655:34
control [1] - 1571:40
controversy [1] - 1655:27
convenient [4] - 1589:44, 1618:22, 1653:36, 1668:36
conversation [85] - 1555:46, 1563:32, 1564:6, 1564:42, 1564:44, 1565:15, 1567:2, 1568:12, 1568:13, 1574:13, 1574:14, 1575:6, 1575:37, 1575:43, 1576:2, 1576:24, 1576:35, 1576:40, 1576:45, 1577:18, 1578:15, 1578:29, 1578:36, 1578:42, 1580:23, 1580:38, 1580:43, 1581:8, 1581:44, 1584:23, 1584:26, 1586:27, 1586:47, 1587:16, 1587:30, 1587:40, 1587:46, 1588:1, 1588:5, 1588:42, 1589:8, 1594:25, 1594:29, 1595:22, 1595:35, 1596:8, 1613:24, 1613:26, 1617:1, 1617:4, 1617:29, 1618:8, 1627:17, 1629:4, 1629:8, 1629:10, 1633:1, 1633:9, 1633:17, 1633:21, 1633:26, 1633:42, 1634:2, 1634:25, 1634:30, 1635:19, 1635:21, 1635:22, 1637:39, 1639:5, 1641:6, 1642:45, 1643:42, 1644:15, 1649:3, 1649:11, 1649:26, 1649:41, 1650:16, 1650:18, 1650:29, 1657:19, 1662:10, 1666:8, 1668:23
conversations [26] - 1552:25, 1563:15, 1572:39, 1579:22, 1585:32, 1585:36, 1585:37, 1585:38, 1586:6, 1586:10, 1587:15, 1587:41, 1587:47, 1594:24, 1605:8, 1610:13, 1610:17, 1610:26, 1617:22, 1617:44, 1636:19, 1643:40, 1644:5, 1645:14, 1657:10, 1657:20
convey [7] - 1565:23, 1575:40, 1576:15, 1576:18, 1576:25, 1580:28, 1594:23
conveyance [1] - 1567:23
conveyed [9] - 1567:15, 1567:18, 1567:20, 1575:24, 1575:34, 1576:44, 1591:47, 1644:38, 1662:22
conveying [1] - 1591:44
conviction [1] - 1658:20
convinced [2] - 1659:41, 1665:41
cooperate [2] - 1639:41, 1652:33
copies [2] - 1613:45, 1657:37
copy [8] - 1553:28, 1553:30, 1556:40, 1561:5, 1613:44, 1621:24, 1621:28, 1656:7
correct [8] - 1557:6, 1594:37, 1622:4, 1622:22, 1622:27, 1656:8, 1656:42, 1658:27
correspondence [1] - 1660:8
Counsel [1] - 1549:36
counsel [6] - 1562:31, 1562:45, 1563:5, 1565:31, 1584:8, 1651:28
counsellor [1] - 1629:18
countenance [1] -

1619:44
counterproductive [4] -
1552:25, 1563:34,
1563:36, 1566:47
country [3] - 1587:39,
1609:46, 1667:40
couple [2] - 1556:45,
1641:13
course [11] - 1553:37,
1554:44, 1554:47,
1575:45, 1599:22,
1602:30, 1608:11,
1619:45, 1631:39,
1644:26, 1656:47
Court [5] - 1549:24,
1549:25, 1551:19,
1551:20, 1592:25
court [5] - 1552:8,
1552:30, 1581:10,
1617:40, 1664:22
courtroom [1] - 1585:9
Courts [1] - 1551:6
cover [5] - 1615:35,
1616:1, 1616:12,
1616:21, 1616:24
cover-up [3] - 1615:35,
1616:21, 1616:24
covered [1] - 1624:11
covering [3] - 1605:22,
1616:4, 1654:25
covering-up [1] - 1605:22
crack [2] - 1613:27,
1659:5
cracked [1] - 1613:26
crave [1] - 1589:40
create [7] - 1578:20,
1580:25, 1624:4,
1630:19, 1631:36,
1631:38, 1655:33
created [4] - 1623:40,
1631:47, 1632:3, 1632:4
creates [3] - 1604:19,
1612:13, 1655:30
creating [1] - 1630:6
creation [1] - 1630:14
crime [2] - 1604:8,
1604:20
crimes [4] - 1609:12,
1609:17, 1651:5,
1651:42
Crimes [2] - 1604:18,
1604:36
criminal [36] - 1555:25,
1558:27, 1558:30,
1559:11, 1560:36,
1561:24, 1561:32,
1561:37, 1562:3,
1563:12, 1571:11,
1592:23, 1592:24,
1592:26, 1592:28,
1599:24, 1599:30,
1599:34, 1599:37,
1600:1, 1600:4,
1603:47, 1605:40,
1609:7, 1609:9,
1612:24, 1620:5,
1626:36, 1629:34,

1629:40, 1638:18,
1639:34, 1640:5,
1646:46, 1647:46,
1652:12
Criminal [1] - 1615:18
CRIMINAL [1] - 1561:28
critical [6] - 1570:43,
1586:36, 1596:22,
1614:45, 1627:44,
1657:1
criticised [1] - 1590:25
cross [1] - 1572:7
Crown [1] - 1549:41
crudely [1] - 1613:36
crystal [9] - 1596:6,
1596:12, 1596:17,
1596:24, 1627:30,
1628:4, 1657:45,
1658:6, 1658:10
culling [2] - 1631:19,
1631:25
Cunneen [1] - 1549:33
current [1] - 1603:23
curriculum [3] - 1553:28,
1553:32, 1557:28
CURRICULUM [1] -
1557:33
customers [1] - 1656:23
cut [4] - 1597:8, 1610:3,
1612:15, 1622:12

D

daily [1] - 1665:4
damage [2] - 1562:8,
1606:43
damaged [1] - 1611:38
danger [1] - 1554:9
dangerous [1] - 1631:17
date [5] - 1555:22,
1582:24, 1586:23,
1645:38, 1654:24
dated [11] - 1556:42,
1557:15, 1557:36,
1558:16, 1558:19,
1645:19, 1645:32,
1647:4, 1647:22,
1656:26, 1662:30
DATED [4] - 1557:18,
1558:22, 1645:25,
1656:31
David [1] - 1549:37
days [1] - 1575:14
deacon [1] - 1551:10
deal [18] - 1551:28,
1554:1, 1554:45,
1571:15, 1584:11,
1590:29, 1592:25,
1606:31, 1612:12,
1626:24, 1626:30,
1629:9, 1630:33,
1632:8, 1645:3, 1655:4,
1655:28, 1656:13
dealing [25] - 1552:43,
1554:15, 1555:25,
1568:42, 1569:23,

1570:37, 1571:4,
1572:35, 1575:26,
1578:11, 1579:47,
1581:2, 1588:3,
1593:39, 1598:28,
1599:29, 1600:16,
1602:43, 1620:6,
1626:27, 1632:41,
1646:46, 1652:12,
1661:21, 1662:2
dealt [25] - 1551:20,
1554:36, 1566:30,
1567:15, 1567:23,
1568:17, 1568:23,
1569:3, 1569:11,
1569:12, 1570:7,
1586:37, 1587:16,
1603:47, 1605:4,
1605:5, 1617:41,
1620:4, 1620:13,
1643:14, 1656:3,
1657:4, 1657:5, 1658:36
December [1] - 1662:30
decided [1] - 1599:1
decision [3] - 1620:36,
1631:37, 1638:17
decisions [1] - 1587:2
decisively [2] - 1606:31,
1612:12
DECLARATION [1] -
1656:31
declaration [5] - 1655:44,
1656:1, 1656:8,
1656:26, 1656:28
define [1] - 1658:46
definition [1] - 1647:30
definitive [1] - 1580:30
degree [4] - 1550:30,
1559:6, 1592:17, 1609:8
degrees [2] - 1635:10,
1639:29
delay [1] - 1550:5
delegate [3] - 1576:1,
1576:7, 1637:26
delegate" [1] - 1576:8
deliberate [2] - 1619:26,
1619:44
deliberately [2] - 1579:38,
1619:36
delving [1] - 1574:23
demand [1] - 1588:36
denial [4] - 1564:44,
1590:30, 1617:28,
1635:10
denied [1] - 1576:37
Denis [2] - 1614:16,
1656:3
DENIS [1] - 1614:18
denunciation [1] -
1562:35
deny [6] - 1577:3,
1592:35, 1592:42,
1594:42, 1613:35,
1613:38
deposited [2] - 1625:40,
1625:46
depression [1] - 1656:16

deprived [2] - 1553:16,
1571:23
depth [1] - 1556:14
describe [1] - 1597:7
described [4] - 1570:15,
1596:45, 1607:28,
1607:30
description [1] - 1597:3
deserves [1] - 1606:22
designed [1] - 1621:44
desire [2] - 1618:2,
1651:43
destroy [2] - 1615:44,
1616:24
destroyed [3] - 1629:40,
1630:35, 1631:14
destroying [2] - 1623:37,
1630:30
destruction [6] - 1629:32,
1630:2, 1630:15,
1630:40, 1631:3,
1631:32
detail [20] - 1567:36,
1567:39, 1567:44,
1573:45, 1573:47,
1575:46, 1576:35,
1582:9, 1584:24,
1584:28, 1584:44,
1585:1, 1589:2,
1596:39, 1597:12,
1597:15, 1597:18,
1597:20, 1598:18,
1598:25
detailed [1] - 1597:3
details [10] - 1572:44,
1573:18, 1574:29,
1634:29, 1636:5,
1636:6, 1638:20,
1639:7, 1639:23,
1639:25
determination [1] - 1568:4
determined [1] - 1568:9
deterrence [1] - 1612:25
developed [1] - 1554:14
diaries [1] - 1582:23
diary [2] - 1586:15,
1586:38
dictate [1] - 1660:47
difference [2] - 1571:36,
1598:35
different [30] - 1561:44,
1563:14, 1563:15,
1570:26, 1570:37,
1580:47, 1592:10,
1592:35, 1593:2,
1595:28, 1599:17,
1600:43, 1602:24,
1603:3, 1603:7,
1603:28, 1609:32,
1617:19, 1624:10,
1632:37, 1635:6,
1635:16, 1635:25,
1635:27, 1635:31,
1636:22, 1648:18,
1649:5, 1649:23,
1662:14
differentiate [1] - 1558:37

difficult [7] - 1567:3,
1575:42, 1584:45,
1602:22, 1643:1,
1651:33, 1651:36
difficulties [3] - 1551:24,
1561:36, 1631:39
difficulty [8] - 1593:23,
1593:31, 1593:36,
1593:46, 1593:47,
1600:7, 1607:43, 1620:1
dilemma [15] - 1565:30,
1565:32, 1602:2,
1602:3, 1610:12,
1619:47, 1638:12,
1642:41, 1642:43,
1642:44, 1643:1,
1643:3, 1643:22,
1643:23
dilemmas [7] - 1602:22,
1602:24, 1602:27,
1602:39, 1606:4,
1619:46, 1621:9
diocesan [5] - 1562:34,
1562:45, 1563:5,
1563:11, 1646:20
diocese [15] - 1558:11,
1562:32, 1586:40,
1586:41, 1635:45,
1635:47, 1636:44,
1641:1, 1660:12,
1660:25, 1661:46,
1667:35, 1667:40,
1668:5, 1668:13
DIocese [1] - 1549:17
dioceses [1] - 1558:11
Diploma [2] - 1554:22,
1554:25
direct [5] - 1555:10,
1617:20, 1626:29,
1630:13, 1637:43
directed [4] - 1600:11,
1622:20, 1622:37,
1630:26
directing [2] - 1626:5,
1626:32
directly [4] - 1574:9,
1618:13, 1638:3,
1651:14
directory [2] - 1607:4,
1607:14
disciplinary [1] - 1552:38
discipline [2] - 1552:15,
1552:21
disclose [2] - 1552:31,
1604:20
disclosed [2] - 1579:8,
1579:15
disclosing [5] - 1591:31,
1641:21, 1642:31,
1642:37, 1643:5
disclosure [1] - 1617:38
discourage [1] - 1603:42
discouraged [1] - 1603:12
discovered [2] - 1631:21,
1631:26
discuss [1] - 1629:25
discussed [5] - 1587:42,

1597:21, 1598:45,
1604:38, 1604:41
discussing [4] - 1562:23,
1579:41, 1581:32,
1641:26
discussion [5] - 1560:22,
1566:6, 1580:22,
1601:39, 1650:11
discussions [4] - 1556:33,
1595:40, 1601:29,
1626:6
dismissal [2] - 1562:10,
1589:11
disorder [2] - 1663:40,
1665:23
disorders [1] - 1656:15
dispersing [1] - 1559:13
disputation [1] - 1603:21
dispute [2] - 1637:8,
1637:10
disrepute [1] - 1606:26
disseminated [1] - 1560:6
dissemination [2] -
1559:25, 1560:12
distinction [3] - 1558:41,
1558:43, 1571:22
distinguish [1] - 1559:2
distinguishing [1] -
1559:43
distributed [1] - 1559:22
disturbance [1] - 1580:25
Divine [1] - 1665:3
DOCUMENT [1] - 1561:27
document [67] - 1556:1,
1556:10, 1558:27,
1558:28, 1559:12,
1559:13, 1559:16,
1559:20, 1559:29,
1559:33, 1559:44,
1559:45, 1559:47,
1560:1, 1560:6,
1560:15, 1560:20,
1560:22, 1560:24,
1560:27, 1560:30,
1560:32, 1560:35,
1560:46, 1561:4,
1561:13, 1561:14,
1561:17, 1561:31,
1561:36, 1561:39,
1561:42, 1561:47,
1563:2, 1563:3, 1563:7,
1570:17, 1612:45,
1614:37, 1615:29,
1623:37, 1623:40,
1630:19, 1631:39,
1645:28, 1645:36,
1645:37, 1645:38,
1646:4, 1646:38,
1648:2, 1648:33,
1649:28, 1651:46,
1652:10, 1652:26,
1654:14, 1654:31,
1660:42, 1660:45,
1661:20, 1662:37
documentation [5] -
1562:37, 1580:34,
1632:38, 1646:21,
1649:23
documented [5] -
1563:24, 1649:10,
1649:29, 1657:12,
1657:14
documents [35] - 1556:17,
1557:1, 1557:22,
1560:16, 1586:32,
1590:47, 1614:38,
1614:41, 1623:29,
1623:45, 1624:4,
1625:8, 1625:15,
1625:39, 1626:23,
1629:23, 1629:32,
1629:33, 1629:40,
1630:6, 1630:8,
1630:15, 1630:34,
1631:13, 1631:36,
1631:40, 1631:46,
1632:3, 1632:4, 1632:9,
1634:8, 1641:16,
1657:40, 1668:4,
1668:13
doings [1] - 1665:14
done [22] - 1553:17,
1559:8, 1559:23,
1564:5, 1589:15,
1589:16, 1589:27,
1591:42, 1594:43,
1598:4, 1600:36,
1600:41, 1601:20,
1603:6, 1608:11,
1612:3, 1612:4, 1621:6,
1634:40, 1635:2,
1661:9, 1661:11
doubt [7] - 1558:29,
1558:33, 1558:34,
1593:40, 1610:36,
1623:26, 1628:17
down [17] - 1563:34,
1565:23, 1573:31,
1573:36, 1573:39,
1573:42, 1578:19,
1594:2, 1598:17,
1615:29, 1625:2,
1633:43, 1649:38,
1650:5, 1657:5,
1662:45, 1664:40
dozen [1] - 1658:29
draft [5] - 1560:37,
1560:46, 1561:31,
1647:22, 1654:31
drafting [1] - 1647:26
draw [4] - 1598:15,
1634:44, 1664:33,
1664:36
dreamt [1] - 1667:30
dress [1] - 1572:19
drill [1] - 1594:2
due [2] - 1579:42, 1616:40
duplicate [1] - 1569:6
duplicated [2] - 1569:1,
1569:10
duress [2] - 1579:17,
1580:1
during [5] - 1551:3,
1551:38, 1551:41,
1569:35, 1576:16
duties [2] - 1552:35,
1640:30
duty [2] - 1551:7, 1551:19

E

early [13] - 1554:14,
1555:23, 1574:38,
1581:45, 1585:14,
1586:11, 1586:38,
1592:41, 1601:14,
1601:26, 1640:31,
1643:43, 1665:32
ears [1] - 1565:23
easier [1] - 1564:36
ecclesial [3] - 1622:1,
1652:14, 1652:21
edicts [1] - 1611:44
educated [2] - 1568:22,
1651:21
Education [1] - 1554:22
effect [25] - 1556:21,
1564:10, 1576:1,
1579:24, 1579:29,
1581:7, 1586:15,
1591:15, 1592:4,
1604:36, 1605:26,
1609:40, 1610:27,
1613:39, 1624:12,
1627:7, 1632:35,
1633:18, 1638:45,
1646:45, 1652:21,
1652:34, 1657:45,
1659:7, 1659:9
effective [1] - 1665:18
effectively [1] - 1576:7
effects [1] - 1554:1
eight [1] - 1658:36
either [11] - 1556:3,
1582:29, 1585:30,
1586:3, 1588:36,
1592:43, 1620:13,
1626:36, 1648:7,
1656:2, 1662:4
elaborate [2] - 1649:4,
1660:44
elderly [1] - 1638:32
element [1] - 1611:33
elements [1] - 1623:9
elsewhere [1] - 1572:46
embargo [1] - 1653:30
embarrass [1] - 1597:12
embarrassed [1] -
1638:14
embarrassment [1] -
1603:5
Emma [1] - 1549:41
employ [1] - 1611:5
employee [1] - 1590:18
employer [1] - 1590:17
employment [1] - 1611:4
Encompass [5] - 1655:45,
1656:4, 1656:10,
1656:36, 1656:40
encourage [5] - 1564:16,
1567:42, 1603:16,
1603:43, 1617:29
encouraged [3] - 1603:12,
1620:15, 1635:15
encouraging [1] - 1603:30
end [10] - 1550:45, 1551:9,
1555:47, 1556:10,
1572:17, 1576:42,
1576:46, 1577:16,
1583:7, 1651:11
endorse [1] - 1563:43
endorsed [3] - 1562:43,
1563:47
energy [1] - 1550:3
engage [5] - 1607:40,
1609:16, 1629:14,
1633:33, 1644:42
engaged [11] - 1571:11,
1592:41, 1617:29,
1627:4, 1633:30,
1635:46, 1636:2,
1651:4, 1657:3,
1659:11, 1668:19
engagement [1] - 1637:3
engaging [2] - 1635:41,
1652:32
enrolment [1] - 1666:43
ensure [6] - 1571:34,
1575:34, 1580:11,
1606:40, 1608:18,
1614:46
ensuring [3] - 1572:3,
1660:35, 1661:4
entailed [1] - 1667:20
entered [1] - 1575:42
entire [2] - 1608:34,
1636:13
entirely [2] - 1648:24,
1648:25
entitled [2] - 1561:23,
1593:32
ENTITLED [1] - 1561:27
entry [3] - 1586:14,
1586:24, 1586:38
enunciated [1] - 1649:6
equation [2] - 1569:34,
1643:14
equipment [1] - 1550:4
errant [1] - 1590:3
escaped [1] - 1658:20
essentially [1] - 1625:31
establish [2] - 1556:15,
1602:38
established [9] - 1551:5,
1555:21, 1555:22,
1568:38, 1568:44,
1601:27, 1645:16,
1656:11
establishment [2] -
1555:36, 1658:25
estimate [1] - 1658:38
Et [1] - 1559:36
euphemism [1] - 1584:42
euphemisms [2] -
1597:42, 1597:43
euphemistic [3] - 1573:12,
1573:15, 1597:16
evaluate [2] - 1567:29,
1577:30
evaluated [1] - 1639:15
evaluation [2] - 1639:12,
1639:20
Evelyn [1] - 1569:20
evening [1] - 1556:6
event [5] - 1565:16,
1575:9, 1584:46,
1584:47, 1597:29
events [3] - 1555:28,
1579:39, 1598:10
eventually [2] - 1559:7,
1645:6
evidence [41] - 1556:19,
1557:2, 1559:39,
1560:5, 1563:19,
1563:20, 1563:28,
1568:36, 1573:20,
1574:6, 1577:25,
1577:26, 1582:8,
1584:30, 1587:29,
1588:28, 1591:10,
1593:30, 1595:22,
1599:36, 1605:26,
1611:40, 1614:25,
1615:22, 1615:45,
1616:24, 1621:39,
1627:3, 1627:7,
1627:16, 1629:16,
1632:21, 1632:28,
1632:35, 1633:18,
1642:25, 1646:34,
1646:44, 1650:25,
1657:44, 1659:9
exactly [4] - 1576:4,
1577:46, 1591:33,
1606:10
exam [3] - 1551:46,
1552:1, 1552:2
EXAMINATION [1] -
1550:14
examine [1] - 1593:46
examining [1] - 1593:22
example [21] - 1552:26,
1563:4, 1563:32,
1564:29, 1577:17,
1599:18, 1600:2,
1604:32, 1610:41,
1610:45, 1611:28,
1615:41, 1615:42,
1617:38, 1619:17,
1622:9, 1637:46,
1655:24, 1655:29,
1660:46, 1665:34
examples [3] - 1569:37,
1609:16, 1623:36
exception [3] - 1633:35,
1650:4, 1650:6
exchange [3] - 1595:30,
1595:31, 1595:32
excuse [5] - 1604:21,
1604:25, 1604:31,
1622:30, 1665:1
execute [2] - 1622:16,
1622:31
execution [2] - 1552:35,

1622:41
exempted [1] - 1646:10
exhibit [10] - 1557:16,
 1557:31, 1558:20,
 1561:25, 1614:16,
 1645:22, 1646:41,
 1656:29, 1659:29,
 1661:19
EXHIBIT [7] - 1557:18,
 1557:33, 1558:22,
 1561:27, 1614:18,
 1645:24, 1656:31
exhibits [2] - 1590:44,
 1657:37
exist [2] - 1609:33,
 1630:41
existed [1] - 1564:34
exists [1] - 1590:5
expect [9] - 1552:29,
 1569:11, 1569:12,
 1584:30, 1590:19,
 1597:36, 1597:38,
 1640:28, 1641:1
expectation [2] - 1572:9,
 1617:11
expected [2] - 1597:43,
 1662:22
expensive [1] - 1657:1
experience [18] - 1551:34,
 1564:26, 1564:28,
 1567:2, 1567:4,
 1567:22, 1577:7,
 1577:27, 1589:39,
 1592:40, 1629:38,
 1629:47, 1630:3,
 1631:24, 1631:27,
 1649:35, 1649:47,
 1659:10
expertise [1] - 1556:35
explain [7] - 1558:42,
 1579:45, 1590:27,
 1622:10, 1623:4,
 1623:6, 1623:7
explained [3] - 1597:10,
 1664:42, 1665:11
explaining [1] - 1667:6
explanation [1] - 1622:13
explicitly [3] - 1603:24,
 1605:14, 1610:11
exploration [1] - 1557:23
exposed [1] - 1554:9
exposure [4] - 1616:25,
 1616:28, 1616:29,
 1616:38
express [2] - 1606:38,
 1624:37
expressed [2] - 1571:8,
 1624:40
expressing [1] - 1631:30
expression [3] - 1554:9,
 1563:6, 1655:11
extended [1] - 1575:44
extent [9] - 1560:42,
 1562:38, 1569:6,
 1597:39, 1612:21,
 1649:2, 1649:6,
 1649:26, 1668:1

extract [1] - 1639:42
extraordinarily [1] -
 1567:3
extraordinary [3] -
 1660:19, 1661:32,
 1667:37
extreme [1] - 1580:1
eye [2] - 1582:10, 1619:43

F

face [3] - 1662:4, 1665:46,
 1667:30
faced [3] - 1561:37,
 1606:4, 1617:26
facilitated [1] - 1615:44
facilities [1] - 1657:6
fact [47] - 1560:6, 1567:37,
 1574:11, 1576:23,
 1578:12, 1580:34,
 1585:21, 1586:20,
 1589:7, 1589:15,
 1589:23, 1589:32,
 1589:33, 1589:37,
 1591:11, 1593:37,
 1594:17, 1596:40,
 1598:21, 1606:6,
 1607:39, 1608:44,
 1611:33, 1612:12,
 1612:26, 1616:38,
 1616:42, 1616:43,
 1617:2, 1617:15,
 1617:25, 1619:27,
 1626:26, 1634:32,
 1634:45, 1636:10,
 1636:12, 1653:27,
 1654:21, 1664:28,
 1664:46, 1665:15,
 1665:38, 1667:34,
 1668:2
factor [1] - 1638:42
factors [1] - 1562:28
facts [5] - 1564:43,
 1565:2, 1616:25,
 1616:28
Faculties [1] - 1667:8
faculties [18] - 1553:17,
 1553:25, 1563:21,
 1563:29, 1571:43,
 1571:46, 1572:6,
 1580:30, 1607:16,
 1607:26, 1608:3,
 1608:10, 1608:19,
 1608:28, 1610:45,
 1611:26, 1611:29,
 1668:24
fading [1] - 1568:29
failed [2] - 1663:46,
 1668:32
failing [4] - 1606:31,
 1616:2, 1666:19,
 1666:20
failings [4] - 1665:41,
 1666:1, 1666:5, 1666:9
fails [1] - 1604:20
failure [2] - 1605:20,
 1606:43

failures [1] - 1664:46
fair [9] - 1554:34, 1558:47,
 1580:39, 1580:40,
 1593:34, 1614:39,
 1616:14, 1651:3,
 1651:11
fair-minded [1] - 1616:14
fairer [1] - 1580:21
fairly [6] - 1560:21,
 1603:9, 1617:37,
 1633:39, 1639:28,
 1660:44
fairness [6] - 1563:43,
 1565:27, 1578:18,
 1578:19, 1580:6
faith [2] - 1602:7, 1602:44
fallen [1] - 1558:45
falling [1] - 1665:37
familial [1] - 1554:12
familiar [2] - 1623:15,
 1626:29
families [2] - 1607:47,
 1609:30
family [2] - 1615:24,
 1653:7
fanciful [4] - 1568:5,
 1568:8, 1568:12,
 1568:16
fancy [1] - 1660:45
fancy-looking [1] -
 1660:45
fantasy [2] - 1667:21,
 1667:31
far [8] - 1564:31, 1582:3,
 1582:6, 1583:22,
 1621:30, 1633:40,
 1659:40, 1661:41
fashion [1] - 1643:29
Father [63] - 1550:5,
 1550:16, 1551:37,
 1556:4, 1556:33,
 1557:14, 1557:29,
 1557:35, 1557:41,
 1557:42, 1557:43,
 1557:45, 1558:18,
 1558:19, 1559:16,
 1559:40, 1560:2,
 1560:42, 1561:24,
 1561:30, 1562:4,
 1563:1, 1565:20,
 1565:34, 1566:30,
 1569:4, 1569:17,
 1569:18, 1569:31,
 1569:34, 1569:35,
 1570:17, 1581:31,
 1581:32, 1581:41,
 1581:44, 1586:20,
 1590:2, 1590:38,
 1591:4, 1600:26,
 1601:10, 1607:38,
 1607:42, 1607:44,
 1613:24, 1616:17,
 1616:37, 1622:28,
 1628:21, 1628:25,
 1645:19, 1645:21,
 1646:42, 1650:25,
 1656:29, 1656:35,

1657:15, 1657:44,
 1664:16, 1665:11,
 1665:36, 1665:40
father [7] - 1556:40,
 1558:26, 1619:3,
 1622:36, 1646:44,
 1650:47, 1659:30
FATHER [7] - 1557:18,
 1557:33, 1558:22,
 1561:28, 1645:24,
 1656:31
fathers [1] - 1656:36
fear [1] - 1665:37
featured [1] - 1554:5
featuring [1] - 1554:30
February [4] - 1582:14,
 1582:32, 1648:40,
 1657:8
feed [1] - 1593:33
feedback [1] - 1637:38
fell [1] - 1577:34
fellowship [1] - 1554:46
felonies [2] - 1558:38,
 1559:2
felony [12] - 1558:44,
 1599:8, 1600:28,
 1600:34, 1601:20,
 1604:8, 1604:15,
 1619:5, 1619:10,
 1619:32, 1621:10,
 1636:27
felt [3] - 1626:45, 1635:2,
 1635:4
female [1] - 1597:13
few [8] - 1553:31, 1568:31,
 1575:14, 1610:14,
 1621:24, 1621:36,
 1627:33, 1659:45
fifth [2] - 1631:9, 1648:3
figure [1] - 1658:37
final [1] - 1580:29
fine [2] - 1559:33, 1625:26
finish [1] - 1593:29
firm [2] - 1550:43, 1550:44
first [24] - 1562:35,
 1565:29, 1571:34,
 1584:35, 1584:44,
 1585:46, 1588:1,
 1588:9, 1595:18,
 1601:27, 1612:39,
 1612:44, 1619:20,
 1630:6, 1631:36,
 1636:29, 1643:31,
 1645:13, 1652:38,
 1658:29, 1659:28,
 1659:36, 1660:39,
 1662:26
firstly [1] - 1573:17
fitting [1] - 1665:2
five [2] - 1568:31, 1657:23
five-minute [1] - 1657:23
fix [1] - 1643:26
Fletcher [4] - 1581:32,
 1581:36, 1656:3,
 1656:37
floated [2] - 1619:18,
 1645:9

flood [2] - 1658:42,
 1658:46
focus [4] - 1574:38,
 1592:13, 1611:18,
 1611:33
focused [2] - 1554:6,
 1605:16
focusing [1] - 1639:34
follow [5] - 1552:43,
 1625:47, 1649:27,
 1652:1, 1652:5
followed [4] - 1629:39,
 1630:1, 1651:18,
 1660:20
following [4] - 1632:44,
 1651:16, 1662:40,
 1667:44
follows [1] - 1664:28
font [1] - 1560:2
foolish [2] - 1595:32,
 1597:14
forbidden [1] - 1607:40
force [3] - 1590:23,
 1622:7, 1622:17
Force [1] - 1622:15
forced [1] - 1647:43
foreign [1] - 1667:40
foreseen [2] - 1661:29,
 1661:31
forget [1] - 1645:13
form [6] - 1572:1, 1572:30,
 1616:41, 1619:44,
 1628:45, 1656:14
formal [11] - 1563:22,
 1563:26, 1567:4,
 1567:22, 1570:36,
 1572:29, 1590:15,
 1601:16, 1626:12,
 1643:32, 1648:16
formally [3] - 1555:22,
 1571:23, 1650:37
formed [1] - 1560:20
forth [1] - 1658:33
fortunately [1] - 1665:32
forum [2] - 1605:5,
 1626:38
forward [3] - 1595:16,
 1602:20, 1617:28
founded [1] - 1593:30
four [1] - 1635:18
fourth [1] - 1653:12
fragile [1] - 1555:47
frame [2] - 1555:10,
 1601:25
frames [1] - 1556:18
frankly [1] - 1650:4
free [2] - 1665:14, 1665:22
freely [1] - 1665:40
fresh [1] - 1610:4
friend [3] - 1587:28,
 1593:27, 1593:31
friendships [1] - 1607:46
FROM [1] - 1558:22
front [7] - 1563:45,
 1564:25, 1566:47,
 1580:3, 1645:27,
 1653:44, 1654:34

fulfil [2] - 1568:41, 1636:7
fulfilling [1] - 1570:13
full [2] - 1550:16, 1617:38
function [2] - 1660:21, 1661:4
functioning [1] - 1571:45
fundamental [4] - 1611:20, 1660:20, 1660:29, 1661:8
fundamentals [1] - 1667:44
funeral [1] - 1607:45
future [5] - 1638:26, 1638:29, 1643:35, 1650:34, 1655:36

G

gaol [3] - 1609:33, 1610:18, 1610:40
gathered [1] - 1631:14
General [1] - 1553:41
general [31] - 1550:42, 1550:45, 1559:19, 1560:19, 1561:38, 1566:17, 1567:31, 1567:33, 1570:34, 1570:42, 1575:25, 1575:31, 1576:27, 1578:4, 1578:9, 1580:45, 1585:40, 1585:42, 1589:6, 1590:14, 1592:32, 1597:16, 1612:25, 1621:8, 1623:36, 1623:42, 1641:7, 1642:19, 1647:44, 1656:9, 1662:18
generally [19] - 1564:3, 1567:36, 1567:39, 1569:3, 1569:31, 1571:17, 1572:9, 1575:30, 1580:47, 1594:2, 1597:45, 1601:43, 1602:33, 1607:32, 1608:41, 1629:13, 1629:17, 1660:43, 1665:22
gentlemen [1] - 1585:46
girl [2] - 1553:45, 1596:47
girls [2] - 1554:7, 1554:11
given [37] - 1556:19, 1556:44, 1559:6, 1564:33, 1576:34, 1578:4, 1578:21, 1579:16, 1584:30, 1591:8, 1595:27, 1597:1, 1597:3, 1598:5, 1601:16, 1601:18, 1615:13, 1620:10, 1623:8, 1624:12, 1632:35, 1632:36, 1633:11, 1634:21, 1634:32, 1637:46, 1644:13, 1645:44, 1646:44, 1650:9, 1650:34, 1651:9,

1657:44, 1658:41, 1659:9, 1664:37, 1666:14
glance [1] - 1653:44
God [1] - 1665:12
golden [1] - 1608:8
gossip [1] - 1655:29
governed [1] - 1612:9
grace [1] - 1665:12
graded [1] - 1577:26
grades [1] - 1577:14
Graduate [1] - 1554:22
granted [3] - 1636:13, 1636:15, 1649:6
greater [9] - 1611:34, 1612:17, 1626:35, 1638:24, 1638:26, 1638:28, 1641:20, 1642:30, 1642:36
Gregorian [1] - 1554:40
ground [1] - 1624:11
grounds [1] - 1616:26
group [10] - 1568:45, 1568:46, 1569:24, 1570:14, 1605:6, 1623:10, 1624:28, 1647:33, 1658:26, 1658:42
groups [1] - 1603:20
grown [1] - 1567:47
guarded [1] - 1625:17
guessing [1] - 1560:11
guided [1] - 1584:7
guidelines [2] - 1559:34, 1629:22
guilt [3] - 1626:25, 1626:35, 1663:11
guilty [3] - 1577:42, 1617:41, 1620:16
Guinea [1] - 1662:46

H

half [2] - 1650:25, 1658:29
halfway [1] - 1629:35
Hamlet [1] - 1623:17
hamlet [1] - 1623:21
hamper [1] - 1615:34
hand [9] - 1553:28, 1591:44, 1591:45, 1600:31, 1608:38, 1616:33, 1621:28, 1635:35, 1636:16
hands [2] - 1584:10, 1584:25
handwriting [2] - 1598:33, 1603:25
handwritten [2] - 1581:8, 1662:40
happy [2] - 1564:29, 1648:36
hard [4] - 1561:38, 1577:30, 1659:5, 1661:28
hardest [1] - 1613:27
harm [1] - 1655:35

harm's [1] - 1606:32
Hart [7] - 1585:42, 1586:16, 1586:20, 1586:27, 1628:41, 1644:24, 1662:5
headed [3] - 1558:27, 1612:45, 1646:5
heading [7] - 1562:27, 1615:18, 1622:45, 1625:3, 1630:8, 1648:2, 1662:41
Healing [2] - 1602:17, 1603:34
hear [3] - 1577:25, 1597:9, 1598:4
heard [5] - 1565:22, 1606:27, 1660:18, 1662:2, 1667:12
hearing [1] - 1552:26
heart [1] - 1577:19
held [6] - 1579:35, 1610:31, 1624:38, 1624:42, 1635:35, 1659:43
help [3] - 1555:37, 1592:13, 1665:12
helped [1] - 1602:38
helpful [6] - 1553:33, 1557:2, 1588:20, 1588:24, 1589:25, 1639:26
hence [1] - 1550:4
hesitation [1] - 1594:1
hide [1] - 1616:24
high [2] - 1561:14, 1667:24
higher [7] - 1585:23, 1595:13, 1631:35, 1641:23, 1641:30, 1643:3, 1643:5
highly [1] - 1651:21
Hill [2] - 1663:23, 1663:31
himself [11] - 1564:16, 1564:19, 1571:47, 1607:46, 1609:29, 1610:46, 1611:27, 1629:17, 1639:27, 1639:42, 1641:10
historical [3] - 1631:2, 1662:9, 1662:16
history [4] - 1560:27, 1650:34, 1661:47, 1667:7
hold [5] - 1571:27, 1571:47, 1579:32, 1624:43
holding [1] - 1611:27
holds [1] - 1636:16
holidays [3] - 1551:3, 1551:8
hollow [1] - 1659:40
honest [3] - 1556:24, 1578:45, 1638:21
hoping [1] - 1611:9
hour [1] - 1650:26
house [1] - 1583:19
hundred [2] - 1624:29,

1650:3
hundreds [1] - 1624:27
Hunt [1] - 1549:38
hypothesise [1] - 1655:26

I

idea [10] - 1563:10, 1579:24, 1588:27, 1624:33, 1640:22, 1645:8, 1645:13, 1654:47, 1655:21, 1661:12
ideally [2] - 1610:9, 1661:41
identify [1] - 1564:40
identifying [2] - 1582:24, 1631:29
ignorance [2] - 1619:42, 1622:29
illegal [1] - 1577:9
images [1] - 1614:10
immediate [1] - 1602:12
immediately [3] - 1575:28, 1628:10, 1650:18
impact [1] - 1612:4
impasse [2] - 1590:30, 1617:27
implementation [1] - 1645:14
importance [1] - 1654:44
important [22] - 1551:44, 1552:11, 1552:37, 1553:1, 1553:6, 1576:15, 1576:18, 1576:25, 1580:35, 1581:19, 1589:16, 1620:5, 1635:34, 1636:9, 1636:11, 1639:8, 1639:11, 1643:13, 1643:19, 1643:20, 1643:23
imposed [1] - 1572:18
imposes [1] - 1562:12
impractical [1] - 1631:7
impression [1] - 1604:45
IN [1] - 1549:15
inadmissible [1] - 1581:9
inappropriate [4] - 1567:47, 1570:4, 1573:14, 1666:24
inappropriately [1] - 1597:47
incardinated [3] - 1550:23, 1611:21, 1635:47
incardination [1] - 1660:30
incidences [1] - 1666:1
incidentally [1] - 1659:39
incidents [1] - 1658:43
include [4] - 1601:30, 1616:29, 1647:40, 1653:30
includes [4] - 1604:26, 1632:40, 1647:46,

1658:6
including [5] - 1583:15, 1592:23, 1604:18, 1666:46, 1667:41
inclusive [2] - 1555:11, 1590:45
incriminating [2] - 1631:20, 1631:25
indeed [1] - 1555:35
independent [4] - 1552:36, 1579:21, 1597:33, 1660:12
indicate [2] - 1593:46, 1603:25
indicated [1] - 1603:13
indicates [1] - 1664:24
individual [8] - 1555:35, 1617:35, 1617:45, 1637:19, 1664:15, 1664:26, 1664:29, 1664:30
individually [1] - 1637:30
individuals [3] - 1578:11, 1622:9, 1631:40
induce [2] - 1649:3, 1649:19
induced [2] - 1626:45, 1633:5
inducement [7] - 1633:11, 1633:14, 1633:44, 1650:27, 1650:29, 1650:39, 1651:5
inference [5] - 1598:16, 1636:18, 1636:21, 1664:34, 1664:36
inferences [2] - 1593:8, 1631:11
inform [3] - 1648:39, 1660:25, 1660:28
informal [4] - 1601:17, 1605:3, 1605:8, 1643:33
information [26] - 1556:20, 1560:7, 1564:10, 1564:32, 1573:26, 1575:24, 1575:34, 1580:28, 1582:23, 1584:5, 1588:23, 1607:36, 1620:26, 1636:9, 1636:28, 1638:38, 1639:26, 1641:32, 1641:35, 1644:13, 1644:19, 1644:22, 1644:38, 1653:26, 1659:43, 1663:35
informed [2] - 1645:5, 1660:2
ingratiate [2] - 1607:46, 1609:29
initial [2] - 1559:44, 1628:16
injustice [1] - 1562:9
inquire [2] - 1661:34, 1662:8
inquiries [5] - 1611:6, 1611:14, 1611:23, 1615:34, 1628:32

INQUIRY [1] - 1549:11
inquiry [1] - 1559:1
insensitive [1] - 1585:6
insight [1] - 1551:32
insofar [1] - 1587:1
instance [9] - 1566:14,
1566:43, 1568:11,
1571:32, 1605:8,
1620:43, 1621:11,
1638:1, 1668:34
instances [15] - 1566:23,
1566:38, 1566:40,
1566:46, 1569:11,
1569:13, 1575:9,
1577:34, 1577:40,
1578:2, 1579:16,
1579:27, 1602:46,
1603:2, 1661:1
instead [1] - 1638:3
instigated [1] - 1615:21
Institute [1] - 1554:19
instruct [1] - 1646:20
instructed [1] - 1614:5
instructions [1] - 1657:24
insurance [1] - 1647:36
intellectual [1] - 1593:47
intelligent [1] - 1651:22
intended [2] - 1648:15,
1648:27
interest [2] - 1554:34,
1623:27
interested [2] - 1578:7,
1606:20
interests [3] - 1567:8,
1578:22, 1581:2
interface [1] - 1659:21
interfere [3] - 1594:11,
1610:5, 1619:45
interfered [5] - 1565:20,
1593:14, 1594:6,
1594:16, 1597:46
interference [1] - 1598:9
interject [1] - 1598:14
interjection [1] - 1598:8
internal [1] - 1554:11
interpretation [1] - 1622:5
interrupt [1] - 1650:21
intervening [1] - 1664:44
interview [24] - 1564:9,
1564:24, 1567:5,
1574:39, 1574:44,
1575:13, 1583:19,
1589:24, 1594:31,
1595:42, 1595:44,
1595:47, 1596:4,
1596:5, 1596:31,
1597:21, 1613:8,
1616:3, 1616:11,
1616:31, 1628:46,
1652:33, 1653:27,
1658:43
interviewed [4] - 1591:16,
1594:15, 1616:10,
1658:30
interviewer [1] - 1564:14
interviewing [2] - 1630:24,
1653:23

interviews [4] - 1575:3,
1590:3, 1618:16,
1624:14
intimate [1] - 1609:31
INTO [1] - 1549:13
introduced [2] - 1605:15,
1628:45
introduction [2] - 1605:15,
1622:45
intrude [1] - 1631:40
invariable [2] - 1633:36,
1633:38
inverted [1] - 1646:24
investigation [7] -
1615:23, 1620:28,
1625:46, 1626:1,
1626:8, 1626:11,
1648:44
INVESTIGATION [1] -
1549:13
investigative [2] -
1622:32, 1622:39
involve [3] - 1622:9,
1631:10, 1632:9
involved [18] - 1563:6,
1570:23, 1586:29,
1600:46, 1601:5,
1617:3, 1620:13,
1623:9, 1629:2,
1629:11, 1643:8,
1644:29, 1644:31,
1644:32, 1644:35,
1644:39, 1658:32,
1668:9
involvement [9] - 1559:15,
1586:19, 1586:46,
1587:8, 1603:5,
1614:42, 1620:14,
1628:35, 1646:45
involving [1] - 1636:23
irrelevant [3] - 1612:5,
1612:7, 1632:19
issue [15] - 1555:44,
1571:24, 1571:25,
1571:37, 1581:22,
1586:37, 1600:29,
1600:30, 1600:43,
1601:21, 1603:10,
1603:17, 1604:14,
1617:18, 1618:1
Issues [1] - 1647:29
issues [15] - 1554:7,
1556:14, 1557:23,
1564:41, 1573:19,
1605:36, 1607:1,
1618:16, 1622:8,
1631:41, 1634:36,
1646:27, 1647:33,
1658:26, 1658:42
issues" [1] - 1647:35
itself [1] - 1556:22

J

James [3] - 1581:32,
1581:36, 1656:3
Jessica [1] - 1549:42

job [2] - 1577:32, 1661:36
jocular [1] - 1623:26
jog [1] - 1614:11
John [14] - 1556:4,
1556:6, 1566:30,
1569:4, 1569:31,
1600:26, 1629:9,
1629:12, 1629:17,
1645:32, 1645:37,
1645:45, 1649:16,
1657:11
join [1] - 1660:46
Joseph [2] - 1550:5,
1550:16
JOSEPH [1] - 1550:7
jubilee [1] - 1608:8
judge [2] - 1626:15,
1626:19
judged [1] - 1591:36
judging [2] - 1591:7,
1591:18
judgment [2] - 1639:4,
1659:42
Julia [1] - 1549:36
JULY [1] - 1668:43
July [1] - 1549:29
jumping [1] - 1653:37
June [1] - 1586:24
Jurisprudence [1] -
1554:25
justice [5] - 1571:5,
1619:45, 1619:46,
1652:40, 1652:47
justifying [1] - 1667:31

K

keep [8] - 1551:44,
1557:21, 1563:10,
1599:40, 1623:45,
1625:8, 1639:37,
1661:37
keeping [4] - 1563:27,
1622:20, 1622:37,
1639:35
Kell [1] - 1549:37
Kensington [1] - 1556:7
kept [9] - 1562:33,
1599:34, 1623:29,
1625:16, 1631:7,
1631:8, 1631:9, 1632:4,
1632:28
Kevin [2] - 1559:16,
1561:24
KEVIN [1] - 1561:28
kind [4] - 1550:40,
1611:30, 1634:12,
1636:2
kindergarten [2] -
1666:44, 1667:24
kinds [1] - 1570:3
Kingdom [2] - 1608:9,
1640:38
knowing [1] - 1630:1
knowledge [13] - 1558:36,
1569:2, 1599:24,
1601:29, 1604:19,
1609:8, 1617:20,
1619:20, 1619:23,
1634:16, 1638:36,
1661:17, 1665:21
known [15] - 1558:41,
1592:44, 1600:28,
1600:29, 1601:20,
1607:42, 1607:43,
1608:27, 1608:31,
1616:42, 1642:47,
1655:45, 1661:47,
1662:16, 1662:20
knows [2] - 1552:30,
1580:36

L

labels [1] - 1607:32
Lady [1] - 1665:13
lady [4] - 1583:24,
1583:25, 1591:25,
1598:21
laicisation [3] - 1571:20,
1571:28, 1572:18
laicised [2] - 1571:36,
1571:38
language [7] - 1563:4,
1591:43, 1613:32,
1613:34, 1613:36,
1659:6, 1666:15
large [1] - 1562:38
last [6] - 1559:28,
1614:26, 1622:42,
1626:32, 1641:15,
1666:37
lasting [1] - 1652:34
late [3] - 1550:1, 1574:38,
1654:20
Latin [1] - 1660:43
LAW [1] - 1645:25
Law [5] - 1551:5, 1621:17,
1624:21, 1625:30,
1645:19
law [58] - 1550:30,
1550:45, 1551:21,
1553:34, 1554:31,
1558:43, 1559:6,
1565:26, 1570:15,
1570:16, 1570:24,
1570:32, 1570:33,
1570:35, 1570:36,
1570:41, 1571:1,
1571:14, 1580:47,
1590:10, 1590:13,
1590:21, 1592:17,
1601:15, 1603:47,
1605:5, 1609:7, 1609:8,
1609:9, 1611:18,
1611:44, 1612:24,
1620:5, 1625:7,
1625:22, 1625:26,
1626:11, 1626:19,
1626:27, 1631:46,
1632:34, 1632:36,
1632:37, 1632:44,
1646:11, 1646:32,
1648:7, 1648:13,
1648:19, 1648:24,
1648:25, 1648:26,
1648:30, 1652:46,
1655:10, 1661:39
Law" [1] - 1625:4
lawful [3] - 1604:21,
1604:25, 1604:31
Laws [1] - 1553:37
lawyer [5] - 1551:37,
1552:4, 1552:18,
1552:24, 1570:10
lawyers [16] - 1570:18,
1570:43, 1571:3,
1571:8, 1590:25,
1600:29, 1601:18,
1601:24, 1601:39,
1604:38, 1604:42,
1605:1, 1605:6, 1605:9,
1614:28, 1629:25
laypeople [1] - 1624:23
lead [2] - 1593:8, 1598:21
leaders [1] - 1555:25
leads [2] - 1564:44,
1565:3
leafing [1] - 1559:12
learned [1] - 1552:15
least [12] - 1566:32,
1567:44, 1568:1,
1587:16, 1603:45,
1604:4, 1641:25,
1642:16, 1643:33,
1652:5, 1659:3, 1659:30
leave [5] - 1565:37,
1567:42, 1569:33,
1571:31, 1627:35
lectures [1] - 1551:38
led [3] - 1560:23, 1620:27,
1644:41
left [2] - 1563:40, 1563:42
legal [25] - 1550:36,
1550:40, 1551:6,
1551:15, 1552:15,
1558:37, 1562:31,
1579:9, 1579:15,
1579:25, 1581:7,
1586:32, 1592:14,
1593:12, 1593:41,
1600:2, 1600:27,
1601:14, 1601:16,
1602:38, 1605:32,
1620:40, 1620:46,
1646:36
legislation [2] - 1554:8,
1562:39
less [5] - 1554:10,
1577:38, 1606:39,
1643:23, 1667:12
lest [1] - 1585:1
letter [17] - 1557:36,
1557:41, 1558:6,
1558:15, 1558:18,
1566:8, 1586:25,
1586:26, 1586:28,
1586:29, 1659:31,
1659:35, 1660:3,

1662:26, 1662:27,
1662:30, 1665:27

LETTER [1] - 1558:22

letterhead [1] - 1558:16

letters [2] - 1659:20,
1659:24

level [6] - 1562:34,
1563:11, 1568:1,
1568:2, 1575:46,
1631:35

leverage [1] - 1571:39

liability [2] - 1600:11,
1647:41

liars [2] - 1610:33,
1638:46

Licentiate [1] - 1554:29

life [7] - 1553:11, 1553:13,
1562:14, 1571:32,
1577:16, 1660:12,
1664:47

lifetime [1] - 1552:22

light [4] - 1641:19,
1642:23, 1642:35,
1643:45

lighter [1] - 1560:2

likelihood [2] - 1561:12,
1667:25

likely [9] - 1602:44,
1613:9, 1613:11,
1615:22, 1628:44,
1631:20, 1646:27,
1650:30, 1659:7

likewise [1] - 1663:21

limit [3] - 1627:8, 1639:44,
1640:1

Limited [1] - 1655:45

limits [3] - 1631:6,
1643:31, 1643:33

line [1] - 1593:26

lines [1] - 1577:26

list [7] - 1568:26, 1573:3,
1585:13, 1591:26,
1607:6, 1607:9, 1607:13

listed [1] - 1652:10

litigation [1] - 1562:30

live [3] - 1587:40, 1640:37,
1641:10

lived [1] - 1660:12

living [6] - 1551:25,
1571:39, 1607:21,
1607:41, 1607:43,
1665:34

local [1] - 1661:30

locally [1] - 1570:7

located [2] - 1588:8,
1641:5

location [3] - 1582:25,
1588:37, 1610:4

locations [1] - 1574:43

lollies [1] - 1608:38

Lonergan [9] - 1549:36,
1581:29, 1589:47,
1591:2, 1650:21,
1651:1, 1657:34,
1667:16, 1668:39

LONERGAN [47] - 1550:1,
1550:14, 1550:16,

1557:12, 1557:21,
1557:28, 1557:35,
1558:15, 1558:25,
1561:17, 1561:21,
1561:30, 1581:26,
1581:31, 1587:25,
1587:34, 1589:44,
1590:43, 1591:4,
1593:36, 1594:8,
1610:24, 1614:5,
1614:13, 1614:20,
1616:17, 1616:23,
1618:22, 1619:3,
1622:27, 1645:18,
1645:27, 1646:38,
1646:44, 1651:3,
1651:18, 1651:26,
1651:46, 1655:9,
1656:25, 1656:34,
1657:23, 1657:30,
1657:36, 1657:44,
1667:18, 1668:36

look [9] - 1559:5, 1576:44,
1580:44, 1592:46,
1614:20, 1624:45,
1633:20, 1661:20,
1662:26

looked [3] - 1582:11,
1582:22, 1601:39

looking [23] - 1559:43,
1560:36, 1560:47,
1561:32, 1568:25,
1576:4, 1576:19,
1576:21, 1586:31,
1586:38, 1588:32,
1589:32, 1614:6,
1615:3, 1619:23,
1629:22, 1641:13,
1642:3, 1653:46,
1654:12, 1654:33,
1660:45, 1661:6

looks [2] - 1645:29,
1645:44

loose [2] - 1610:3,
1612:15

loosely [1] - 1587:25

Lucas [23] - 1550:5,
1550:17, 1557:14,
1557:29, 1557:35,
1558:19, 1561:30,
1562:4, 1565:34,
1590:2, 1590:38,
1616:17, 1616:37,
1622:28, 1645:19,
1656:29, 1656:35,
1657:44, 1659:41,
1664:16, 1665:11,
1665:36, 1665:40

LUCAS [6] - 1550:7,
1557:18, 1557:33,
1558:22, 1645:24,
1656:31

Lucas's [2] - 1645:21,
1646:42

LUNCHEON [1] - 1618:26

luncheon [1] - 1619:3

M

maiden [1] - 1595:29

main [1] - 1572:35

maintain [1] - 1659:14

maintained [1] - 1551:1

Maitland [5] - 1583:19,
1641:2, 1659:40,
1660:25, 1661:34

MAITLAND [1] - 1549:17

Maitland-Newcastle [3] -
1583:19, 1660:25,
1661:34

**MAITLAND-
NEWCASTLE** [1] -
1549:17

major [1] - 1615:32

malevolent [1] - 1616:15

Malone [1] - 1662:27

man [6] - 1572:19,
1608:31, 1611:1,
1611:31, 1611:32,
1643:27

manage [4] - 1561:34,
1600:15, 1623:43,
1629:23

managed [1] - 1601:22

management [4] - 1587:8,
1587:13, 1611:20,
1640:32

managing [6] - 1593:23,
1600:10, 1600:38,
1600:43, 1601:2, 1665:4

manifest [1] - 1556:22

manner [2] - 1571:4,
1585:6

March [3] - 1556:42,
1557:15, 1657:8

Margaret [1] - 1549:33

marginally [1] - 1663:37

mark [1] - 1629:35

marked [10] - 1557:15,
1557:31, 1558:20,
1561:25, 1614:16,
1615:11, 1645:22,
1651:39, 1656:29

marriage [8] - 1625:34,
1626:37, 1631:41,
1631:45, 1642:19,
1642:22, 1642:25,
1642:26

Mary's [1] - 1661:2

mass [2] - 1657:1,
1660:47

Mass [1] - 1663:14

Master [2] - 1553:37,
1553:40

material [22] - 1561:23,
1567:30, 1574:10,
1582:17, 1586:23,
1588:33, 1614:24,
1614:29, 1614:33,
1614:39, 1614:46,
1622:8, 1630:9,
1630:40, 1631:20,
1631:25, 1638:45,

1645:28, 1645:42,
1653:37, 1656:35,
1659:19

materials [1] - 1557:22

matter [43] - 1565:16,
1567:25, 1578:44,
1580:35, 1581:19,
1586:7, 1587:13,
1587:17, 1589:9,
1590:32, 1590:34,
1596:27, 1598:5,
1600:38, 1601:3,
1601:4, 1601:35,
1601:46, 1603:25,
1604:32, 1605:5,
1605:45, 1606:11,
1606:18, 1607:3,
1607:20, 1617:21,
1617:25, 1618:3,
1619:14, 1623:42,
1638:13, 1641:25,
1641:29, 1643:11,
1643:15, 1643:45,
1644:12, 1655:5,
1657:24, 1661:42,
1664:37, 1667:34

matters [28] - 1553:32,
1554:35, 1555:32,
1556:34, 1557:2,
1561:31, 1568:22,
1579:40, 1586:21,
1592:23, 1592:24,
1592:25, 1592:26,
1594:30, 1599:41,
1600:10, 1600:16,
1601:41, 1605:3,
1614:42, 1629:34,
1629:41, 1641:14,
1643:14, 1657:5,
1657:31, 1664:13,
1665:28

MATTERS [1] - 1549:13

MATTHEWS [1] - 1561:28

Matthews [3] - 1559:17,
1559:40, 1561:25

Matthews' [4] - 1560:2,
1560:42, 1563:1,
1570:17

mature [1] - 1560:23

maturing [1] - 1624:46

MCALINDEN [1] - 1614:18

McAlinden [114] -
1572:34, 1573:1,
1573:8, 1573:25,
1574:2, 1577:22,
1581:41, 1581:44,
1582:24, 1583:20,
1583:25, 1583:44,
1583:47, 1584:3,
1584:6, 1584:25,
1584:32, 1585:31,
1585:33, 1585:47,
1586:16, 1586:37,
1586:45, 1587:9,
1587:18, 1587:39,
1587:44, 1588:3,
1588:8, 1588:27,
1588:37, 1588:42,

1588:43, 1589:7,
1589:9, 1591:9,
1591:15, 1591:17,
1591:19, 1594:40,
1595:15, 1595:41,
1596:46, 1598:5,
1599:6, 1606:2, 1608:2,
1610:17, 1610:27,
1610:36, 1610:40,
1610:44, 1612:8,
1613:8, 1613:13,
1613:24, 1613:26,
1613:42, 1614:6,
1614:16, 1617:45,
1618:6, 1618:12,
1627:17, 1627:20,
1627:32, 1627:39,
1628:35, 1632:27,
1633:2, 1633:17,
1633:43, 1634:2,
1640:31, 1643:37,
1644:28, 1648:40,
1649:3, 1649:40,
1650:27, 1656:3,
1656:36, 1657:18,
1658:16, 1658:19,
1658:24, 1659:5,
1659:15, 1659:19,
1659:30, 1660:7,
1660:11, 1660:16,
1660:32, 1661:14,
1661:21, 1661:35,
1661:38, 1662:27,
1663:30, 1664:26,
1665:25, 1665:47,
1666:13, 1666:28,
1666:37, 1667:4,
1667:11, 1667:25,
1667:34, 1668:19,
1668:24, 1668:33

McAlinden's [8] - 1574:7,
1583:40, 1584:4,
1585:13, 1586:39,
1589:1, 1660:26,
1661:47

McGuckin [2] - 1569:17,
1569:35

mean [21] - 1569:33,
1580:4, 1589:31,
1593:47, 1597:44,
1602:32, 1605:32,
1609:44, 1610:21,
1615:39, 1617:20,
1621:35, 1622:29,
1631:6, 1631:32,
1639:28, 1651:33,
1655:23, 1668:19,
1668:23

means [6] - 1612:16,
1622:43, 1624:7,
1626:11, 1654:44,
1666:20

media [4] - 1554:45,
1555:2, 1590:44,
1657:37

Medical [1] - 1666:46

medication [1] - 1562:13

meeting [42] - 1556:7,

1572:30, 1582:1,
1582:2, 1582:3, 1582:7,
1582:9, 1582:13,
1582:24, 1583:20,
1583:21, 1583:39,
1583:44, 1583:46,
1583:47, 1584:3,
1584:4, 1584:5,
1584:17, 1592:5,
1596:13, 1597:2,
1597:37, 1598:3,
1598:29, 1598:30,
1598:36, 1598:37,
1598:38, 1598:44,
1613:4, 1617:19,
1627:31, 1628:5,
1628:9, 1628:14,
1628:26, 1628:45,
1658:2, 1658:19,
1659:15

meetings [4] - 1581:31,
1582:33, 1582:39,
1627:10

Melbourne [1] - 1555:31

member [6] - 1555:14,
1569:18, 1569:19,
1569:20, 1609:32,
1658:26

members [5] - 1555:26,
1569:16, 1608:29,
1622:6, 1624:23

memo [1] - 1580:22

memory [13] - 1553:33,
1555:47, 1568:25,
1568:29, 1573:34,
1584:2, 1584:3,
1586:31, 1597:39,
1614:11, 1628:34,
1634:12, 1666:13

men [1] - 1611:4

mention [4] - 1596:19,
1615:18, 1631:19,
1663:44

mentioned [10] - 1572:21,
1590:2, 1594:39,
1595:24, 1609:21,
1625:37, 1629:33,
1659:20, 1659:45,
1664:15

mentions [1] - 1654:2

Mercy [1] - 1595:37

mercy [1] - 1652:40

merely [1] - 1661:5

message [4] - 1572:43,
1573:16, 1588:2,
1613:17

messier [1] - 1578:31

met [4] - 1598:21,
1613:13, 1614:7,
1628:21

method [1] - 1655:35

methodology [1] -
1657:12

mid [1] - 1551:8

mid-year [1] - 1551:8

middle [5] - 1551:4,
1586:24, 1625:3,
1625:37, 1662:44

might [25] - 1556:17,
1561:46, 1564:46,
1567:7, 1574:2,
1574:13, 1591:41,
1592:46, 1595:33,
1596:43, 1597:22,
1598:16, 1603:46,
1605:28, 1623:37,
1629:43, 1633:38,
1634:17, 1641:20,
1642:36, 1650:6,
1650:39, 1664:29,
1664:39

militated [1] - 1605:45

mind [30] - 1555:10,
1558:25, 1558:29,
1559:12, 1559:28,
1561:47, 1568:5,
1573:35, 1580:26,
1588:10, 1599:15,
1605:16, 1610:8,
1610:36, 1615:46,
1616:6, 1616:8, 1618:2,
1620:34, 1623:23,
1623:29, 1626:5,
1628:10, 1628:18,
1634:35, 1639:29,
1640:20, 1650:44,
1653:41, 1666:13

mind's [1] - 1582:10

minded [2] - 1616:14,
1639:33

mine [1] - 1620:36

minimise [2] - 1576:41,
1663:11

minister [1] - 1660:31

ministry [48] - 1562:2,
1562:12, 1563:33,
1564:16, 1564:19,
1565:37, 1567:43,
1569:27, 1571:5,
1571:17, 1571:20,
1571:23, 1571:46,
1576:23, 1586:39,
1587:10, 1588:4,
1590:28, 1600:32,
1606:46, 1607:6,
1607:17, 1607:25,
1609:23, 1634:43,
1634:46, 1635:1,
1635:7, 1635:11,
1635:14, 1635:17,
1635:24, 1635:26,
1635:39, 1636:17,
1639:28, 1639:30,
1639:31, 1639:35,
1639:39, 1639:43,
1641:9, 1643:27,
1643:34, 1649:20,
1650:37, 1661:6,
1661:41

minted [1] - 1624:44

minute [2] - 1623:6,
1657:23

minutes [1] - 1590:39

misconduct [5] - 1632:9,
1647:44, 1647:46,
1668:10

misdeemeanour [2] -
1558:43, 1599:9

misdeemeanours [1] -
1559:2

miserably [2] - 1663:46,
1666:19

misguided [1] - 1596:38

misinterpreted [1] -
1593:1

mislead [2] - 1577:35,
1622:29

misprision [14] - 1600:12,
1600:28, 1600:34,
1601:15, 1601:20,
1604:8, 1604:15,
1618:19, 1619:5,
1619:19, 1619:32,
1619:42, 1621:10,
1636:27

misprizing [1] - 1619:10

misrepresent [1] -
1566:15

Miss [3] - 1593:15, 1594:6,
1594:11

missing [1] - 1646:24

mistake [1] - 1598:28

mistaken [2] - 1556:11,
1628:38

misunderstood [2] -
1635:28, 1642:39

molestation [3] - 1573:14,
1584:42, 1647:42

molested [1] - 1597:46

moment [4] - 1562:34,
1630:7, 1648:34,
1663:10

Monsignor [7] - 1557:42,
1585:42, 1586:16,
1586:27, 1628:41,
1644:24, 1662:5

month [1] - 1583:1

months [4] - 1666:29,
1667:16, 1667:18,
1667:19

mood [1] - 1605:19

moral [3] - 1554:9,
1629:34, 1629:40

morning [4] - 1550:2,
1550:5, 1561:46,
1591:10

most [19] - 1554:6,
1565:12, 1567:23,
1567:31, 1577:18,
1584:40, 1606:43,
1609:42, 1609:44,
1610:8, 1611:20,
1625:16, 1639:26,
1643:13, 1643:19,
1659:12, 1660:20,
1661:31, 1664:16

mostly [2] - 1566:29,
1596:41

mouth [3] - 1596:42,
1597:22, 1598:17

move [3] - 1581:26,
1619:40, 1654:27

moved [1] - 1655:19

moving [1] - 1588:4

MR [10] - 1550:9, 1581:24,
1587:23, 1587:28,
1593:26, 1610:21,
1616:14, 1622:22,
1651:9, 1651:16

MS [47] - 1550:1, 1550:14,
1550:16, 1557:12,
1557:21, 1557:28,
1557:35, 1558:15,
1558:25, 1561:17,
1561:21, 1561:30,
1581:26, 1581:31,
1587:25, 1587:34,
1589:44, 1590:43,
1591:4, 1593:36,
1594:8, 1610:24,
1614:5, 1614:13,
1614:20, 1616:17,
1616:23, 1618:22,
1619:3, 1622:27,
1645:18, 1645:27,
1646:38, 1646:44,
1651:3, 1651:18,
1651:26, 1651:46,
1655:9, 1656:25,
1656:34, 1657:23,
1657:30, 1657:36,
1657:44, 1667:18,
1668:36

must [6] - 1555:45,
1583:44, 1615:33,
1654:37, 1666:9,
1667:19

N

name [15] - 1550:16,
1551:10, 1573:39,
1574:2, 1574:4,
1595:16, 1595:17,
1595:18, 1595:28,
1595:29, 1595:33,
1607:4, 1654:4, 1654:37

names [5] - 1568:26,
1591:28, 1595:24,
1636:5, 1636:9

narrative [1] - 1606:27

nature [23] - 1555:37,
1563:23, 1564:6,
1565:15, 1567:46,
1567:47, 1576:40,
1581:32, 1590:17,
1598:1, 1599:17,
1599:21, 1599:30,
1609:12, 1610:7,
1612:25, 1617:44,
1621:7, 1641:32,
1641:35, 1647:42,
1650:29, 1663:24

near [1] - 1605:35

necessarily [13] - 1552:23,
1564:29, 1565:25,
1567:7, 1573:32,
1573:45, 1577:14,
1605:47, 1606:1,
1634:42, 1636:6,
1649:17, 1668:9

necessary [5] - 1567:37,
1567:40, 1576:28,
1650:13, 1650:15

need [42] - 1550:4,
1553:45, 1554:7,
1555:36, 1562:14,
1564:47, 1567:29,
1567:44, 1568:4,
1569:16, 1570:32,
1571:17, 1577:25,
1588:24, 1597:11,
1599:1, 1599:4,
1616:25, 1616:28,
1616:38, 1623:41,
1626:15, 1631:2,
1632:10, 1632:20,
1634:29, 1634:39,
1635:45, 1636:6,
1636:35, 1636:47,
1637:2, 1637:11,
1637:25, 1638:19,
1648:34, 1648:39,
1649:22, 1654:2,
1655:28, 1660:28

needed [9] - 1556:14,
1559:1, 1562:19,
1567:33, 1570:37,
1588:23, 1598:31,
1598:46, 1634:42

needs [5] - 1564:45,
1635:37, 1635:38,
1635:41, 1639:23

negotiated [1] - 1668:25

neutral [6] - 1603:9,
1603:16, 1603:31,
1603:39, 1603:41,
1603:42

never [27] - 1552:29,
1572:3, 1573:17,
1573:21, 1574:33,
1580:18, 1584:43,
1592:43, 1592:44,
1592:45, 1597:29,
1616:6, 1616:20,
1620:8, 1620:10,
1620:20, 1620:22,
1620:25, 1631:27,
1631:36, 1636:30,
1650:3, 1650:6,
1661:29, 1661:31,
1662:37, 1663:10

New [11] - 1551:5,
1553:41, 1565:36,
1569:43, 1583:13,
1583:15, 1621:17,
1622:7, 1622:15,
1624:22, 1662:46

NEWCASTLE [1] -
1549:17

Newcastle [7] - 1549:24,
1549:25, 1583:19,
1583:29, 1583:36,
1660:25, 1661:34

newly [1] - 1624:44

next [7] - 1562:2, 1574:2,
1632:8, 1663:7,

1663:43, 1666:18, 1667:11
night [2] - 1651:16, 1651:18
nine [1] - 1565:21
no-one [1] - 1660:30
non [3] - 1551:12, 1551:14, 1584:8
non-practising [2] - 1551:12, 1551:14
non-publication [1] - 1584:8
none [5] - 1593:5, 1593:6, 1593:10, 1641:47, 1645:41
norm [1] - 1577:2
normal [9] - 1572:9, 1589:29, 1589:31, 1594:44, 1594:46, 1633:27, 1633:30, 1633:33, 1634:27
normally [4] - 1629:4, 1633:32, 1633:35
norms [1] - 1612:16
note [19] - 1565:12, 1565:23, 1567:19, 1567:21, 1578:14, 1578:17, 1578:28, 1578:32, 1578:33, 1578:36, 1578:42, 1579:4, 1579:8, 1580:5, 1580:6, 1580:7, 1580:10, 1615:4, 1654:25
noted [3] - 1550:12, 1562:4, 1562:28
notepad [1] - 1649:37
notes [57] - 1551:38, 1551:41, 1551:44, 1552:4, 1552:25, 1552:26, 1563:40, 1563:42, 1563:45, 1563:47, 1564:2, 1564:23, 1564:26, 1564:32, 1564:34, 1564:37, 1566:6, 1566:11, 1566:20, 1566:36, 1567:1, 1567:5, 1571:12, 1575:5, 1575:23, 1579:14, 1579:21, 1579:25, 1579:39, 1580:4, 1580:42, 1588:17, 1590:3, 1598:29, 1598:37, 1598:40, 1598:44, 1599:33, 1599:34, 1599:36, 1599:40, 1600:1, 1600:4, 1616:2, 1616:10, 1619:27, 1623:45, 1624:7, 1624:14, 1632:30, 1634:26, 1642:12, 1645:29, 1646:39, 1649:43, 1650:10, 1662:40
nothing [5] - 1611:27, 1653:33, 1655:38, 1660:29, 1663:24
nowhere [1] - 1605:35
NSW [4] - 1549:25, 1610:14, 1610:17, 1610:26
number [31] - 1555:43, 1557:24, 1562:2, 1563:14, 1564:11, 1570:18, 1573:35, 1573:36, 1574:4, 1577:36, 1581:20, 1582:35, 1585:37, 1601:18, 1602:10, 1602:37, 1603:18, 1605:42, 1605:44, 1620:15, 1624:12, 1625:3, 1625:42, 1633:44, 1634:34, 1641:36, 1644:25, 1661:1, 1662:44, 1665:17, 1667:20
Number [1] - 1549:25
numbered [2] - 1625:2, 1662:44
nun [1] - 1595:37
nuncio [1] - 1586:25
nurse [1] - 1663:3
nut [2] - 1613:27, 1659:5

O

o'clock [2] - 1618:24, 1668:40
oath [1] - 1590:22
obfuscate [2] - 1576:41, 1577:3
object [5] - 1581:24, 1593:26, 1610:21, 1616:14, 1651:9
objection [2] - 1590:46, 1657:39
obligation [5] - 1611:47, 1612:7, 1617:2, 1617:45, 1665:3
obligations [3] - 1602:18, 1636:7, 1648:6
obliged [1] - 1652:14
observation [7] - 1562:4, 1570:42, 1570:45, 1615:26, 1615:30, 1632:16, 1663:47
observed [1] - 1612:18
obstruct [1] - 1652:46
obtained [1] - 1624:4
obtaining [1] - 1639:7
obvious [2] - 1640:6, 1650:41
obviously [8] - 1561:39, 1572:30, 1574:9, 1606:21, 1614:38, 1617:21, 1623:9, 1636:43
occasion [21] - 1553:24, 1566:5, 1570:15, 1570:21, 1574:39, 1574:43, 1575:20, 1579:12, 1579:14, 1586:12, 1594:47, 1595:5, 1602:5, 1620:10, 1620:40, 1620:45, 1629:2, 1630:23, 1640:19, 1641:4, 1645:46
occasionally [1] - 1551:8
occasions [6] - 1551:30, 1566:29, 1566:32, 1575:16, 1620:15, 1663:9
occur [6] - 1589:23, 1597:1, 1664:16, 1664:27, 1664:29, 1664:30
occurred [12] - 1574:13, 1576:16, 1582:25, 1583:43, 1588:22, 1589:23, 1598:29, 1598:37, 1599:18, 1634:13, 1636:30, 1653:27
occurs [2] - 1630:9, 1654:11
OCTOBER [1] - 1645:25
October [7] - 1557:36, 1558:16, 1558:19, 1624:39, 1624:41, 1641:28, 1645:19
od [1] - 1581:22
OF [9] - 1549:11, 1549:13, 1549:17, 1557:18, 1557:33, 1561:27, 1614:18, 1656:31
offence [12] - 1558:30, 1599:9, 1604:19, 1604:26, 1615:35, 1615:44, 1616:1, 1616:5, 1616:12, 1617:21, 1618:19, 1626:36
offences [10] - 1558:45, 1561:37, 1565:13, 1599:17, 1603:21, 1603:46, 1605:23, 1609:36, 1612:24, 1658:45
offended [1] - 1606:40
offender [3] - 1629:5, 1629:7, 1629:8
offending [3] - 1576:24, 1660:26, 1661:47
offer [2] - 1661:23, 1661:27
offered [2] - 1650:30, 1651:4
offering [1] - 1663:14
office [1] - 1583:9
Office [5] - 1549:41, 1568:37, 1582:44, 1583:6, 1665:3
officers [2] - 1590:8, 1645:15
official [7] - 1552:35, 1555:2, 1607:4, 1607:11, 1607:14, 1617:1, 1628:14
officials [2] - 1559:14, 1615:33
often [3] - 1592:42, 1605:4, 1628:21
old [1] - 1584:37
older [1] - 1571:33
once [7] - 1571:16, 1571:45, 1583:9, 1587:11, 1658:39, 1658:41, 1661:40
one [92] - 1552:24, 1552:26, 1552:29, 1556:6, 1562:6, 1562:9, 1563:32, 1563:37, 1567:10, 1568:11, 1568:16, 1568:18, 1568:21, 1569:18, 1569:19, 1575:20, 1575:42, 1577:17, 1577:32, 1580:10, 1581:3, 1582:2, 1582:3, 1584:11, 1585:46, 1589:39, 1590:2, 1590:19, 1590:20, 1591:28, 1591:44, 1593:38, 1598:28, 1598:35, 1598:38, 1600:31, 1600:38, 1600:43, 1601:2, 1602:28, 1603:45, 1604:4, 1605:42, 1605:44, 1606:36, 1609:8, 1609:21, 1609:45, 1611:19, 1612:23, 1613:3, 1613:44, 1616:32, 1616:43, 1617:47, 1619:17, 1619:18, 1619:23, 1619:31, 1623:22, 1625:42, 1627:30, 1627:35, 1628:18, 1629:31, 1631:39, 1634:35, 1638:24, 1638:25, 1638:31, 1638:42, 1640:36, 1643:20, 1643:22, 1646:27, 1650:4, 1650:6, 1653:21, 1653:46, 1654:11, 1654:12, 1654:20, 1654:33, 1658:2, 1658:29, 1659:31, 1660:6, 1660:30, 1664:29
ongoing [3] - 1586:39, 1587:12, 1640:32
open [2] - 1598:40, 1645:27
opened [1] - 1665:39
openly [1] - 1650:5
operate [3] - 1622:33, 1622:39, 1648:25
operates [1] - 1648:23
operation [3] - 1656:9, 1656:41
opinion [3] - 1561:44, 1615:14, 1667:30
opportunity [2] - 1568:25, 1606:41
opposed [6] - 1585:26, 1587:7, 1588:33, 1603:31, 1638:23, 1639:35
oppression [1] - 1590:7
options [2] - 1602:27, 1602:29
ordained [4] - 1550:26, 1550:29, 1551:10, 1660:38
order [2] - 1568:27, 1590:6
ordinary [2] - 1628:47, 1629:2
ordination [1] - 1553:11
organisation [3] - 1622:16, 1656:4, 1656:40
organisations [2] - 1622:31, 1622:38
origin [1] - 1654:43
original [2] - 1563:1, 1568:10
orphanage [1] - 1647:42
otherwise [12] - 1563:27, 1587:8, 1590:29, 1596:26, 1602:18, 1603:30, 1609:31, 1630:5, 1630:14, 1633:36, 1634:12, 1654:44
ought [8] - 1563:43, 1578:22, 1601:31, 1607:41, 1632:28, 1632:35, 1634:22, 1638:18
ourselves [2] - 1564:8, 1657:11
outcome [21] - 1566:9, 1575:38, 1575:41, 1576:5, 1576:19, 1576:21, 1581:5, 1588:6, 1589:11, 1590:26, 1590:33, 1603:13, 1612:27, 1613:12, 1634:29, 1637:39, 1649:12, 1650:41, 1650:45, 1661:44
outcomes [1] - 1643:30
outfit [2] - 1572:14, 1608:3
outline [5] - 1550:40, 1555:19, 1559:19, 1626:22, 1656:9
outlined [8] - 1560:28, 1596:31, 1596:37, 1618:17, 1625:7, 1635:22, 1640:11, 1654:29
outlining [1] - 1557:2
outside [12] - 1570:41, 1571:1, 1608:30, 1609:3, 1617:3, 1622:33, 1622:39, 1641:29, 1643:6,

1648:24, 1648:25
overall [1] - 1641:16
overnight [2] - 1664:39,
1665:27
overseas [2] - 1660:11,
1667:39
own [14] - 1552:47,
1564:45, 1565:23,
1569:11, 1569:13,
1578:14, 1578:17,
1581:13, 1597:14,
1598:32, 1602:6,
1603:24, 1615:14,
1619:39

P

Pablo [7] - 1666:29,
1666:33, 1666:36,
1666:42, 1667:35,
1668:5, 1668:13
pad [1] - 1598:39
paedophile [15] - 1605:40,
1607:26, 1607:31,
1608:29, 1608:32,
1608:34, 1609:26,
1609:36, 1610:37,
1611:39, 1639:36,
1639:37, 1645:4,
1658:45, 1659:10
paedophile" [1] - 1607:33
paedophile-related [1] -
1658:45
paedophiles [3] - 1610:32,
1638:46, 1665:22
paedophilia [4] - 1609:41,
1639:8, 1665:21,
1665:24
paedophilic [1] - 1592:41
page [46] - 1559:28,
1559:29, 1561:47,
1562:27, 1625:2,
1625:3, 1625:12,
1625:37, 1626:22,
1626:24, 1626:25,
1626:33, 1629:33,
1629:35, 1630:10,
1630:42, 1632:8,
1632:13, 1641:14,
1641:15, 1646:4,
1647:21, 1647:30,
1648:2, 1652:9,
1653:39, 1653:41,
1653:44, 1654:2,
1659:37, 1662:26,
1662:40, 1662:44,
1662:45, 1662:46,
1663:7, 1663:43,
1665:29, 1666:28,
1666:37, 1666:38,
1667:11
pages [1] - 1630:7
pain [1] - 1596:40
PAPER [1] - 1645:24
paper [19] - 1579:40,
1603:46, 1623:28,
1624:31, 1624:37,

1624:38, 1624:40,
1624:43, 1625:2,
1625:22, 1625:31,
1629:21, 1629:24,
1630:33, 1631:19,
1641:13, 1645:18,
1645:21, 1646:29
papers [4] - 1619:13,
1619:17, 1662:32,
1662:35
Papua [1] - 1662:46
paragraph [25] - 1559:30,
1562:1, 1563:6,
1622:42, 1626:30,
1630:41, 1631:9,
1632:11, 1632:13,
1642:19, 1647:20,
1647:21, 1647:23,
1648:3, 1648:19,
1648:37, 1659:36,
1660:6, 1664:24,
1664:33, 1664:44,
1665:29, 1665:30,
1666:18, 1666:38
paragraphs [4] - 1559:31,
1626:23, 1626:33,
1664:40
parallel [3] - 1642:18,
1642:34, 1642:38
parallels [1] - 1642:16
pardon [1] - 1594:20
parish [4] - 1655:25,
1655:27, 1655:30,
1660:47
parochial [2] - 1607:40,
1607:41
part [45] - 1551:4,
1552:34, 1552:45,
1553:24, 1554:15,
1554:45, 1560:29,
1562:22, 1562:47,
1563:3, 1570:13,
1570:14, 1570:17,
1572:10, 1575:41,
1576:21, 1585:14,
1589:14, 1589:16,
1594:28, 1596:1,
1596:38, 1600:10,
1600:11, 1600:12,
1600:26, 1601:29,
1602:18, 1603:34,
1605:20, 1611:47,
1614:29, 1615:15,
1615:29, 1617:11,
1627:44, 1637:15,
1640:44, 1646:41,
1647:27, 1649:18,
1655:4, 1659:35,
1662:7, 1664:26
part-time [1] - 1551:4
partial [1] - 1597:2
participated [1] - 1551:7
particular [124] - 1554:6,
1554:26, 1554:34,
1555:20, 1555:28,
1555:39, 1560:6,
1564:39, 1564:40,
1564:43, 1565:14,

1566:42, 1568:35,
1568:41, 1568:43,
1569:1, 1569:17,
1569:24, 1569:44,
1570:13, 1570:22,
1571:36, 1571:41,
1572:24, 1572:33,
1573:2, 1573:24,
1575:29, 1576:2,
1576:22, 1576:35,
1577:17, 1577:34,
1577:40, 1577:41,
1578:2, 1578:3, 1578:8,
1578:11, 1578:12,
1579:13, 1579:21,
1580:36, 1581:21,
1582:1, 1582:33,
1584:9, 1585:12,
1586:46, 1587:38,
1587:40, 1589:34,
1591:31, 1593:40,
1594:3, 1594:16,
1594:29, 1595:21,
1603:38, 1604:10,
1604:26, 1604:36,
1604:41, 1609:41,
1616:10, 1617:6,
1617:19, 1617:35,
1618:2, 1619:13,
1619:40, 1620:47,
1624:19, 1624:26,
1624:46, 1625:22,
1626:7, 1626:11,
1626:30, 1627:31,
1627:36, 1628:1,
1629:43, 1630:2,
1630:9, 1630:19,
1630:24, 1630:38,
1631:45, 1632:40,
1635:15, 1636:5,
1636:6, 1636:27,
1640:30, 1641:4,
1642:18, 1644:40,
1645:3, 1647:26,
1648:8, 1648:15,
1648:36, 1649:18,
1651:47, 1652:20,
1652:33, 1653:35,
1653:45, 1654:43,
1656:47, 1657:9,
1657:10, 1657:24,
1660:3, 1662:1, 1662:9,
1662:16, 1665:23,
1666:15, 1668:34
particularly [13] - 1554:12,
1554:14, 1555:31,
1571:33, 1577:8,
1580:35, 1581:40,
1590:31, 1597:12,
1598:5, 1603:19,
1605:16, 1622:8
parties [1] - 1553:30
partly [5] - 1586:26,
1593:40, 1596:40,
1628:31, 1643:44
parts [5] - 1556:45,
1560:15, 1576:35,
1606:3, 1649:23

party [3] - 1559:25,
1620:26, 1626:36
pass [3] - 1571:13,
1572:43, 1613:17
passed [3] - 1566:25,
1566:44, 1613:17
past [10] - 1611:2, 1611:4,
1617:27, 1665:38,
1665:40, 1665:42,
1666:1, 1666:5, 1666:9,
1667:7
pastoral [13] - 1554:39,
1567:1, 1572:21,
1589:16, 1589:26,
1636:35, 1636:38,
1636:41, 1636:43,
1637:3, 1637:11,
1637:15, 1653:6
Paula [7] - 1595:37,
1596:14, 1613:21,
1618:14, 1628:6,
1637:36, 1658:6
pause [1] - 1612:46
paused [1] - 1593:28
penal [5] - 1625:45,
1625:47, 1626:8,
1626:11, 1626:37
Penance [1] - 1663:13
people [40] - 1552:26,
1554:16, 1569:24,
1577:41, 1578:3,
1578:8, 1578:44,
1578:47, 1580:45,
1580:47, 1590:6,
1592:41, 1595:17,
1601:41, 1602:19,
1602:27, 1602:45,
1607:32, 1607:44,
1608:18, 1608:30,
1609:40, 1609:45,
1611:13, 1612:12,
1623:10, 1623:43,
1637:11, 1637:17,
1637:27, 1640:12,
1640:15, 1640:19,
1650:31, 1655:35,
1656:14, 1661:2,
1662:1, 1667:41
people's [1] - 1611:14
per [3] - 1578:29, 1624:22,
1650:3
perception [1] - 1564:45
perfect [3] - 1663:47,
1664:6, 1666:21
perfectly [1] - 1561:8
performed [4] - 1569:30,
1569:35, 1583:10,
1641:43
performing [1] - 1608:20
perhaps [16] - 1556:11,
1558:42, 1585:22,
1587:28, 1597:20,
1603:5, 1622:10,
1622:42, 1623:4,
1628:44, 1630:41,
1647:42, 1650:25,
1650:42, 1651:29,

1663:37
period [7] - 1550:36,
1568:31, 1568:32,
1569:36, 1624:42,
1631:4, 1658:35
permanent [7] - 1565:28,
1578:20, 1578:21,
1632:31, 1634:17,
1634:22, 1663:3
permitted [1] - 1572:7
perpetrator [41] - 1564:15,
1564:32, 1566:7,
1567:30, 1567:34,
1571:11, 1575:29,
1575:35, 1575:36,
1575:40, 1575:43,
1576:3, 1576:17,
1576:22, 1576:23,
1576:37, 1577:3,
1577:8, 1577:16,
1578:16, 1578:42,
1579:17, 1580:11,
1581:9, 1589:15,
1589:27, 1589:33,
1589:37, 1591:32,
1591:46, 1591:47,
1592:5, 1606:22,
1606:30, 1617:23,
1617:33, 1634:16,
1637:1, 1638:10,
1640:7, 1642:8
perpetrators [5] -
1568:26, 1569:25,
1569:26, 1576:41,
1582:40
perpetual [3] - 1663:47,
1664:7, 1666:21
person [70] - 1564:23,
1565:19, 1565:22,
1568:9, 1572:24,
1573:2, 1573:24,
1573:29, 1573:35,
1573:44, 1574:3,
1574:18, 1578:29,
1579:47, 1580:44,
1584:9, 1584:17,
1585:12, 1585:21,
1585:22, 1592:44,
1592:45, 1592:47,
1593:1, 1594:16,
1597:30, 1597:45,
1604:19, 1606:32,
1608:19, 1608:28,
1608:44, 1609:26,
1611:6, 1611:28,
1612:17, 1612:27,
1612:30, 1613:16,
1614:7, 1616:15,
1617:9, 1617:10,
1617:15, 1617:20,
1617:29, 1617:37,
1619:28, 1620:18,
1620:47, 1624:7,
1626:44, 1627:20,
1628:44, 1632:41,
1634:39, 1637:35,
1637:37, 1638:2,
1639:19, 1639:35,

1641:19, 1642:23,
1651:22, 1653:15,
1653:30, 1653:31,
1658:7, 1662:19
person's [1] - 1612:40
person] [1] - 1659:47
personal [3] - 1598:18,
1606:38, 1615:14
personally [7] - 1560:29,
1611:37, 1619:38,
1620:11, 1620:46,
1652:27, 1656:34
persons [6] - 1556:44,
1609:16, 1617:3,
1620:6, 1622:31,
1658:44
perspective [1] - 1580:26
persuade [3] - 1563:33,
1633:14, 1650:27
persuaded [4] - 1577:42,
1587:3, 1587:9, 1587:12
persuading [2] - 1565:37,
1569:27
persuasively [1] - 1623:31
pervert [2] - 1619:45,
1652:47
Philippine [1] - 1661:32
Philippines [6] - 1660:8,
1660:13, 1660:17,
1660:19, 1660:26,
1661:16
Phillip [1] - 1550:43
phone [31] - 1566:2,
1572:36, 1573:8,
1573:21, 1573:26,
1573:35, 1573:36,
1574:4, 1574:8,
1574:16, 1574:25,
1574:26, 1574:29,
1584:23, 1584:26,
1584:27, 1584:35,
1584:39, 1584:43,
1584:47, 1585:11,
1586:22, 1591:5,
1591:7, 1591:8,
1591:12, 1594:30,
1606:12, 1613:7,
1640:33, 1644:24
phoned [5] - 1573:2,
1573:7, 1574:17,
1591:14, 1601:9
photo [5] - 1614:5, 1614:6,
1614:8, 1614:9, 1614:10
photocopy [1] - 1614:15
PHOTOCOPY [1] -
1614:18
photograph [4] - 1613:42,
1614:1, 1614:13,
1614:15
PHOTOGRAPH [1] -
1614:18
phrase [1] - 1654:44
physical [2] - 1596:32,
1596:46
physically [2] - 1583:18,
1641:5
piece [1] - 1636:9
pinpoint [4] - 1582:38,
1585:38, 1586:19,
1588:21
pinpointing [1] - 1582:29
pique [1] - 1623:27
place [20] - 1565:29,
1568:13, 1576:45,
1583:35, 1583:44,
1592:45, 1595:30,
1595:32, 1608:18,
1609:45, 1611:15,
1611:17, 1616:32,
1619:20, 1630:6,
1631:36, 1634:26,
1645:15, 1649:24,
1656:13
placement [1] - 1551:25
plain [2] - 1597:16,
1651:10
plan [5] - 1586:44,
1640:36, 1640:41,
1640:44, 1640:47
planned [1] - 1584:31
planning [1] - 1558:2
plans [2] - 1587:8, 1641:4
playground [1] - 1608:38
plead [2] - 1577:42,
1617:41
pleaded [1] - 1620:16
pleased [1] - 1623:22
plenary [1] - 1556:7
point [15] - 1587:35,
1588:12, 1589:26,
1593:31, 1603:15,
1610:7, 1613:46,
1634:21, 1634:24,
1636:36, 1636:38,
1643:21, 1656:19,
1661:22, 1667:6
Police [4] - 1610:14,
1610:17, 1610:26,
1622:15
police [94] - 1590:8,
1596:23, 1596:27,
1597:20, 1600:3,
1600:33, 1600:39,
1600:45, 1601:3,
1601:4, 1601:9,
1601:32, 1601:41,
1601:45, 1601:46,
1601:47, 1602:1,
1602:44, 1603:4,
1603:8, 1603:10,
1603:17, 1603:26,
1603:31, 1603:40,
1603:41, 1603:43,
1604:27, 1604:31,
1604:32, 1605:28,
1605:46, 1605:47,
1606:2, 1606:19,
1612:31, 1612:33,
1612:36, 1612:40,
1615:21, 1615:34,
1617:25, 1617:34,
1617:46, 1618:3,
1620:11, 1620:14,
1620:16, 1620:19,
1620:27, 1620:28,
1620:42, 1620:47,
1622:6, 1622:17,
1622:32, 1627:40,
1627:45, 1638:10,
1638:13, 1638:15,
1638:18, 1640:7,
1640:12, 1640:15,
1640:16, 1640:20,
1640:21, 1643:11,
1643:16, 1643:31,
1644:10, 1644:12,
1644:29, 1644:31,
1644:34, 1644:35,
1644:39, 1644:42,
1644:43, 1644:46,
1645:4, 1645:8,
1645:14, 1650:39,
1651:6, 1651:42,
1651:44, 1653:31,
1653:33, 1655:33,
1655:39, 1658:11
POLICE [1] - 1549:13
policies [3] - 1649:5,
1649:10, 1661:40
policy [10] - 1562:7,
1562:24, 1603:38,
1619:41, 1630:8,
1630:40, 1631:8,
1631:37, 1641:16,
1667:44
Pontifical [1] - 1554:40
pored [1] - 1601:18
poring [1] - 1601:24
pose [1] - 1638:24
posed [3] - 1622:14,
1630:22, 1641:29
poses [1] - 1612:17
position [53] - 1551:21,
1553:10, 1564:30,
1565:34, 1565:40,
1572:23, 1578:37,
1579:7, 1579:16,
1579:43, 1579:45,
1582:45, 1583:11,
1584:16, 1584:20,
1591:6, 1591:10,
1592:40, 1597:19,
1598:24, 1602:10,
1602:37, 1603:29,
1604:24, 1605:9,
1607:27, 1608:35,
1611:13, 1616:46,
1617:15, 1617:35,
1617:43, 1619:8,
1619:34, 1620:35,
1627:10, 1629:26,
1634:13, 1634:14,
1638:17, 1640:8,
1640:13, 1643:13,
1645:41, 1648:23,
1652:2, 1659:14,
1660:37, 1660:38,
1661:6, 1665:21,
1666:41, 1667:32
possibility [1] - 1590:7
possible [17] - 1562:9,
1585:23, 1594:23,
1594:47, 1595:4,
1595:11, 1595:12,
1598:28, 1600:11,
1601:11, 1608:40,
1612:21, 1628:29,
1633:32, 1646:35,
1649:28, 1664:34
possibly [2] - 1585:17,
1613:39
posted [1] - 1666:35
potential [1] - 1636:26
potentially [3] - 1611:30,
1618:18, 1652:34
power [6] - 1572:14,
1602:12, 1638:9,
1638:11, 1665:33,
1665:35
practical [6] - 1571:25,
1581:5, 1590:26,
1601:11, 1623:42,
1629:47
practicalities [1] - 1581:2
practice [43] - 1551:4,
1551:15, 1572:23,
1574:16, 1574:23,
1574:24, 1574:32,
1585:20, 1587:7,
1587:11, 1591:8,
1591:18, 1591:28,
1591:37, 1594:23,
1594:28, 1594:35,
1594:44, 1594:46,
1597:4, 1597:25,
1603:23, 1603:38,
1613:21, 1619:40,
1628:47, 1629:2,
1630:44, 1633:28,
1633:31, 1633:33,
1633:37, 1633:38,
1633:39, 1634:28,
1637:38, 1641:7,
1649:15, 1649:16,
1649:35, 1662:7,
1662:15
practices [1] - 1665:17
practise [4] - 1553:13,
1580:37, 1611:19,
1652:35
practised [2] - 1550:36,
1592:20
practising [6] - 1551:1,
1551:2, 1551:12,
1551:14, 1553:7,
1602:43
practitioner [2] - 1550:36,
1550:41
prayer [2] - 1665:33,
1666:14
prayers [1] - 1665:2
preamble [1] - 1648:3
precepts [1] - 1562:13
precise [5] - 1555:22,
1567:39, 1569:21,
1598:1, 1632:42
precisely [3] - 1558:44,
1606:43, 1609:28
predicament [5] -
1600:30, 1600:31,
1609:33, 1617:26,
1666:15
prefer [3] - 1564:30,
1592:25, 1651:30
preference [1] - 1612:19
preliminary [2] - 1570:30,
1648:44
preparation [3] - 1560:16,
1614:25, 1621:39
prepare [6] - 1555:24,
1560:27, 1560:37,
1575:12, 1645:36,
1655:43
prepared [14] - 1556:41,
1559:16, 1560:22,
1560:30, 1560:45,
1562:44, 1604:14,
1615:4, 1618:18,
1619:8, 1645:41,
1650:4, 1656:1, 1659:19
preparing [7] - 1560:32,
1560:35, 1560:45,
1561:14, 1599:5,
1624:42, 1625:29
presence [1] - 1568:13
present [22] - 1552:8,
1555:19, 1558:7,
1564:36, 1567:30,
1574:47, 1595:42,
1596:14, 1597:28,
1597:31, 1623:28,
1625:33, 1628:6,
1628:14, 1628:26,
1628:34, 1628:42,
1628:46, 1629:3,
1629:23, 1646:1, 1658:7
presentation [5] - 1556:8,
1556:12, 1556:13,
1645:45, 1645:46
presented [7] - 1563:13,
1564:9, 1564:32,
1566:24, 1575:4,
1624:39, 1654:21
presenting [2] - 1564:43,
1565:2
preserve [2] - 1646:29,
1652:15
preserving [7] - 1641:23,
1641:30, 1642:32,
1643:4, 1643:6, 1643:8,
1643:9
pressure [3] - 1580:1,
1603:42, 1607:44
presumably [1] - 1615:43
presume [7] - 1560:41,
1561:1, 1561:3, 1561:4,
1586:47, 1643:39
presumed [1] - 1662:11
presuming [2] - 1573:23,
1586:27
pretended [1] - 1660:17
pretending [2] - 1661:3,
1661:15
prevailing [3] - 1562:39,
1606:27, 1618:1
prevent [13] - 1608:22,

1609:2, 1609:12, 1610:45, 1622:41, 1654:5, 1654:38, 1655:7, 1655:10, 1655:17, 1655:34, 1655:35, 1655:38

preventing [1] - 1668:33

priest [141] - 1550:20, 1550:29, 1552:24, 1553:10, 1553:13, 1553:16, 1563:21, 1563:29, 1563:32, 1565:25, 1565:37, 1565:43, 1567:42, 1568:6, 1569:45, 1571:4, 1571:15, 1571:31, 1571:33, 1571:44, 1571:45, 1571:47, 1572:7, 1572:13, 1572:34, 1573:25, 1575:6, 1575:13, 1577:17, 1577:21, 1577:28, 1578:15, 1580:23, 1580:30, 1580:36, 1580:37, 1581:39, 1587:12, 1590:22, 1592:39, 1593:14, 1594:10, 1594:14, 1594:15, 1594:16, 1594:24, 1594:29, 1602:12, 1603:6, 1606:17, 1606:35, 1606:39, 1606:46, 1607:15, 1608:20, 1608:22, 1608:31, 1608:36, 1608:41, 1608:45, 1609:23, 1609:24, 1609:27, 1609:29, 1609:35, 1609:41, 1610:3, 1610:9, 1611:19, 1611:22, 1611:26, 1611:34, 1611:38, 1612:15, 1616:3, 1616:9, 1616:29, 1616:39, 1616:46, 1620:11, 1620:41, 1634:33, 1635:1, 1635:23, 1635:25, 1635:35, 1635:41, 1635:46, 1636:4, 1636:10, 1636:16, 1636:36, 1636:39, 1637:16, 1637:30, 1637:40, 1638:23, 1638:31, 1638:32, 1638:36, 1639:2, 1639:3, 1639:7, 1639:16, 1639:27, 1639:38, 1639:41, 1641:5, 1641:36, 1642:4, 1642:35, 1642:45, 1649:36, 1650:6, 1650:33, 1652:33, 1652:35, 1653:23, 1653:24, 1655:25, 1655:32, 1655:39, 1656:45, 1660:17, 1660:22, 1660:34, 1660:35, 1660:46, 1661:3, 1661:4, 1661:15, 1661:29, 1662:10, 1662:16, 1667:23, 1668:13, 1668:20, 1668:33

priest's [2] - 1608:3, 1638:38

priesthood [5] - 1589:12, 1633:14, 1649:4, 1650:28, 1650:31

priestly [5] - 1572:14, 1609:3, 1635:7, 1639:38, 1639:43

priests [34] - 1552:31, 1552:44, 1553:2, 1553:7, 1553:25, 1566:1, 1570:3, 1571:28, 1574:44, 1575:4, 1577:40, 1579:41, 1581:3, 1581:20, 1582:33, 1590:4, 1605:40, 1606:40, 1613:33, 1618:17, 1620:4, 1620:15, 1624:4, 1624:14, 1626:7, 1627:10, 1630:24, 1657:10, 1658:30, 1658:32, 1658:43, 1660:30, 1660:42

primary [1] - 1666:44

principle [2] - 1590:14, 1654:28

principles [2] - 1611:20, 1649:5

priority [1] - 1571:34

privacy [5] - 1607:2, 1622:9, 1631:40, 1646:30, 1653:17

private [4] - 1552:36, 1607:9, 1607:36, 1657:3

privately [1] - 1607:21

privilege [2] - 1646:36, 1668:20

privileged [3] - 1646:26, 1646:31

problem [7] - 1630:39, 1639:34, 1643:24, 1643:26, 1643:28, 1643:29, 1656:46

problems [3] - 1656:16, 1663:1, 1665:38

procedural [1] - 1580:6

procedure [5] - 1560:16, 1570:19, 1590:12, 1601:19, 1657:14

procedures [1] - 1580:45

proceeded [1] - 1595:17

proceeding [1] - 1650:15

Proceedings [1] - 1615:19

proceedings [6] - 1556:45, 1573:3, 1579:15, 1581:10, 1596:43, 1624:34

process [59] - 1553:11, 1553:25, 1570:24, 1570:41, 1571:14, 1571:18, 1572:16, 1572:17, 1579:9, 1579:25, 1580:21, 1590:15, 1590:24, 1605:34, 1611:39, 1625:47, 1626:12, 1626:38, 1631:15, 1631:32, 1632:36, 1632:37, 1632:42, 1632:44, 1641:18, 1641:24, 1641:31, 1641:38, 1641:41, 1641:43, 1641:44, 1642:5, 1642:9, 1642:12, 1642:17, 1642:32, 1643:7, 1643:9, 1643:31, 1643:32, 1643:33, 1644:29, 1644:31, 1644:34, 1645:4, 1646:29, 1646:34, 1648:16, 1648:28, 1649:18, 1649:23, 1649:24, 1652:20, 1652:32, 1652:47, 1661:9, 1668:28, 1668:32

Process" [1] - 1646:5

processes [28] - 1570:32, 1570:33, 1570:35, 1570:36, 1570:41, 1571:1, 1587:43, 1605:33, 1619:45, 1620:3, 1620:6, 1627:4, 1635:16, 1642:44, 1645:3, 1648:19, 1649:4, 1649:10, 1651:4, 1651:47, 1652:5, 1661:40, 1662:8, 1663:36, 1668:18, 1668:23

producing [1] - 1660:31

production [1] - 1579:26

Professional [3] - 1568:37, 1582:44, 1583:6

professional [2] - 1555:16, 1646:36

program [6] - 1554:12, 1656:13, 1656:47, 1657:1, 1657:2, 1657:5

prohibit [1] - 1631:3

promise [3] - 1626:46, 1627:9, 1633:6

promoted [2] - 1652:6, 1652:9

prompt [3] - 1555:42, 1555:43, 1666:13

prompted [3] - 1555:29, 1555:36, 1595:34

proper [5] - 1567:19, 1593:45, 1622:43, 1637:11, 1637:15

properly [3] - 1606:31, 1639:41, 1661:36

property [1] - 1550:45

proposes [1] - 1654:27

proposition [9] - 1562:18, 1578:9, 1578:40, 1592:32, 1610:6, 1619:25, 1619:30, 1635:14, 1651:20

propositions [1] - 1582:21

prosecuted [7] - 1610:10, 1612:28, 1612:31, 1612:32, 1612:35, 1612:39, 1661:42

prosecuting [1] - 1612:24

prosecution [2] - 1603:20, 1661:43

prosecutions [1] - 1605:37

prosecutorial [1] - 1605:34

protect [5] - 1562:36, 1590:6, 1611:30, 1636:26, 1646:33

protected [2] - 1572:4, 1607:35

protecting [1] - 1643:35

protection [8] - 1550:9, 1606:30, 1612:16, 1634:32, 1634:35, 1634:45, 1636:7, 1661:22

protocol [35] - 1553:3, 1555:24, 1559:18, 1559:19, 1559:21, 1560:16, 1560:19, 1562:23, 1568:44, 1602:17, 1603:34, 1645:16, 1646:46, 1647:4, 1647:9, 1647:13, 1647:22, 1647:26, 1648:5, 1648:15, 1648:23, 1648:33, 1648:39, 1648:43, 1649:2, 1649:17, 1649:22, 1651:46, 1652:1, 1652:26, 1653:35, 1653:45, 1654:29, 1655:14, 1657:14

protocols [5] - 1552:42, 1601:19, 1601:25, 1601:40, 1602:38

provide [6] - 1559:34, 1566:5, 1566:11, 1566:20, 1571:43, 1656:7

provided [5] - 1567:21, 1614:28, 1624:31, 1640:8, 1650:9

provides [1] - 1625:43

province [2] - 1568:45, 1583:12

provision [1] - 1648:13

provisions [2] - 1625:8, 1625:22

prudence [3] - 1623:42, 1629:43, 1660:47

prudent [5] - 1611:10, 1623:47, 1624:3, 1624:15, 1631:38

prudential [1] - 1639:4

pseudonym [2] - 1585:13, 1591:26

pseudonyms [3] - 1556:43, 1556:44, 1573:3

psychiatric [1] - 1657:6

psycho [1] - 1663:22

psycho-analyst [1] - 1663:22

psychoanalysed [1] - 1663:31

psychological [3] - 1656:16, 1656:45, 1663:40

psychologist [1] - 1556:37

psychosexual [2] - 1656:15, 1656:45

public [4] - 1609:32, 1647:41, 1653:26, 1653:27

publication [1] - 1584:8

publicity [5] - 1555:30, 1555:32, 1609:37, 1609:40, 1659:1

publicly [4] - 1585:8, 1608:27, 1609:17, 1609:18

published [15] - 1579:12, 1579:23, 1579:29, 1603:45, 1606:47, 1607:1, 1607:11, 1607:13, 1607:14, 1608:29, 1610:31, 1615:15, 1624:33, 1624:41, 1638:45

pull [1] - 1649:37

punish [1] - 1609:9

punished [1] - 1609:18

pupils [1] - 1666:43

purpose [7] - 1552:45, 1555:23, 1556:15, 1598:3, 1619:26, 1632:22, 1656:10

purposes [8] - 1551:46, 1552:2, 1576:29, 1589:22, 1597:17, 1625:21, 1661:5, 1667:31

pursue [2] - 1573:43, 1619:41

pushes [1] - 1562:11

put [30] - 1571:2, 1583:34, 1585:22, 1586:31, 1593:42, 1595:12, 1595:16, 1597:19, 1597:22, 1598:17, 1598:24, 1600:3, 1602:21, 1603:42, 1607:4, 1607:32, 1607:44, 1608:18, 1609:17, 1609:35,

1622:30, 1633:39,
1636:30, 1640:36,
1645:15, 1651:11,
1656:13, 1657:8,
1658:39, 1661:28
putting [10] - 1563:26,
1565:31, 1578:40,
1580:1, 1582:21,
1589:37, 1596:41,
1601:8, 1601:37,
1651:20
puzzled [1] - 1595:16

Q

qualified [1] - 1663:21
queried [1] - 1629:43
questioning [1] - 1593:27
questions [20] - 1551:18,
1552:1, 1553:31,
1554:35, 1558:28,
1568:40, 1570:30,
1584:15, 1585:5,
1587:37, 1591:5,
1593:23, 1605:39,
1609:22, 1611:25,
1619:4, 1625:35,
1629:24, 1629:28,
1629:31
quibble [1] - 1612:26
quick [1] - 1562:11
quickly [3] - 1559:1,
1559:8, 1617:37
quite [20] - 1552:25,
1552:39, 1554:15,
1566:14, 1576:42,
1577:35, 1579:42,
1603:11, 1605:14,
1606:10, 1608:11,
1613:36, 1622:22,
1632:42, 1633:32,
1649:1, 1651:10,
1659:7, 1660:18,
1668:15
quo [1] - 1643:7

R

raise [5] - 1623:28,
1629:28, 1630:18,
1641:14, 1641:16
raised [5] - 1622:46,
1625:34, 1629:31,
1630:5, 1630:38
raising [2] - 1622:4,
1629:24
ran [1] - 1656:23
rang [1] - 1586:20
range [3] - 1592:10,
1593:2, 1593:5
ranging [2] - 1666:44,
1667:24
rare [1] - 1568:19
rarely [5] - 1566:29,
1572:29, 1573:18,
1629:10, 1659:10

rather [4] - 1587:28,
1603:16, 1605:46,
1623:8
reach [1] - 1557:25
reached [1] - 1588:32
read [31] - 1560:46,
1561:5, 1561:13,
1582:17, 1614:24,
1614:37, 1614:39,
1614:41, 1614:46,
1621:29, 1621:35,
1621:39, 1626:25,
1626:26, 1630:8,
1647:23, 1648:14,
1648:34, 1651:32,
1651:39, 1653:21,
1655:4, 1659:24,
1660:7, 1662:32,
1664:44, 1665:27,
1665:46, 1667:21,
1668:4, 1668:14
reading [2] - 1558:6,
1659:18
real [5] - 1565:30, 1579:7,
1600:30, 1605:36,
1619:27
really [8] - 1576:25,
1580:35, 1591:46,
1601:45, 1624:45,
1639:29, 1643:29,
1647:40
reason [23] - 1578:35,
1578:41, 1590:35,
1596:22, 1596:28,
1596:30, 1599:40,
1600:40, 1603:3,
1610:2, 1610:11,
1616:41, 1619:27,
1620:32, 1620:34,
1625:32, 1627:44,
1634:22, 1645:2,
1650:5, 1650:10,
1650:12, 1651:41
reasonable [7] - 1561:8,
1561:33, 1561:35,
1579:10, 1616:26,
1617:11, 1649:15
reasonably [1] - 1626:29
reasons [8] - 1580:5,
1584:44, 1590:2,
1596:37, 1603:7,
1618:3, 1631:10,
1658:11
recalled [1] - 1588:27
recalling [2] - 1588:33,
1613:35
receive [1] - 1581:7
received [10] - 1554:26,
1561:5, 1562:35,
1573:27, 1581:21,
1588:2, 1601:14,
1601:42, 1660:2, 1660:7
receiving [1] - 1663:13
recently [1] - 1621:29
recognised [1] - 1603:15
recognising [1] - 1553:1
recognition [1] - 1555:36

recollect [17] - 1572:36,
1586:20, 1591:6,
1595:21, 1620:45,
1624:26, 1627:16,
1627:20, 1627:26,
1628:29, 1633:17,
1633:26, 1633:42,
1634:5, 1644:5,
1644:15, 1659:3
recollection [56] -
1555:45, 1556:9,
1556:11, 1560:42,
1572:40, 1572:41,
1574:7, 1574:24,
1581:35, 1583:26,
1583:33, 1583:46,
1584:12, 1584:17,
1585:27, 1586:6,
1586:21, 1586:22,
1586:37, 1586:45,
1587:1, 1587:7, 1595:1,
1595:3, 1595:31,
1596:2, 1596:4, 1596:6,
1596:12, 1596:18,
1596:24, 1597:2,
1605:7, 1614:7,
1620:43, 1621:3,
1621:5, 1621:8,
1625:32, 1627:30,
1628:5, 1628:13,
1628:16, 1628:36,
1628:43, 1633:1,
1633:8, 1633:46,
1634:1, 1645:43,
1656:12, 1657:45,
1658:6, 1658:10,
1659:15
recommendation [2] -
1556:13, 1563:9
recommendations [2] -
1556:20, 1629:27
recommended [1] -
1562:32
reconstruct [1] - 1574:12
reconstructed [1] - 1634:8
reconstruction [6] -
1572:42, 1585:17,
1585:19, 1585:23,
1587:45, 1587:47
record [14] - 1562:33,
1562:43, 1563:10,
1563:16, 1563:28,
1565:29, 1578:20,
1578:21, 1598:31,
1619:24, 1619:32,
1632:31, 1634:17,
1634:23
recorded [1] - 1564:1
recording [2] - 1599:33,
1600:4
records [4] - 1582:23,
1622:38, 1625:9,
1656:35
redacted [1] - 1556:46
Redgrove [12] - 1595:37,
1595:47, 1596:9,
1597:28, 1597:33,
1613:4, 1613:7,

1613:15, 1613:25,
1638:5, 1658:7, 1659:4
reference [14] - 1556:47,
1586:26, 1614:29,
1623:14, 1623:26,
1623:38, 1646:28,
1647:38, 1648:43,
1659:36, 1662:45,
1665:29, 1666:9,
1666:24
references [1] - 1666:14
referred [4] - 1567:25,
1612:40, 1647:20,
1647:30
referring [8] - 1573:2,
1604:2, 1642:17,
1642:43, 1646:25,
1647:9, 1647:10,
1647:12
refers [5] - 1556:1,
1648:47, 1660:7,
1666:28, 1667:11
reflect [1] - 1629:25
reflection [2] - 1560:20,
1629:29
refresh [2] - 1568:25,
1628:33
refused [1] - 1650:43
refute [1] - 1584:38
regard [2] - 1624:3,
1665:15
regarded [4] - 1578:22,
1601:21, 1616:20,
1623:47
regarding [16] - 1570:21,
1572:34, 1574:40,
1586:16, 1591:5,
1593:38, 1610:17,
1624:4, 1624:5,
1634:33, 1641:5,
1644:10, 1653:23,
1659:32, 1664:6,
1666:19
regular [1] - 1663:2
reinventing [1] - 1610:46
reject [2] - 1651:21,
1651:41
rejected [2] - 1578:41,
1651:26
relate [4] - 1596:13,
1614:42, 1625:8, 1630:6
related [11] - 1552:12,
1554:7, 1554:15,
1554:31, 1554:44,
1563:28, 1593:40,
1598:12, 1614:47,
1656:46, 1658:45
relating [10] - 1554:36,
1555:30, 1555:32,
1579:40, 1584:9,
1621:1, 1625:45,
1626:23, 1630:24,
1656:36
RELATING [1] - 1549:13
relation [32] - 1567:46,
1567:47, 1570:2,
1572:33, 1573:1,

1573:8, 1573:43,
1575:3, 1575:23,
1577:25, 1578:1,
1581:20, 1583:43,
1584:31, 1585:30,
1585:47, 1586:39,
1587:43, 1588:13,
1596:12, 1601:15,
1601:24, 1605:27,
1612:8, 1612:24,
1629:21, 1640:31,
1648:13, 1653:21,
1655:44, 1664:12,
1666:20
relationship [11] -
1564:41, 1596:19,
1608:41, 1608:44,
1609:3, 1610:8,
1617:47, 1627:36,
1627:43, 1628:1,
1641:44
relationships [1] - 1572:1
relative [1] - 1640:37
release [2] - 1590:47,
1657:39
relevance [3] - 1554:2,
1556:46
relevant [13] - 1559:1,
1565:24, 1590:14,
1614:29, 1614:38,
1616:43, 1629:28,
1630:34, 1631:8,
1639:19, 1648:27,
1659:35, 1663:39
relied [1] - 1584:5
religious [3] - 1597:31,
1597:36, 1658:32
Religious [1] - 1554:22
reluctant [1] - 1644:42
rely [4] - 1573:34,
1638:42, 1639:2, 1639:3
relying [4] - 1585:19,
1585:25, 1587:6,
1638:37
remain [2] - 1603:39,
1607:36
remaining [1] - 1603:31
remedy [6] - 1654:5,
1654:39, 1655:7,
1655:10, 1655:17,
1655:28
remember [22] - 1551:45,
1552:11, 1577:33,
1583:18, 1583:43,
1584:7, 1584:23,
1584:38, 1621:7,
1621:21, 1628:8,
1628:41, 1644:40,
1650:16, 1650:28,
1651:34, 1651:37,
1657:19, 1657:21,
1658:24, 1658:31,
1663:33
remembering [2] -
1571:34, 1575:37
reminded [1] - 1650:22
removal [4] - 1571:43,

1606:46, 1639:34,
1668:24
remove [4] - 1564:16,
1606:32, 1611:35,
1643:26
removed [20] - 1553:25,
1564:19, 1571:46,
1572:7, 1588:4,
1606:41, 1607:5,
1607:16, 1607:25,
1608:4, 1608:10,
1608:19, 1608:28,
1609:23, 1610:45,
1611:26, 1611:29,
1634:46, 1655:13
removed" [1] - 1591:17
removing [1] - 1580:30
repeated [1] - 1659:46
rephrases [1] - 1587:28
report [23] - 1575:10,
1575:12, 1575:46,
1578:4, 1588:5,
1596:27, 1600:38,
1600:44, 1601:3,
1601:4, 1604:32,
1605:20, 1605:28,
1617:45, 1620:11,
1620:18, 1620:41,
1620:47, 1634:28,
1638:9, 1638:18,
1650:18
reported [23] - 1576:31,
1601:31, 1601:35,
1601:38, 1606:2,
1606:6, 1606:18,
1612:31, 1612:35,
1613:12, 1613:15,
1616:34, 1617:12,
1617:21, 1617:24,
1617:33, 1620:27,
1641:8, 1643:15,
1644:12, 1651:6,
1651:42, 1651:43
reporters [1] - 1550:2
reporting [22] - 1564:5,
1565:16, 1575:45,
1576:29, 1599:5,
1601:40, 1603:39,
1603:41, 1605:27,
1605:45, 1605:46,
1605:47, 1638:14,
1640:6, 1641:29,
1644:10, 1645:8,
1645:16, 1653:31,
1653:33, 1655:32,
1655:39
reports [2] - 1606:8,
1612:36
representative [3] -
1606:35, 1612:1, 1640:1
representatives [1] -
1586:33
reprimanded [1] - 1608:6
reprisal [1] - 1564:41
reputation [9] - 1606:25,
1606:29, 1606:39,
1606:42, 1606:44,
1611:38, 1653:15,
1653:24, 1653:30
request [4] - 1588:36,
1590:43, 1643:15,
1657:36
requested [1] - 1565:17
required [1] - 1570:24
requirement [6] - 1612:9,
1625:8, 1631:46,
1649:27, 1652:25,
1653:29
requirements [2] -
1632:34, 1648:14
requires [1] - 1563:23
requiring [4] - 1603:24,
1625:13, 1632:40,
1652:32
reread [3] - 1561:42,
1623:35, 1629:42
research [2] - 1559:7,
1625:21
resign [20] - 1563:33,
1564:47, 1571:5,
1571:16, 1571:20,
1571:22, 1581:4,
1587:3, 1587:12,
1590:27, 1617:30,
1633:14, 1634:43,
1635:39, 1636:5,
1641:9, 1650:28,
1650:31, 1650:37,
1650:40
resign" [1] - 1576:47
resignation [2] - 1649:4,
1649:20
resile [2] - 1574:10,
1591:11
resolve [1] - 1602:22
resolved [1] - 1610:13
resource [3] - 1568:45,
1568:46, 1647:33
respect [11] - 1579:42,
1598:5, 1600:33,
1600:35, 1616:40,
1621:9, 1625:33,
1628:18, 1628:19,
1639:45, 1652:46
respectful [2] - 1593:38,
1593:45
respecting [1] - 1600:32
responsibility [2] -
1639:19, 1639:21
rest [1] - 1624:23
restate [2] - 1567:27,
1596:40
rested [1] - 1587:3
result [2] - 1594:25,
1615:23
results [1] - 1594:31
RESUMPTION [1] - 1619:1
retain [1] - 1630:29
retained [6] - 1552:41,
1564:14, 1585:46,
1588:9, 1605:1, 1632:20
retention [3] - 1630:14,
1630:40, 1632:19
retired [5] - 1550:46,
1607:10, 1607:24,
1607:30, 1607:33
retired" [3] - 1607:7,
1607:22, 1607:28
return [3] - 1562:2,
1562:11, 1588:37
reveal [3] - 1616:43,
1617:2, 1633:6
revealed [1] - 1611:39
revealing [1] - 1603:6
review [1] - 1614:33
reviewed [1] - 1622:6
rhetoric [1] - 1623:9
rhetorical [1] - 1622:46
rider [1] - 1654:34
rights [4] - 1553:2, 1553:6,
1571:6, 1648:6
ring [11] - 1573:13,
1585:22, 1586:15,
1588:3, 1588:44,
1613:19, 1613:28,
1613:29, 1644:25,
1644:27, 1659:40
ringing [2] - 1574:7,
1613:20
rise [2] - 1589:47, 1646:35
risk [33] - 1564:41,
1571:35, 1573:19,
1596:42, 1598:9,
1600:17, 1600:19,
1600:25, 1600:38,
1600:44, 1601:2,
1608:39, 1608:42,
1609:22, 1609:25,
1609:27, 1609:28,
1609:32, 1610:41,
1611:33, 1612:17,
1618:18, 1619:10,
1626:35, 1638:24,
1638:26, 1638:28,
1639:12, 1639:15,
1639:20, 1639:30
road [1] - 1598:17
role [26] - 1551:28,
1552:37, 1553:1,
1553:24, 1559:13,
1560:32, 1562:22,
1565:35, 1565:37,
1568:35, 1568:40,
1569:1, 1569:6,
1569:10, 1569:25,
1569:30, 1569:35,
1570:13, 1570:31,
1586:39, 1587:38,
1587:42, 1640:32,
1647:26, 1658:42,
1661:21
roll [1] - 1551:11
Rome [1] - 1554:40
room [2] - 1563:41,
1563:43
Room [1] - 1549:25
Rosary [1] - 1665:4
rules [2] - 1660:21,
1660:29
run [1] - 1653:38
running [2] - 1583:9,
1596:42

S

Sacrament [1] - 1663:13
sacraments [1] - 1552:36
Sacred [1] - 1554:29
sadly [1] - 1553:26
safe [12] - 1621:18,
1621:43, 1621:47,
1622:6, 1622:14,
1622:15, 1622:37,
1622:40, 1622:43,
1639:35, 1639:37,
1661:37
safeguard [2] - 1654:4,
1654:37
safety [3] - 1571:43,
1605:39, 1606:1
San [7] - 1666:29,
1666:33, 1666:36,
1666:42, 1667:35,
1668:5, 1668:13
sat [1] - 1633:43
satisfied [1] - 1661:20
satisfy [1] - 1656:34
save [1] - 1653:38
savings [1] - 1648:13
saw [2] - 1645:43, 1658:24
SC [2] - 1549:33, 1549:36
scandal [12] - 1611:43,
1612:2, 1612:5, 1612:9,
1612:11, 1612:13,
1654:6, 1654:39,
1655:17, 1655:30,
1655:33, 1655:34
scandal" [1] - 1655:7
scandals [1] - 1655:10
scheme [2] - 1551:6,
1551:7
school [3] - 1610:46,
1610:47, 1667:23
scruples [1] - 1601:8
se [1] - 1578:29
sealed [1] - 1660:44
search [5] - 1622:1,
1622:17, 1622:31,
1622:41, 1631:15
searches [1] - 1656:2
second [7] - 1588:5,
1635:35, 1643:32,
1646:4, 1647:21,
1648:2, 1652:44
secondary [1] - 1666:45
secrecy [2] - 1554:30,
1625:16
secret [3] - 1625:15,
1625:40, 1646:10
secretariat [1] - 1559:23
section [7] - 1550:10,
1604:18, 1604:36,
1605:15, 1621:9,
1626:26, 1647:30
secular [1] - 1571:32
seduce [1] - 1581:3
see [38] - 1556:42,
1558:26, 1559:30,
1561:43, 1562:1,
1563:43, 1570:30,
1577:16, 1580:7,
1590:12, 1602:24,
1609:45, 1612:7,
1615:4, 1625:7,
1625:12, 1626:19,
1626:40, 1629:21,
1648:10, 1653:44,
1654:2, 1654:8,
1654:20, 1656:2,
1660:6, 1662:41,
1663:16, 1663:27,
1664:3, 1665:6,
1665:18, 1665:27,
1666:28, 1666:32,
1667:1, 1667:11,
1667:13
seeing [1] - 1573:16
seek [1] - 1622:41
seem [1] - 1593:22
seeming [1] - 1562:8
seizure [2] - 1622:37,
1622:38
selected [1] - 1631:14
selection [1] - 1631:10
selective [3] - 1631:19,
1631:25, 1631:31
self [1] - 1572:42
self-serving [1] - 1572:42
seminar [3] - 1558:2,
1558:6, 1558:9
seminars [1] - 1605:4
seminary [3] - 1550:47,
1551:3, 1551:9
send [1] - 1563:35
sense [14] - 1581:3,
1584:40, 1590:23,
1593:12, 1609:42,
1609:44, 1610:22,
1617:17, 1629:47,
1637:5, 1643:22,
1652:28, 1652:31,
1661:3
sensitive [1] - 1605:35
sent [2] - 1587:39, 1610:3
sentence [1] - 1572:17
separate [2] - 1632:10,
1655:19
serious [10] - 1599:8,
1599:17, 1599:21,
1600:31, 1602:2,
1603:10, 1604:20,
1626:44, 1633:13,
1650:27
served [4] - 1553:30,
1641:21, 1642:31,
1642:37
servicing [1] - 1572:42
set [11] - 1561:31,
1561:35, 1563:47,
1564:43, 1582:44,
1583:6, 1617:19,
1625:42, 1631:9,
1648:33, 1652:24
sets [2] - 1629:36,

1665:17
setting [2] - 1584:14, 1629:22
seven [2] - 1614:28, 1614:36
several [3] - 1568:45, 1624:6, 1651:11
SEXUAL [1] - 1549:15
sexual [43] - 1551:29, 1554:2, 1554:11, 1554:16, 1556:22, 1558:2, 1558:30, 1558:38, 1565:8, 1567:3, 1567:45, 1569:26, 1570:4, 1572:22, 1573:14, 1573:18, 1574:40, 1577:41, 1584:42, 1589:39, 1592:39, 1593:2, 1598:40, 1599:16, 1599:28, 1602:42, 1603:30, 1605:27, 1606:6, 1612:45, 1616:3, 1620:28, 1624:5, 1628:22, 1630:25, 1643:30, 1647:38, 1653:23, 1658:21, 1659:11, 1662:9, 1666:24, 1666:25
Sexual [1] - 1645:29
sexually [47] - 1564:10, 1565:3, 1565:21, 1565:43, 1569:45, 1571:28, 1591:25, 1593:6, 1593:11, 1594:42, 1597:16, 1597:46, 1606:36, 1610:27, 1616:29, 1616:39, 1616:47, 1617:9, 1618:7, 1620:4, 1620:7, 1620:11, 1620:19, 1620:42, 1621:1, 1621:2, 1624:15, 1634:33, 1634:40, 1635:7, 1635:18, 1635:25, 1635:36, 1636:11, 1636:23, 1636:36, 1637:4, 1637:16, 1639:16, 1641:36, 1642:4, 1642:46, 1643:38, 1653:32, 1655:33, 1655:39, 1666:10
Shakespeare [2] - 1623:15, 1623:22
Shakespearean [1] - 1623:14
shall [1] - 1562:43
sheer [1] - 1630:39
Shepherd [2] - 1553:44, 1554:13
shielding [1] - 1636:27
shocks [1] - 1667:42
SHORT [2] - 1590:41, 1657:28
short [5] - 1550:4, 1554:47, 1556:8, 1649:7, 1649:9
short-circuit [1] - 1649:9
short-circuited [1] - 1649:7
shortcut [1] - 1657:31
shortly [5] - 1555:11, 1556:17, 1586:23, 1619:18, 1622:13
show [8] - 1556:17, 1557:22, 1580:11, 1613:42, 1613:44, 1619:17, 1653:6, 1659:28
shown [2] - 1556:40, 1661:19
shows [2] - 1622:29, 1667:46
shred [7] - 1623:1, 1623:11, 1623:27, 1623:41
shredding [1] - 1623:31
side [3] - 1609:46, 1627:35, 1640:36
signal [1] - 1563:35
signed [1] - 1660:43
significant [11] - 1560:43, 1561:40, 1561:42, 1580:25, 1602:17, 1603:19, 1609:37, 1610:8, 1634:35, 1643:17, 1658:47
silence [4] - 1565:26, 1580:1, 1590:4, 1590:20
silent [1] - 1580:46
simple [3] - 1593:38, 1617:25, 1661:9
simplistic [1] - 1563:13
simply [13] - 1564:43, 1564:44, 1565:16, 1565:29, 1572:43, 1583:35, 1611:18, 1619:28, 1620:36, 1624:7, 1635:2, 1643:26, 1650:42
Sister [17] - 1595:37, 1595:47, 1596:9, 1596:14, 1597:28, 1597:33, 1613:4, 1613:7, 1613:15, 1613:21, 1613:25, 1618:14, 1628:6, 1637:36, 1638:5, 1658:6, 1659:4
sister [3] - 1569:19, 1597:31, 1597:36
Sisters [2] - 1553:44, 1554:14
sit [2] - 1566:47, 1580:3
sitting [4] - 1564:25, 1565:20, 1572:25, 1598:39
situation [35] - 1554:12, 1564:8, 1564:39, 1565:14, 1588:33, 1597:30, 1601:45, 1603:21, 1608:45, 1610:10, 1610:44, 1611:15, 1612:20, 1616:9, 1617:6, 1620:20, 1620:25, 1620:31, 1632:26, 1634:21, 1635:10, 1635:23, 1637:13, 1637:16, 1638:21, 1638:40, 1642:35, 1643:7, 1643:8, 1651:5, 1655:24, 1658:15, 1667:6, 1667:29, 1667:36
situations [8] - 1552:34, 1578:12, 1603:18, 1605:3, 1609:30, 1623:40, 1635:27, 1635:31
six [4] - 1658:35, 1667:16, 1667:18, 1667:19
size [1] - 1630:39
skilled [1] - 1629:12
skills [2] - 1559:1, 1559:5
skin [2] - 1599:16
skin-on-skin [1] - 1599:16
SKINNER [10] - 1550:9, 1581:24, 1587:23, 1587:28, 1593:26, 1610:21, 1616:14, 1622:22, 1651:9, 1651:16
Skinner [1] - 1550:12
Skinner's [2] - 1587:26, 1587:35
slightly [1] - 1624:10
slotted [1] - 1556:43
small [1] - 1639:33
small-minded [1] - 1639:33
smaller [1] - 1624:28
sobbing [1] - 1577:18
social [1] - 1556:38
society [1] - 1605:20
SOCIETY [1] - 1645:25
Society [5] - 1551:5, 1621:17, 1624:21, 1625:30, 1645:19
soliciting [1] - 1571:4
solicitor [5] - 1550:44, 1551:7, 1551:19, 1568:14, 1646:20
Solicitor's [1] - 1549:41
solicitors [1] - 1551:11
solicitude [1] - 1653:6
solution [4] - 1580:10, 1623:31, 1643:28, 1645:6
someone [11] - 1559:3, 1598:15, 1598:25, 1600:31, 1608:35, 1611:5, 1611:22, 1628:25, 1642:25, 1661:6, 1663:31
sometimes [7] - 1563:15, 1564:4, 1564:44, 1565:2, 1571:37, 1603:11, 1617:39
somewhere [7] - 1568:28, 1583:29, 1607:42, 1611:19, 1611:21, 1623:34, 1623:38
soon [3] - 1575:31, 1594:23, 1594:28
sophisticated [2] - 1605:12, 1605:13
sophistication [2] - 1631:32, 1631:35
sorry [44] - 1569:33, 1570:28, 1574:14, 1574:21, 1575:18, 1575:21, 1578:26, 1578:38, 1583:3, 1585:9, 1593:20, 1604:11, 1604:13, 1608:21, 1608:25, 1614:10, 1616:17, 1622:28, 1623:15, 1625:24, 1628:12, 1629:46, 1632:11, 1632:13, 1633:16, 1635:28, 1636:29, 1638:1, 1641:38, 1641:40, 1642:39, 1643:5, 1644:31, 1647:14, 1650:21, 1651:37, 1653:37, 1654:22, 1654:45, 1655:1, 1655:21, 1664:44, 1666:33, 1666:36
sort [19] - 1561:41, 1564:42, 1591:18, 1591:43, 1606:30, 1611:15, 1613:32, 1613:34, 1613:35, 1615:45, 1619:19, 1619:26, 1628:46, 1629:19, 1630:40, 1631:31, 1655:29, 1657:2, 1661:35
sorts [10] - 1551:32, 1563:15, 1568:11, 1572:1, 1582:39, 1583:5, 1592:10, 1593:3, 1617:22, 1626:15
sought [6] - 1557:3, 1620:46, 1621:6, 1621:13, 1628:33, 1656:13
sound [4] - 1591:17, 1613:34, 1613:35, 1659:6
sounds [1] - 1656:42
South [8] - 1551:5, 1553:41, 1565:36, 1569:44, 1583:13, 1583:15, 1622:7, 1622:15
space [1] - 1631:6
speaking [9] - 1564:3, 1567:39, 1584:10, 1587:43, 1590:18, 1601:43, 1619:39, 1624:7, 1643:47
speaks [1] - 1666:15
Special [4] - 1556:47, 1557:23, 1614:30, 1647:29
special [12] - 1568:35, 1568:40, 1582:33, 1617:43, 1618:16, 1647:33, 1647:35, 1649:26, 1652:24, 1658:25, 1658:41, 1658:42
SPECIAL [1] - 1549:11
specialist [1] - 1554:15
specific [21] - 1566:14, 1567:36, 1568:12, 1569:23, 1569:37, 1576:28, 1591:34, 1591:36, 1591:45, 1591:47, 1592:3, 1604:1, 1604:9, 1605:7, 1612:25, 1620:43, 1621:10, 1621:11, 1625:35, 1636:28
specifically [5] - 1600:40, 1601:34, 1604:6, 1620:40, 1662:33
specificity [1] - 1568:1
specifics [5] - 1572:39, 1573:10, 1591:7, 1594:41, 1596:8
specify [1] - 1625:39
spend [1] - 1614:45
spent [2] - 1550:42, 1577:18
spirit [1] - 1649:17
spiritual [1] - 1664:47
spoken [4] - 1584:31, 1590:8, 1591:15, 1637:30
spokesman [1] - 1555:2
Springwood [1] - 1551:1
St [2] - 1550:47, 1661:2
stab [2] - 1568:21, 1568:22
staff [1] - 1661:2
stage [12] - 1551:2, 1559:21, 1569:18, 1569:19, 1569:21, 1582:32, 1585:2, 1585:19, 1613:45, 1635:47, 1643:39, 1654:31
staggered [1] - 1667:27
staggering [1] - 1668:16
staggers [1] - 1667:42
stand [1] - 1658:37
standards [1] - 1555:16
Standards [3] - 1568:37, 1582:44, 1583:6
standing [3] - 1611:22, 1660:35, 1661:9
start [2] - 1550:1, 1624:40
started [1] - 1582:37
state [8] - 1561:12, 1562:10, 1571:23, 1571:31, 1588:8,

1590:7, 1620:6, 1644:9
statement [16] - 1553:29, 1556:1, 1566:24, 1566:43, 1566:44, 1566:45, 1573:23, 1581:8, 1617:6, 1617:10, 1632:26, 1645:39, 1646:8, 1647:4, 1647:8, 1663:44
statements [6] - 1579:18, 1591:46, 1592:1, 1592:3, 1592:11, 1593:3
states [1] - 1659:31
States [1] - 1555:33
stating [1] - 1648:19
statistic [1] - 1667:20
status [1] - 1643:7
statutory [5] - 1655:43, 1656:1, 1656:7, 1656:25, 1656:28
STATUTORY [1] - 1656:31
stayed [1] - 1550:44
stays [1] - 1552:21
step [4] - 1580:30, 1612:39, 1635:23, 1640:6
steps [5] - 1562:33, 1563:11, 1608:17, 1651:11, 1661:21
still [10] - 1572:18, 1607:3, 1607:45, 1607:46, 1635:11, 1635:47, 1641:15, 1645:27, 1648:20, 1659:14
stood [1] - 1651:29
stop [4] - 1560:26, 1572:18, 1574:20, 1577:21
stopped [3] - 1568:35, 1582:43, 1583:5
story [1] - 1596:41
straight [2] - 1565:35, 1649:10
strategy [3] - 1586:28, 1619:44, 1654:29
Street [2] - 1549:25, 1550:43
strict [1] - 1659:44
strip [1] - 1563:20
stripped [1] - 1607:26
stripping [1] - 1563:29
strong [5] - 1624:47, 1635:2, 1635:4, 1635:6, 1635:24
strong-armed [4] - 1635:2, 1635:4, 1635:6, 1635:24
stronger [1] - 1564:31
strongly [1] - 1571:8
struck [1] - 1551:11
structure [1] - 1560:19
structured [3] - 1553:3, 1567:5, 1570:36
structuring [3] - 1552:42, 1562:23, 1646:45
struggled [1] - 1602:30
student [2] - 1552:15, 1625:26
studied [1] - 1592:28
Studies [1] - 1553:41
study [8] - 1551:37, 1551:41, 1553:34, 1554:6, 1554:13, 1554:31, 1556:14, 1610:16
subcategory [1] - 1647:41
subject [6] - 1579:13, 1587:17, 1601:40, 1604:5, 1606:29, 1619:13
subjective [1] - 1620:36
subjects [1] - 1623:46
submission [5] - 1593:30, 1593:33, 1593:34, 1593:39, 1593:45
subsequent [4] - 1560:37, 1579:9, 1579:25, 1596:43
subsequently [6] - 1580:3, 1597:19, 1598:16, 1601:16, 1610:32, 1631:26
substance [1] - 1606:13
substantial [1] - 1609:28
substitution [1] - 1648:30
subtitle [1] - 1622:1
successful [2] - 1579:26, 1661:43
suffered [1] - 1584:25
sufficient [3] - 1558:36, 1584:3, 1615:22
suggest [17] - 1563:35, 1572:33, 1573:1, 1578:18, 1578:20, 1579:38, 1582:13, 1584:35, 1588:41, 1591:14, 1591:23, 1595:15, 1595:27, 1596:45, 1611:10, 1613:25, 1622:46
suggested [9] - 1568:41, 1585:5, 1585:11, 1585:22, 1594:39, 1599:35, 1611:37, 1628:26, 1659:3
suggesting [14] - 1552:47, 1569:39, 1570:40, 1578:28, 1587:37, 1597:42, 1619:30, 1619:38, 1620:26, 1621:6, 1627:3, 1632:28, 1656:44, 1668:12
suggestion [9] - 1563:10, 1587:46, 1600:3, 1601:30, 1628:19, 1630:33, 1636:30, 1646:32, 1660:18
suggestions [4] - 1563:1, 1598:22, 1628:17, 1628:18
suggests [6] - 1558:1, 1563:4, 1580:7, 1582:8, 1582:18, 1606:7
suitable [1] - 1620:37
Sullivan [1] - 1549:41
summary [2] - 1580:39, 1580:40
summer [1] - 1551:8
Sunday [1] - 1660:47
superior [4] - 1565:24, 1566:2, 1566:6, 1566:11
superiors [2] - 1566:20, 1615:32
supervised [1] - 1612:18
supervision [2] - 1612:16, 1612:20
support [7] - 1597:30, 1602:6, 1602:45, 1613:16, 1637:37, 1638:2, 1658:7
suppose [1] - 1655:24
Supreme [1] - 1549:24
surely [1] - 1563:47
surmising [4] - 1597:24, 1597:25, 1633:23, 1633:27
surname [1] - 1595:28
surrounded [1] - 1638:39
surrounding [1] - 1627:26
suspect [1] - 1588:5
suspected [1] - 1639:8
suspicion [1] - 1606:13
sworn [1] - 1550:7
Sydney [15] - 1550:23, 1550:43, 1551:6, 1551:18, 1554:19, 1554:26, 1555:3, 1558:13, 1568:38, 1568:46, 1570:6, 1574:35, 1574:39, 1605:6, 1612:1
system [1] - 1646:32

T

TAB [1] - 1561:28
tab [10] - 1557:26, 1557:35, 1558:25, 1561:19, 1561:23, 1562:1, 1645:28, 1646:39, 1653:38, 1659:29
table [3] - 1553:30, 1590:45, 1657:38
task [4] - 1559:45, 1568:42, 1569:44, 1570:2
tasks [5] - 1570:22, 1581:20, 1583:5, 1583:10, 1626:5
taught [1] - 1665:33
teacher [1] - 1610:46
teachers [1] - 1666:45
teachings [1] - 1553:20
telephone [2] - 1573:28, 1574:13
telephoned [1] - 1574:27
television [1] - 1614:9
tended [3] - 1592:24, 1603:12, 1629:11
tendency [1] - 1663:12
tender [8] - 1557:12, 1557:28, 1558:15, 1561:17, 1614:13, 1645:18, 1646:38, 1656:25
tendered [1] - 1662:35
tenor [1] - 1623:36
tentative [1] - 1615:14
term [1] - 1587:25
terms [52] - 1551:25, 1556:46, 1556:47, 1558:36, 1560:11, 1561:33, 1561:38, 1564:31, 1567:31, 1567:33, 1576:44, 1577:3, 1577:33, 1578:4, 1593:42, 1596:32, 1596:46, 1597:17, 1598:45, 1599:16, 1599:28, 1602:6, 1602:32, 1603:47, 1607:35, 1609:22, 1611:18, 1611:31, 1614:6, 1614:29, 1619:39, 1624:27, 1627:21, 1628:4, 1628:41, 1630:2, 1632:34, 1633:39, 1638:28, 1638:36, 1639:11, 1640:5, 1643:28, 1647:29, 1648:33, 1648:35, 1652:5, 1652:24, 1656:9, 1659:35, 1668:33
terribly [1] - 1622:28
territory [1] - 1598:43
testimony [1] - 1659:46
text [1] - 1647:19
THE [35] - 1549:13, 1549:15, 1550:12, 1557:14, 1557:31, 1558:18, 1561:19, 1561:23, 1581:29, 1587:32, 1589:47, 1590:38, 1591:2, 1594:5, 1614:3, 1614:15, 1616:20, 1618:24, 1622:25, 1645:21, 1645:24, 1646:41, 1650:21, 1650:47, 1651:14, 1651:24, 1651:41, 1655:7, 1656:28, 1657:26, 1657:34, 1657:42, 1667:16, 1668:39, 1668:42
themselves [1] - 1552:44
theological [2] - 1553:12, 1571:24
Theology [2] - 1554:18, 1554:29
theoretical [4] - 1589:24, 1609:22, 1609:25, 1610:40
theoretically [5] - 1608:40, 1616:9, 1616:36, 1616:37, 1619:39
therapists [1] - 1657:2
therapy [2] - 1656:13, 1656:15
thesis [6] - 1553:38, 1553:40, 1554:1, 1554:5, 1554:11, 1554:30
they've [1] - 1585:3
thinking [2] - 1577:42, 1624:46
thinks [2] - 1616:34, 1632:31
third [5] - 1630:30, 1630:41, 1643:33, 1653:4, 1659:36
thirty [1] - 1568:31
thirty-five [1] - 1568:31
thoughts [1] - 1579:13
thousand [1] - 1667:12
three [4] - 1628:46, 1635:17, 1643:29, 1654:11
tidy [1] - 1587:34
timing [2] - 1588:10, 1588:13
title [6] - 1621:43, 1647:29, 1647:31, 1647:32, 1647:36
titled [2] - 1621:17, 1645:29
TO [4] - 1549:13, 1558:22, 1645:24, 1668:43
today [6] - 1572:35, 1600:35, 1605:35, 1614:25, 1624:12, 1662:31
together [5] - 1555:43, 1558:3, 1586:31, 1629:10, 1657:8
tomorrow [1] - 1668:40
tone [1] - 1585:6
took [16] - 1565:22, 1566:27, 1568:13, 1568:24, 1571:3, 1572:35, 1572:38, 1575:34, 1600:17, 1600:19, 1600:22, 1600:23, 1600:25, 1603:8, 1662:3
top [2] - 1630:9, 1666:33
topic [1] - 1604:10
total [2] - 1631:3, 1643:28
touched [2] - 1597:47, 1656:36
touching [1] - 1573:14
towards [6] - 1551:4, 1572:3, 1588:4, 1603:29, 1605:45, 1643:34
Towards [2] - 1602:16, 1603:34
tragically [1] - 1572:1
trail [1] - 1579:40

training [3] - 1592:14, 1609:7
transcript [1] - 1550:2
trashed [2] - 1606:30, 1606:31
trauma [1] - 1605:37
travel [3] - 1574:39, 1574:43, 1660:43
travelling [2] - 1660:46, 1661:5
trial [5] - 1563:22, 1609:17, 1609:36, 1609:45, 1609:47
trials [2] - 1563:23, 1563:26
tribunal [6] - 1625:34, 1641:18, 1641:38, 1641:41, 1641:44, 1642:16
tribunals [1] - 1631:45
tried [1] - 1663:10
trouble [2] - 1551:20, 1552:44
troubles [1] - 1551:32
true [9] - 1557:6, 1603:32, 1610:42, 1612:37, 1612:41, 1622:18, 1627:18, 1634:3, 1656:8
trusted [3] - 1608:20, 1608:45, 1609:29
trusting [1] - 1572:1
truth [6] - 1589:40, 1597:36, 1597:38, 1666:2, 1666:4, 1666:6
try [2] - 1568:25, 1608:27
trying [8] - 1563:33, 1563:38, 1577:33, 1594:2, 1615:40, 1615:42, 1636:26, 1658:38
turn [3] - 1591:43, 1646:4, 1661:3
turned [1] - 1582:28
turning [6] - 1558:25, 1559:28, 1561:47, 1572:41, 1619:43, 1653:41
twice [1] - 1656:38
two [16] - 1550:42, 1556:6, 1572:33, 1585:45, 1585:46, 1587:47, 1617:3, 1617:47, 1626:23, 1626:32, 1629:2, 1638:24, 1638:25, 1654:15, 1654:18, 1664:39
type [5] - 1563:37, 1599:8, 1599:16, 1599:28, 1665:24
typed [1] - 1581:8
types [8] - 1558:45, 1568:22, 1570:7, 1577:27, 1579:22, 1579:40, 1581:20, 1605:21
typescript [1] - 1645:38

U

ultimately [2] - 1610:12, 1639:21
unable [2] - 1624:44, 1644:9
uncontrollable [1] - 1663:12
under [11] - 1550:10, 1559:30, 1562:1, 1562:27, 1615:18, 1622:45, 1625:16, 1648:2, 1662:41, 1663:43, 1665:9
understood [12] - 1556:21, 1600:30, 1601:19, 1602:3, 1608:5, 1608:17, 1613:16, 1617:23, 1642:47, 1648:5, 1661:39
undertake [1] - 1666:41
undertook [1] - 1554:46
unfair [1] - 1626:28
unfairness [2] - 1581:4, 1621:29
unfounded [1] - 1655:26
United [3] - 1555:32, 1608:9, 1640:38
universal [1] - 1648:7
University [4] - 1553:41, 1554:25, 1554:40, 1666:45
university [1] - 1592:28
unlawfully [2] - 1608:12, 1608:14
unless [2] - 1594:16, 1611:22
unlikely [1] - 1607:30
unrestricted [1] - 1551:2
untrue [1] - 1607:24
unusual [7] - 1577:7, 1577:13, 1577:28, 1577:30, 1577:36, 1577:39, 1597:29
unwilling [2] - 1640:16, 1640:19
unworkable [1] - 1570:36
up [32] - 1553:28, 1559:5, 1562:14, 1582:28, 1582:44, 1583:6, 1583:9, 1583:29, 1587:9, 1587:34, 1605:22, 1615:35, 1616:1, 1616:4, 1616:12, 1616:21, 1616:24, 1627:43, 1628:1, 1635:35, 1636:16, 1641:10, 1645:12, 1645:13, 1647:31, 1647:32, 1650:23, 1651:29, 1656:19, 1661:3, 1665:39, 1667:30
UPON [1] - 1619:1
useful [2] - 1565:12,

1571:13
uses [1] - 1666:14
Usher [21] - 1556:4, 1556:6, 1556:33, 1557:41, 1557:42, 1557:45, 1558:18, 1566:30, 1569:4, 1569:31, 1600:26, 1628:21, 1628:25, 1629:9, 1629:12, 1629:17, 1645:32, 1645:45, 1649:16, 1657:11, 1657:15
USHER [1] - 1558:22
Usher's [1] - 1645:37
usual [14] - 1574:16, 1574:23, 1574:24, 1574:32, 1577:30, 1585:14, 1585:20, 1587:6, 1587:11, 1591:7, 1591:18, 1591:27, 1591:37, 1597:25
utterly [3] - 1640:16, 1640:19, 1667:28

V

valuable [1] - 1565:21
value [14] - 1641:23, 1641:30, 1643:4, 1643:5, 1643:6, 1643:13, 1643:17, 1643:19, 1661:28, 1662:4, 1665:46, 1667:30
values [9] - 1616:32, 1619:47, 1643:21, 1652:6, 1652:9, 1652:16, 1652:26, 1652:28, 1652:38
various [19] - 1556:44, 1565:36, 1569:43, 1570:18, 1577:14, 1584:44, 1586:32, 1590:44, 1602:39, 1604:38, 1605:9, 1611:44, 1626:22, 1627:10, 1645:14, 1652:15, 1657:31, 1663:9
varying [1] - 1635:9
verse [1] - 1652:1
version [8] - 1598:10, 1647:12, 1653:35, 1653:45, 1653:46, 1654:12, 1654:33, 1655:14
vicar [4] - 1575:25, 1575:31, 1585:40, 1585:42
vicinity [1] - 1571:44
victim [67] - 1564:40, 1564:43, 1566:24, 1567:22, 1567:24, 1572:25, 1572:29, 1572:31, 1573:13, 1573:18, 1574:7, 1574:29, 1583:25, 1583:39, 1583:47, 1584:4, 1584:43, 1585:12, 1585:16, 1585:30, 1588:47, 1589:7, 1589:10, 1589:11, 1589:26, 1589:32, 1589:35, 1591:28, 1591:31, 1591:37, 1591:45, 1597:13, 1597:14, 1597:30, 1598:40, 1600:33, 1600:35, 1600:40, 1600:46, 1601:5, 1601:8, 1601:34, 1601:38, 1601:44, 1601:45, 1601:46, 1602:1, 1603:9, 1603:13, 1603:22, 1603:43, 1604:26, 1604:30, 1605:29, 1605:35, 1605:37, 1606:16, 1607:2, 1612:32, 1615:24, 1629:10, 1638:12, 1643:10, 1653:7, 1653:16
victim's [4] - 1567:7, 1615:24, 1643:15, 1653:7
victims [28] - 1551:29, 1554:16, 1566:12, 1567:3, 1572:22, 1574:25, 1581:36, 1584:45, 1585:1, 1589:39, 1590:32, 1591:29, 1596:39, 1602:5, 1602:11, 1602:42, 1603:20, 1603:24, 1603:30, 1610:10, 1620:13, 1628:22, 1629:13, 1636:5, 1646:33, 1650:42, 1651:43, 1661:42
view [57] - 1551:3, 1561:34, 1563:9, 1563:20, 1563:27, 1564:46, 1568:28, 1569:27, 1570:34, 1571:3, 1571:6, 1571:7, 1571:24, 1571:27, 1579:32, 1579:35, 1581:13, 1581:16, 1589:26, 1598:18, 1598:22, 1599:15, 1600:34, 1600:35, 1601:12, 1603:8, 1603:29, 1603:38, 1604:30, 1604:37, 1604:41, 1604:45, 1606:28, 1606:38, 1606:42, 1610:31, 1612:3, 1612:11, 1617:28, 1617:32, 1619:18, 1622:1,

1624:13, 1624:46, 1624:47, 1628:45, 1629:46, 1634:22, 1634:25, 1636:36, 1636:38, 1641:28, 1643:3, 1661:22
views [8] - 1570:18, 1579:23, 1624:37, 1624:38, 1624:40, 1624:42, 1624:43, 1624:44
violation [1] - 1647:43
visited [1] - 1663:21
visual [2] - 1627:21, 1627:23
vitae [3] - 1553:28, 1553:32, 1557:29
VITAE [1] - 1557:33
volume [5] - 1557:25, 1558:26, 1645:28, 1653:37, 1659:29
volumes [3] - 1557:24, 1614:28, 1614:36
volunteering [1] - 1611:28
vow [1] - 1664:12

W

WA [1] - 1664:22
Wales [8] - 1551:5, 1553:41, 1565:36, 1569:44, 1583:13, 1583:15, 1622:7, 1622:15
walk [1] - 1607:32
walked [1] - 1608:2
wants [4] - 1566:42, 1571:31, 1593:41, 1604:26
Wardle [1] - 1549:42
warning [1] - 1609:40
warrant [2] - 1622:42, 1631:15
warrants [2] - 1622:17, 1622:32
warrants [1] - 1622:2
Warwick [1] - 1549:38
WAS [1] - 1668:42
weakened [1] - 1665:1
wear [2] - 1572:7, 1572:14
wearing [1] - 1572:19
website [1] - 1568:26
wedding [1] - 1607:45
Wednesday [1] - 1549:29
WEDNESDAY [1] - 1668:43
weekly [1] - 1555:6
weeks [5] - 1614:9, 1621:30, 1621:32, 1621:36, 1659:45
weighed [1] - 1562:14
welfare [3] - 1554:8, 1592:25, 1653:6
well-known [1] - 1600:29
well-understood [2] - 1600:30, 1602:3

Western [8] - 1588:11,
1588:12, 1588:29,
1606:3, 1606:7,
1606:11, 1643:38,
1658:20
whatsoever [5] - 1564:2,
1633:44, 1641:44,
1641:47, 1663:1
WHEN [1] - 1561:27
wherewithal [1] - 1590:28
whilst [2] - 1572:2,
1660:16
white [1] - 1639:29
whole [1] - 1577:16,
1583:15, 1592:10,
1593:2, 1626:25,
1626:26, 1632:37,
1643:21, 1643:45,
1654:5, 1654:38
wide [1] - 1647:39
wider [1] - 1647:40
willing [4] - 1612:32,
1640:20, 1641:8, 1657:3
willingness [3] - 1571:5,
1596:26, 1639:27
wisdom [3] - 1563:27,
1603:29, 1630:5
wise [1] - 1579:13
wish [7] - 1557:9, 1564:39,
1597:12, 1603:25,
1630:18, 1630:29,
1660:46
wishes [1] - 1597:7
withdraw [6] - 1581:26,
1608:24, 1622:28,
1635:1, 1635:11,
1636:17
withdrawal [1] - 1635:14
withdrawn [1] - 1667:9
WITNESS [2] - 1616:20,
1651:41
witness [10] - 1573:4,
1593:28, 1593:39,
1610:21, 1610:24,
1612:43, 1613:45,
1651:9, 1651:21,
1661:19
witness's [1] - 1646:39
witnesses [2] - 1646:30,
1646:33
wonderful [1] - 1550:2
Woodward [1] - 1569:20
word [11] - 1573:15,
1576:8, 1592:13,
1593:22, 1593:40,
1594:1, 1614:37,
1622:40, 1646:24,
1646:25, 1659:39
words [12] - 1590:7,
1591:15, 1596:41,
1597:22, 1598:17,
1644:40, 1647:35,
1649:1, 1655:1, 1655:2,
1659:6
workbook [1] - 1574:3
worker [1] - 1556:38
works [1] - 1553:11

world [4] - 1608:34,
1660:32, 1660:33,
1661:30
worry [2] - 1612:36,
1665:37
worse [3] - 1584:46,
1607:45, 1638:12
worth [1] - 1641:25
wound [2] - 1656:19,
1657:5
write [8] - 1559:39,
1563:34, 1565:23,
1573:31, 1575:12,
1578:19, 1598:32,
1649:38
writing [1] - 1621:16
writings [1] - 1579:20
written [23] - 1562:32,
1562:43, 1563:10,
1563:16, 1563:27,
1566:8, 1566:24,
1566:43, 1566:44,
1567:21, 1573:36,
1573:39, 1573:42,
1574:1, 1574:2,
1586:25, 1586:26,
1604:4, 1605:19,
1606:28, 1619:13,
1623:8, 1630:33
wrong-doings [1] -
1665:14
wrote [2] - 1575:10,
1659:19

Y

year [5] - 1550:45, 1551:8,
1560:23, 1645:12,
1656:40
years [20] - 1550:42,
1556:23, 1556:25,
1556:30, 1583:2,
1588:23, 1592:20,
1597:40, 1608:9,
1610:14, 1611:6,
1638:33, 1638:37,
1654:11, 1654:15,
1654:18, 1658:36,
1662:46, 1663:22,
1665:36
yesterday [1] - 1638:32
young [1] - 1554:16
younger [1] - 1571:30
yourself [17] - 1559:6,
1559:25, 1566:21,
1566:28, 1600:39,
1603:45, 1613:19,
1614:33, 1620:18,
1620:19, 1621:13,
1626:19, 1629:21,
1629:38, 1630:22,
1637:43, 1656:34

Z

Zealand [2] - 1621:17,

1624:22
zeroing [1] - 1622:13