# SPECIAL COMMISSION OF INQUIRY <br> 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 Monday, 15 July 2013 at 9.55am (Day 10)

Before Commissioner: Ms Margaret Cunneen SC<br>Counsel Assisting:<br>Ms Julia Lonergan SC<br>Mr David Kell<br>Mr Warwick Hunt<br>Crown Solicitor's Office: Ms Emma Sullivan, Ms Jessica Wardle

MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, the plan for today is that the cross-examination of Bishop Malone will proceed until completed. Then there will be an adjournment until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning to allow certain in-camera hearings on relevant issues to take place during the middle of the day, if we finish early, and this afternoon.

I have two documents I need to tender that I should have tendered last Friday. The first is the document behind tab 352, which is in volume 5. That's the letter from the Archbishop of Perth to Bishop Malone, dated 28 June 2002.

THE COMMISSIONER: That letter will be exhibit 103.
EXHIBIT \#103 LETTER FROM THE ARCHBISHOP OF PERTH TO BISHOP MALONE DATED 28/6/2002 (TAB 352)

MS LONERGAN: The other is a document that appears in the same volume behind tab 384, and that is the pastoral message to the diocesan community from Bishop Michael Malone dated 16 May 2003.

THE COMMISSIONER: That's 382, I think.
MS LONERGAN: No, it is 384 in my bundle.
MR HARBEN: It is in both.
MS LONERGAN: It is in both, is it? The email from the front to Ms Thomas to the PSO isn't needed, but the pastoral message of 16 May 2003 as well as the press release of 14 May 2003, or the media release, and the press release of 15 May, should all be tendered.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Ms Lonergan. The pastoral message from Bishop Malone dated 16 May 2003, the statement of 14 May 2003 by Bishop Malone, and the press release in relation to the Ombudsman by the CCER will together be admitted and marked exhibit 104.

EXHIBIT \#104 PASTORAL MESSAGE FROM BISHOP MALONE DATED 16/5/2003, STATEMENT OF 14/5/2003 BY BISHOP MALONE, AND THE PRESS RELEASE IN RELATION TO THE OMBUDSMAN BY THE CCER, DATED 15/5/2003 (TAB 384 AND TAB 382)

MS LONERGAN: Thank you, Commissioner. I recall

Bishop Malone.
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
<MICHAEL JOHN MALONE, sworn:
MR HARBEN: Commissioner, I assume I don't need to revisit section 23?

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Harben. That is noted.
MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, I have completed my examination of Bishop Malone.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Mr Gogarty?
MR GOGARTY: Thank you, Commissioner, and I trust we'11 be off to a slightly more productive start than my earlier efforts.

THE COMMISSIONER: Good luck.
<EXAMINATION BY MR GOGARTY:
MR GOGARTY: Q. Good morning, Bishop Malone.
A. Mr Gogarty.
Q. Bishop, did you ever, during your time as Bishop of the Maitland-Newcastle diocese, do anything to dissuade me from talking to the police?
A. Not at all, no.
Q. Thank you. Did you, in your capacity as Bishop of Maitland-Newcastle, ever raise issues at the Conference of Catholic Bishops regarding the claims against Father Jim Fletcher?
A. I can't say that I was that specific, really

Mr Gogarty, about Fletcher in particular. I mean, I think it was fairly common knowledge that the diocese of Maitland-Newcastle had its fair share of paedophilia issues to contend with; so, in a generic kind of way, it came up, yes.
Q. It did come up?
A. It did.
Q. But you don't recall specifically talking about

Father Jim Fletcher?
A. No, I don't.
Q. Thank you. Do you think that his behaviour or the claims against him might have been something that the conference of Australian bishops would be interested in?
A. I'm sure they would have been interested in it, but I didn't really think it was necessary for their reflection really to go into that level of detail.
Q. Good, thank you. Bishop, after you became aware of the 2002 allegations against Fletcher, did you check his file to ascertain whether anyone had raised concerns with your predecessor, Bishop Clarke?
A. No, I did not, Mr Gogarty, no.
Q. Why did you not do that?
A. Well, as I explained to counsel assisting the other day, when it came to files generally, I found that to read about these matters of sexual abuse to me were quite sickening. I certainly opened files, as we established the other day, but I did not sit down and actually study the files in any exhaustive kind of way, so I did not see anything of any previous allegations against him.
Q. Prior to you taking over from Bishop Clarke and in the brief moments before he pointed out the secret briefcase and took off like a rocket, did he give you any last words of advice?

MR HARBEN: I object to that. Advice about the football or, what? That's a very general question, Commissioner. This is a specific inquiry and he's taking over as bishop. I'm sure there might have been lots of things that might have been spoken about.

THE COMMISSIONER: Of course.
MR GOGARTY: Commissioner, I was thinking specifically about any advice regarding the priests who were about to come under the control of Bishop Malone.

MR HARBEN: Again, I would object. There are many priests.

THE COMMISSIONER: Can we confine it to the priests within the term of reference.

MR GOGARTY: I'11 withdraw the question, Commissioner, thank you.
Q. Bishop Malone, when you told Jim Fletcher about the allegations against him, did you tell him he would be under closer scrutiny or supervision?
A. The level of supervision was fairly minimal, I'd have to say. You may have heard me mention that $I$ visited the principal of the school and I advised him about the fact that Fletcher had been - that an investigation was beginning. In speaking with him, I said that Fletcher's activities around the school that were well known, in terms of he used to take reading groups and so on - I said they would need to be curtailed and that the principal would need to keep a close eye on Fletcher just to make sure that there was no conflict of interest between the investigation and Fletcher's appearance at the school.
Q. Certainly. Thank you. Did you, at any point after that, check, particularly with the principal of the school there, whether that sort of scrutiny was happening? A. No, I didn't.
Q. Bishop, I think if I'm correct, it is exhibit 104, under volume 5, tab 384, which is the pastoral message to the diocese of 16 May 2003. Could you just see if you can find that?
A. Volume 5. What's the tab number again?
Q. Tab 384 I think it was, bishop. I'11 just get you, if that's okay, to have a quick look at that.
A. Sure.
Q. Just let me know when you've done that, bishop.
A. Yes, I will.
Q. Have you found it?
A. Not quite yet. I'm here now, yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: Your message is on the next page, bishop.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.
MR GOGARTY: Thank you, Commissioner.

THE WITNESS: Yes, I have it, Mr Gogarty.
MR GOGARTY: Q. That's a pastoral message, bishop, to the diocese which noted that you had stood Fletcher down from ministry on 14 May 2003 following child sexual assault charges against him resulting from a complaint in June 2002; is that correct?
A. Yes, that --

MR HARBEN: That's not right. That's not what it says.
MR GOGARTY: Q. Would you agree, Bishop Malone, that it is a pastoral message from you to the diocese?
A. I do agree with that, yes.
Q. Would you agree that part of that message was you responding to allegations in the media that you should have stood Fletcher down earlier, and I quote you here:

> I sought advice from the NSW Professional
> Standards Office ... and others. I also
> consulted the Director of Catholic Schools
> and the local School Principal ...
> Based on the advice I received and an
> assessment of the potential risk as per NSW
> Child Protection Legislation, I decided to
> leave Father Fletcher in place, aware also
> of his poor health ...

That's the way you read it there?
A. Yes, I can see that.
Q. Thank you. If, as stated in that pastoral message, Bishop Malone, you were concerned about Fletcher's health, were you not potentially worsening it by making him stressed by virtue of telling him that he was under investigation for child sexual assault?
A. That was of concern to me, yes.
Q. Again, if you were concerned for his health, would not subsequently adding to his workload by expanding his parish have potentially worsened his health?
A. Well, I would have hoped that it hadn't. That's why, in my letter, I said to him, you know, "Please try to find ways in which you can share this responsibility so that it is not a burden on you."
Q. Bishop, you mentioned earlier in your evidence there was a primary and secondary school within Fletcher's expanded parish?
A. In Lochinvar, yes.
Q. Was there also an infant's school?
A. Yes, the infants and primary were together.
Q. In the same location?
A. In the same school, yes.
Q. In the same physical location?
A. The infants and primary school was on one side of the New England Highway; the high school was on the other.
Q. Thank you. Bishop, that same pastoral letter of

16 May 2003 also referred, and again I quote, to:
... the potential risk as per NSW Child
Protection Legislation ...
Could you tell the Commissioner who undertook that assessment and when?
A. The risk assessment would have been done by myself, Mr Gogarty, yes.
Q. When did that happen, bishop, do you recall?
A. Probably it would have happened a little bit after my writing or around about the time of my writing this pastoral letter.
Q. My next question is what did it assess or indicate; that it was effectively your opinion, having looked at New South Wales child protection legislation - is that right? A. Not really, no. I just - I needed to jot down a few points as to some of the things that I needed to inform Fletcher about, and to make sure that others who had any contact with him were likewise informed about, so I jotted down these points. They're in my own writing somewhere in all of the files here.
Q. Yes, thank you, bishop.
A. The risk assessment, yes.
Q. Bishop Malone, in a media release dated 11 April 2005 - this was attributed to you and posted on your website - you said this:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text {... victims of sexual abuse and their } \\
& \text { families must be supported by their parish } \\
& \text { and community and not be subjected to } \\
& \text { victimisation or damaging innuendo. } \\
& \text { We must not let them be criticised or } \\
& \text { ostracised for coming forward; in fact they } \\
& \text { should be thanked for bringing abuse out } \\
& \text { into the open. }
\end{aligned}
$$

A. Yes.
Q. Why did you feel the need to issue that press release at that time?
A. It was apparent around about the time of the investigation into Fletcher that people were ostracising the family of [AH] and of another family, and I'll have to go to find it, but anyway --
Q. No, that's fine.
A. -- another family. There was, I think, some intimidation of family members. I understand that a number of parishioners, after mass, would ignore or shun the families concerned. One family even had eggs pelted at the house, as I did myself a little bit later on - my house was pelted by eggs as well, in Hamilton. People were very badly divided by all of this. There were those in favour of Fletcher saying he was innocent, and those against, and that often spilled over into, you know, quite rude behaviour and sort of a quasi-violent behaviour with the throwing of eggs, yes.
Q. Thank you, bishop. Would it be fair to say that, by around the end of 2004, you had a conversion on the road to Damascus, as it were, or perhaps the road to Maitland-Newcastle?
A. Yes, it was growing certainly, Mr Gogarty, yes.
Q. So a switch from protecting the image of the church to a firm stance on the protection of children and justice for victims?
A. Yes, definitely.
Q. You even made a public statement to that effect; is that correct?
A. I did, I did, yes.
Q. Would it also be fair to say you withstood your own form of ostracisation? I think you just referred to your house being pelted with eggs. I'm not sure when that occurred, but you did withstand some form of ostracisation from your colleagues for the stance you took towards the end of your term as bishop?
A. Yes. It was not a - it was not an overt kind of ostracisation, Mr Gogarty. As I mentioned to counsel assisting the other day, it was more of an indifference towards me and the things that I was saying, yes.
Q. Bishop Malone, in your experience, having met and talked to victims of James Patrick Fletcher - I know there have been others, victims of other priests, but I'm specifically interested in the victims of Fletcher - could you tell the Commissioner, in your observation, how child sexual assault has affected those people?
A. Oh, yes, there's a whole raft of ways in which the effect has taken place. The victims with whom I met, and I met with many of them on many occasions, they were extremely - extremely traumatised by the experience. They felt they had been betrayed because a priest had done this to them. They were also conscious of their families, maybe yes, maybe not, believing them were they to come forward to their families. So a number of them kept silence for a number of years precisely for that reason. A number of the victims also found it hard to hold down a job. They also found it hard to hold down relationships and all of these things created a very vulnerable sort of person who was badly traumatised by the abuse.
Q. Bishop, it would be fair to say, I think, you and I have had a number of exchanges over the years?
A. We have, yes.
Q. Do you think that those exchanges have contributed in some sort of a positive way to your thinking about and your response to the issue of childhood sexual assault?
A. Oh, I'm sure they have. I've been most affirmed and I suppose I've learnt a lot from people like yourself and others with whom I've met and that has contributed to my changed attitude, yes.
Q. Good, thank you, Bishop Malone.
A. Thank you, Mr Gogarty.

MR GOGARTY: Those are my questions, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much, Mr Gogarty. Mr Bickford?

## <EXAMINATION BY MR BICKFORD:

MR BICKFORD: Q. Last Wednesday. You were asked this question, it's page 816, on the 10 July transcript:
Q. In terms of files about priests of the diocese kept in the bishop's domain, if I can call it that - "domain" as in your personal office and filing cabinet --
A. Yes.
Q. -- were there only limited people who had access to that material?
A. Definitely were, yes. My
vicar general, of course, had access to it and my personal assistant.
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall giving that evidence?
A. I do.
Q. Your personal assistant was Ms Elizabeth Doyle?
A. Correct, yes.
Q. You had an executive assistant between 2003 and 2008; is that right?
A. I did, yes.
Q. You don't have to refer to that person's name.

I think it's [BS] on the pseudonym list.
A. Yes.
Q. Is it fair to say that person also had access to those files that you were talking about?
A. It is fair to say that, yes.
Q. Was there also someone named Teresa Brierley who worked for the diocese?
A. Yes, there is.
Q. And she was vice chancellor of pastoral ministries?
A. She is that currently.
Q. She remains that today?
A. She does, yes.
Q. Do you recall in 2011 that she was also given access to those files that we're talking about prior to your retirement?
A. I'm finding it hard to remember the circumstances of that, really.
Q. You retired about halfway through 2001?
A. About June, yes, through June 2011, yes.
Q. Is it something that you simply don't recollect at a11?
A. I don't recollect that she had access - well, that she would have access, unless she asked specific permission about something like that and it was given, yes, but my memory is not clear on that.
Q. It is not clear on that?
A. No.
Q. Is it possible that she was given access before you left and by "given access", you gave access to her?
A. That's possible, yes.

MR BICKFORD: Thank you, Commissioner. No further questions.

THE COMMISSIONER: Ms Gerace?
MR GERACE: Commissioner, I need some time to set myself up and have access to documents.

THE COMMISSIONER: Of course. I am across that. I beg your pardon. Mr Skinner?

MR SKINNER: Thank you, Commissioner. I'11 be brief.
<EXAMINATION BY MR SKINNER:
MR SKINNER: Q. Bishop, can I ask you a few questions about your role and the role of bishops generally in the Catholic Church.
A. I'11 try to answer, Mr Skinner, yes.
Q. It is a bishop's decision as to how to discipline or
control the priests in any particular diocese, isn't it?
A. It is, yes.
Q. That includes decisions about withdrawing facilities?
A. Yes, the word is "faculties", really. It was a bit of a --
Q. "Faculties", you're quite right. That was my handwriting. Standing down priests from active ministry is the decision of the bishop?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. Laicisation ultimately is the decision of the bishop?
A. Unless the priest himself initiates that, yes.
Q. Things developed, I think, in relation to statutory obligations. You say in exhibit 86, your statement of June 2013 at paragraph 1.14:

When Head of Agency status was moved by the
Ombudsman from the Catholic Commission for
Employment Relations to each diocesan
Bishop ...
And so on?
A. Yes.
Q. That refers to that happening, doesn't it, that head of agency status being changed --
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. -- under the legislation.
A. It did.
Q. What is that referring to? What is head of agency status in that context?
A. According Ombudsman's legislation regarding matters concerning children, each organisation nominates a person who would be the responsible person for issuing directives or taking the responsibility for actions by that
organisation. In the case of the bishops of New South Wales, we, at a meeting, determined that the Catholic Commission for Employment Relations would be our head of agency, as that responsible person was called.
Q. When was that?
A. Oh, probably around the year 1999-2000. I'm a bit
unsure as to when that legislation came in.
Q. Then it changed, according to your statement, to make it each diocesan bishop?
A. Well, that changed, yes, with the - the Ombudsman's report of 2004 looked at ways in which CCER, in general, had not lived up to its statutory obligations regarding sexual abuse, being a bit deficient, it found, in training and in systems around all of that area. So the report then recommended that the head of agency status change from the Commission to each individual bishop in his own diocese.
Q. I note from exhibit 100, and if you need to refer to it, it is under tab 371 and 372 of volume 5 , they reproduce - it is in two parts. Most relevantly, it is the second part of exhibit 100 I want to take you to, that is, page 982 under 372. Can you see that?
A. This is the police child protection enforcement document?
Q. Yes. That's a photocopy of a dissemination from the Professional Standards Office to the NSW Police Service Child Protection Enforcement Agency. Do you see?
A. I do, yes.
Q. Right at the bottom it indicates that the notifying office is John Davoren?
A. Yes.
Q. It continues, "for the bishop of Maitland-Newcastle." A. Correct.
Q. So, in effect, that was a notification by you as the head of the diocese; is that correct?
A. It was, yes.
Q. Although statutory obligations and things like dissemination arrangements with the police have evolved over time, nonetheless, it has always been the bishop's role to make decisions about disciplining priests in dioceses in Australia, and in particular the Maitland-Newcastle diocese; correct?
A. That's very true, yes.
Q. And that was true for you and for your predecessor Bishop Clarke, wasn't it?
A. Yes, it certainly was, although with Bishop Clarke the

Professional Standards Office didn't exist.
Q. Things have developed; but, in whatever procedure is around from time to time, it's ultimately the bishop's decision, and always has been, as to disciplining priests; correct?
A. True.

MR SKINNER: Thank you.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you Mr Skinner. Mr Cavanagh?
<EXAMINATION BY MR CAVANAGH:
MR CAVANAGH: Q. Bishop, there's only one area I want to take you to. If it assists, you might want to get volume 3, tabs 250 and 251. You will recall there were letters that were sent in June 1995 to the Apostolic Nuncio and to Father Castillo in the Philippines?
A. Just bear with me, Mr Cavanagh.
Q. Of course.
A. 250. Yes, I have it.
Q. You gave some evidence last week, and I should fess up, that I'm limited because I don't have a physical transcript, with me, but I think the transcript reference is about page 791, at 25 to 30 . You were asked some questions about those letters in the context of a discussion that you had with Monsignor Hart?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall that part of the evidence?
A. I do, yes.
Q. You referred to that discussion, and the answer that you gave, page 791, to Mr Harben was:
A. And some communication came through from the bishop, I think, in the Philippines and I discussed that with the vicar general, Monsignor Hart, as to what we would do with that since we were accessing Bishop Clarke's official mail, and he decided he said he'd write to the bishop in the Philippines and I wrote to the Nuncio in Canberra. That was around

> that McAlinden matter that first came up in the June deans' meeting?
A. Yes.
Q. The discussion with Monsignor Hart occurred at a time when you were the coadjutor bishop of the diocese?
A. It did, yes.
Q. You, I think also gave some evidence last week to the effect that, in the role of coadjutor bishop, you effectively, subject to Bishop Clarke, had all of the powers of a bishop, of an auxiliary bishop, and in addition you had the right of succession; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. So, in effect, in Bishop Clarke's absence from the diocese, you were the senior diocesan official?
A. I was, yes.
Q. The discussion that you had with Monsignor Hart in your evidence last week you referred to, as I understood it, was indicating that it was Monsignor Hart that gave direction as to how the correspondence would be sent. Is that what you intended by that evidence?
A. I don't know that Monsignor Hart necessarily was given responsibility to send. I think we agreed that he would write one way and I would write the other.
Q. Would it be more accurate to say that there was a discussion and an agreement was reached as to the division of responsibility for writing letters?
A. That would be accurate, yes.
Q. Thank you, Bishop Malone.
A. Thank you very much.

THE COMMISSIONER: Ms Gerace?

## <EXAMINATION BY MS GERACE:

MR GERACE: Q. Bishop, could I ask some general questions first. You were asked some questions about communications with the bishops in Western Australia?
A. Yes .
Q. As at 1995 , would it be fair to say that there were
three bishops in Western Australia?
A. 1995?

MR GYLES: Sorry, Commissioner, I have a concern about what Ms Gerace's entitlement is to ask questions that don't directly affect her clients. If there is a particular issue that concerns her clients which involves some challenge to the evidence of the bishop, then that's one thing, but I'm concerned that Ms Lonergan has covered matters very thoroughly. We've had additional questions from Mr Gogarty and I'm concerned that we don't have a wide ranging cross-examination of the witness.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. I haven't identified quite where Ms Gerace is going. I will permit you to develop it, Ms Gerace.

MS GERACE: Thank you, Commissioner. For the record, I represent a number of victims as well as people who came forward to the church with complaints. The actions or otherwise of the church in relation to those complaints is a general area of interest to all of those witnesses and, in addition, specifically as to what the bishop did or didn't do, and knew and didn't know, at the time he was dealing with the matters concerning McAlinden is generally of interest to those --

MS LONERGAN: Can I be heard on this issue? I very briefly touched on, in effect, one letter involving the Archbishop of Perth in a discussion this particular witness, as it turns out from his evidence, had with him in 2002. Ms Gerace acts for three victims of McAlinden and, in my respectful submission, this is a matter relevant to her mandate in these proceedings and it is appropriate that she delve further, if she needs to do so

THE COMMISSIONER: I was permitting her to do so. Thank you, Ms Lonergan.

MS GERACE: Q. I'11 rephrase the question, thanks to my instructing solicitor. As at 1995, would it be fair to say there were four bishops in Western Australia?
A. There were four. I've just been thinking how many while you were --
Q. Would it be fair to say if a priest was working in a parish or within one of those dioceses, it would be a fair
suggestion to make that the bishop would know about it? A. Oh, for sure, yes, he would.
Q. In 1995 and the years subsequent, whilst you were the bishop of Maitland-Newcastle, you would have had easy access to be able to contact each of the bishops in Western Australia?
A. I would have, yes.
Q. I will ask you, generally now, some questions about 1995 in terms of correspondence that you had with McAlinden. I will ask you to have a look at tab 253 in volume 3 of 7 .
A. Yes.
Q. The document I next wish you to have a look at is at tab 256, the deans' meeting notes of 2 August 1995.
A. Yes.
Q. Would you also then look at document 255 , which is a letter from Reverend Castillo to Monsignor Hart.
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have that document in front of you?
A. Which one?
Q. The document 255?
A. Yes, I have it here.
Q. As at 29 July 1995, the Reverend Castillo had written to Monsignor Hart advising that Father McAlinden was planning to leave the Philippines to travel to Ireland?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you now look at the following document at 256. This is a meeting of the deans at which you were present on or about 2 August 1995?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you look at point 2 under "Correspondence"?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you see there, in the second paragraph, it says that the bishop - being either yourself, I assume, or Bishop Clarke - indicated that Father McAlinden would be arriving back in Australia on 5 August?
A. Yes, I see that here.
Q. Would it appear, then, that some additional information had been brought to the attention of the bishop - either yourself or Bishop Clarke - that, in lieu of travelling back to Ireland, Father McAlinden would now be returning to Australia on 5 August?

MR HARBEN: I object to that. The question is framed on the assumption, by use of the word "additional", that the contents of tab 255 were in the possession of those attending the deans' meeting on 2 August. There's no evidence of that.

MS GERACE: I am happy to clarify that.
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, thank you, Ms Gerace.
MS GERACE: Q. Are you able to assist us, bishop, as to whether or not the letter at tab 255, being a letter of 29 July 1995 from Reverend Castillo to Monsignor Hart, had been seen by you or was within the diocese by the time the deans met on 2 August 1995?
A. I'd have to say no to that because that letter from Father Castillo was received in our office on 16 August, you see at the bottom of the page.
Q. Thank you.
A. So, therefore, it certainly would not have been available for the deans' meeting.
Q. Thank you very much, bishop. Are you able to assist us in knowing where the information came from in paragraph 2 that Father McAlinden would be arriving back in Australia on 5 August?
A. No, I don't know that at all.
Q. Whilst we're on this document, you gave some evidence last week before the Commission in relation to concerns about the behaviour of [NP], who is mentioned in the discussion of business: Do you see that reference there? A. Yes, I see that down the bottom of page, yes.
Q. You were asked some questions about your knowledge of problems of sexual abuse by clergy within the diocese at the time you became bishop and you said that in relation to [NP], they were suspicions only?
A. Correct, yes.
Q. Can I ask you to just have a look at that second paragraph. The concern about suspicions was partly due to inappropriate behaviour or lack of appreciation of appropriate behaviour by [NP] that had been noted by those attending in these minutes of the deans' meeting on 2 August 1995?
A. Yes. The question you - in the nature of --
Q. No, I don't want to go into the matter.
A. Right.
Q. I want to expand upon the extent of the knowledge that you had at the time you became bishop about [NP]'s behaviour. On the last occasion, it was explored only to the extent that there were suspicions and I want to explore that further.

MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, this Commission is not examining [NP]'s behaviour. It may be Ms Gerace has a particular angle she wishes to pursue. May I have a brief chat?

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, of course.
(Ms Lonergan and Ms Gerace confer)
MS GERACE: I will leave the matter.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Ms Gerace. Thank you, Ms Lonergan.

MS GERACE: Q. I want to ask you now about correspondence by you in relation to McAlinden in 1995. You were taken to a letter of yours, but, firstly, you were asked about a document appearing at tab 250, a letter from Monsignor Hart to Reverend Castillo dated 22 June 1995 ?
A. I have it here, yes.
Q. You were asked about specifically the line at the bottom, the second-last paragraph:

Failing this procedure those who have
lodged complaints intend to consider instituting criminal charges and compensation charges against the Church.
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall giving evidence that, in your opinion, Monsignor Hart was prone to hyperbole in correspondence?

MR HARBEN: I don't think that was the evidence given by this witness.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I don't know if the witness quite --

MS GERACE: Yes, it was. He said, "Monsignor Hart and I were prone to hyperbole in our correspondence."

THE COMMISSIONER: I beg your pardon, if that's the case. I didn't realise that it was quite so general and inclusive. If that is the reference, Ms Gerace, I will permit you to ask the question.

MR HARBEN: I think it is page 794.
MS LONERGAN: My recollection is, and reading the transcript at page 794, I understood this witness's evidence on the question of hyperbole to relate to this witness's letter as well as a letter of Monsignor Hart's rather than a broader comment that Monsignor Hart tended to stray into hyperbole in correspondence.

MS GERACE: Commissioner, could I just have a moment?
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, of course.
MS GERACE: I can't identify that reference. I'11 ask the question it in this way:
Q. Bishop, in relation to that statement there, "Failing this procedure those who lodged complaints intend to consider instituting criminal charges and compensation charges again the Church", is it your evidence or do you have any evidence to give about whether or not those statements made by Monsignor Hart in his correspondence of 20 June 1995 are true or not?
A. I would have to say they're true, to my knowledge.

I would certainly never accuse Monsignor Hart of hyperbole.
Q. So you don't doubt from your perspective what Monsignor Hart wrote in this correspondence on 20 June

1995, that failing the removal of Father McAlinden's facilities in the Philippines, those who had lodged complaints intended to consider instituting criminal charges and compensation charges again the church?

MR GYLES: I object to the question. It is not for this witness to comment upon what Monsignor Hart's state of mind was.

THE COMMISSIONER: No.
MR GYLES: And it is not relevant as to whether he thinks Monsignor Hart is telling the truth or not. That's a matter for you, Commissioner. Monsignor Hart will be giving evidence.

MS GERACE: Except this, Commissioner: as I understood this witness's evidence, correspondence by Monsignor Hart in relation to this matter was discussed with the bishop, and it is relevant to what the bishop had to say about what he knew about the victims and their intentions in or about this time. There's been some confusion about the extent of the bishop's knowledge about those matters and what he believed about what [AK] and [AL] were intending to do in 1995.

MR GYLES: With all due respect, that doesn't make the last question admissible. There are ways to ask admissible questions to explore that issue.

THE COMMISSIONER: I understand that. Thank you, Mr Gyles. Could you ask the bishop then, Ms Gerace -MS GERACE: I will.
Q. This document was discussed with you, wasn't it, bishop?
A. That document itself wasn't, but the division of labour was. Monsignor Hart agreed to write to Castillo and I agreed to write to the Nuncio. So he didn't run his formula of words past me, as far as can I remember.
Q. Did Monsignor Hart discuss with you his understanding that those who had lodged complaints intended to consider instituting criminal charges and compensation charges again the church?
A. I don't remember that he discussed that with me.
Q. But it's possible that he did?
A. Possible, yes.
Q. Is it also possible that you were aware at June 1995 that that was in fact the case, that those who had lodged complaints intended to consider instituting criminal charges and compensation charges against the church if Father McAlinden did not have his faculties removed and returned to England?
A. I was not aware of that, no. Right through the process that we were speaking about last week of laicisation or 1044, or whatever it was, my understanding was always that [AK] and [AL] did not want the matter taken to the police, which is not to say that if there wasn't any action happening that they would have gone to the police.
Q. And that's precisely what I wanted to bring you to now, bishop. I want to put to you that Bishop Clarke told you when the complaints were made by [AK] and [AL], they wished the church to act on the matter and, at that stage, did not intend to take that the matter to the police? A. That's my understanding --

MR HARBEN: I object to this. Is this an assertion from this examiner's instructions, because that's the way it's put, that Bishop Clarke has given that level of detail and instruction to this witness? That's a positive assertion.

THE COMMISSIONER: It is.
MS LONERGAN: I adopt Mr Harben's objection. Perhaps the question could be rephrased in a different manner, but putting Bishop Clarke's knowledge can't be admissible.

MS GERACE: I didn't. I put the matter: "Is it the case that Bishop Clarke told you that, in 1993 when the complaints were made by [AK] and [AL], they wished the church to deal with it firstly?"

MR HARBEN: That's not the question that was asked.
MS LONERGAN: That wasn't the question that was asked and also this witness wasn't present in 1993.

THE COMMISSIONER: No. However, I think you know how you can ask it, Ms Gerace.

MS GERACE: Yes.
Q. When you were discussing the complaints by [AK] and [AL] with Bishop Clarke, did he advise you that the complainants [AK] and [AL] wanted the church to deal with McAlinden?
A. Yes, he did.
Q. And that, in that context and provided the church was doing so, did he also suggest to you that provided that was done, the matter would not go to the police?
A. I don't know that he put it quite like that. My understanding from him was that [AK] and [AL] did not want the police involved, but did want him to be stripped of his faculties and of his priesthood.
Q. The stripping of a priest's faculties is a rare event;
is that right, bishop?
A. It is rare, yes.
Q. Was it also the case that, at some stage, Bishop Clarke told you that one of the victims, either [AK] or [AL], had come forward after it had been discovered that Father McAlinden was in fact or suspected of working in the Philippines?
A. I'm a bit unsure as to the timing of that.
Q. But at some stage - if you'd have a look at your correspondence at 251, your letter to Archbishop Brambilla? A. Yes.
Q. If you look at the third paragraph, do you see there in your correspondence (suppressed) --

Sorry, could that not be published, the reference to the --
A. The person, yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MS GERACE: Q. It says:
(Suppressed) who has come forward is not satisfied with this reply and demands that
a letter be produced indicating that
Father Denis McAlinden has had the
faculties of the San Pab1o Diocese revoked and that he will return to England.
A. I read that, yes.
Q. Is that information you received in or about the time of your correspondence?
A. I presume I must have because I've written about it, yes.
Q. Were you also told at the same time that if the church could not act on this matter, that there would be some consideration for taking legal action against the church? A. That's in the next line, yes. I have indicated --
Q. I just wanted to confirm that was information you received as at that time.
A. Yes, as again I must have, I suppose, otherwise I wouldn't have written it.

MS LONERGAN: I should make a formal application for a non-publication order in relation to those two words that fell from Ms Gerace.

THE COMMISSIONER: That noun will not be published. I direct that now for the members of the press.

MS GERACE: Could I have a word with counsel assisting, Commissioner?

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
(Ms Lonergan and Ms Gerace confer)
MS GERACE: Q. Bishop, can I ask you some further questions about what Bishop Clarke told you, at or about the time June 1995 through to the time you became bishop, about McAlinden and the complaints by [AK] and [AL]. Did Bishop Clarke tell you that when the complaints by [AK] and [AL] were brought forward, he had referred the matter to Father Lucas - those complaints to Father Lucas?
A. It did come in conversation, yes.
Q. In addition to that, did Bishop Clarke convey to you that, as a consequence of Father Lucas investigating those matters - I think you've already given evidence to this extent - Father McAlinden also had a case to answer in
relation to the complaints?
A. I believe so, yes.
Q. You gave some further evidence on the last occasion that shortly after the time you became aware his faculties had been removed to exercise priestly ministries, you were told - and this appears at T808.12 - that the removal of his faculties concerned the sexual abuse of children; do you recall giving that evidence?
A. Yes.
Q. And you gave further evidence that Father Lucas had obtained admissions from McAlinden that he had sexually abused children; do you recall that?
A. He gave those admissions to Bishop Clarke, yes.
Q. You were aware of that? You were told?
A. I was, yes.
Q. Was it also the case that Bishop Clarke informed you at or about this time that the church had reached an agreement with Father McAlinden to deal with the complaints by, firstly, removing his faculties to exercise priestly ministry, and, secondly, that he retire from Australia to Ireland?
A. No, I don't remember being a party to that.
Q. Not that you were a party, but did Bishop Clarke tell you that?
A. No, I don't recollect that.
Q. Would you have a look for me, please, at the document appearing at tab 244, a letter from Bishop Clarke to Reverend Brambilla?
A. The same volume?
Q. Same volume, bishop.
A. Yes, I have it.
Q. Is that a document you've seen?
A. Yes, I've seen it.
Q. Is that a document you saw in or about the time of your deans' meeting in June 1995? Had you seen that by that stage.

MR HARBEN: I think the meeting was in August.

MS GERACE: There were two meetings, as $I$ understood it. There was one in August. It is the same meeting.
Q. Had you seen that correspondence by the deans' meeting in August of 1995?
A. I can't remember that.
Q. Do you recall seeing this letter from Bishop Clarke to Reverend Brambilla when you became involved in that process of correspondence?
A. I have seen the letter, but the timing of when I saw it is very vague.
Q. So is it the case you're not able to assist us now as to when --
A. No.
Q. -- understandably, you first saw that correspondence?
A. I find it hard to remember what happened last week, let alone 18 years ago.
Q. I also want to be very clear - is it also possible then that you are not clear about whether or not you knew, as at August 1995, an agreement had been reached between the church and Father McAlinden that he was to be stripped of his facilities and to retire to England?

MR HARBEN: I think he's answered this question.
THE WITNESS: No, I don't.
MR HARBEN: This is the same question that was asked about four questions ago.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, when the witness said, "No, I don't recall that".

MR HARBEN: There was no ambiguity about that.
THE COMMISSIONER: Sorry, "I don't recollect that", in fact. Now you're putting a time on it?

MS GERACE: I am putting a time on that. I want to be clear about whether it could be something he knew that he now no longer recollects or there's uncertainty whether he knew it or not because it is significant in terms of some
other evidence.
THE COMMISSIONER: Al1 right.
MS GERACE: Q. What I want to suggest, bishop, is that when it was discovered that in fact Father McAlinden was acting as a priest overseas, one of the complainants came forward and indicated that the church needed to act immediately?
A. Yes, I think so.
Q. And that if the church was not prepared to act, they would need to take their own action in order to have the matter dealt with?
A. Probably, yes. I wrote that in my letter.
Q. That's right. And that was part of the reasoning behind the decision taken at the deans' meeting in August 1995 to proceed to laicisation of Father McAlinden?
A. I don't know that the deans' meeting came to that conclusion but that, from my memory, Bishop Clarke spoke to me about continuing the process later in the year.
Q. If you have a look at the document at 256 , which is minutes of the deans' meeting on 2 August 1995, do you see under point 2, under "Correspondence" the fina1 paragraph:

It was resolved that we move towards a ...
procedure, since Father Denis would not
[conform] to the restriction placed upon
him by Bishop Leo.
A. Yes, I see that.
Q. That was a meeting you attended?
A. I was there.
Q. That appears to record a resolution by those in attendance at the meeting to adopt that procedure, doesn't it?
A. It does, yes.
Q. And that it appears to be because consensus was reached that it was necessary to act further because Father McAlinden would not conform to the restriction placed upon him by Bishop Clarke?
A. Yes, apparently, yes.

MS LONERGAN: Can I take this opportunity to tender that minute of the deans' meeting, which I should have tendered last week.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Ms Lonergan. What tab is it, please?

MS LONERGAN: It is tab 256 in volume 3.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. The minutes of the deans' meeting held on 2 August 1995, which is tab 256, will be admitted and marked exhibit 105.

## EXHIBIT \#105 MINUTES OF DEANS' MEETING ON 2/8/1995 (TAB 256)

MS GERACE: Q. The procedure, can we take it, the deans resolved they would move towards was the procedure of laicisation; is that correct?
A. I don't recollect the word "laicisation" being used at that meeting, but obviously from the minute there was a resolution to certainly do something strong, yes.
Q. Do I take it that we can assume that whilst the minute itself does not record it, is it fair in your mind, bishop, that in fact what was being resolved was the movement to proceed to laicise Father McAlinden?
A. That's fair I'd say, yes.
Q. You said in your earlier evidence that procedure was one that had a virtually nil prospect of success?
A. Correct, yes.
Q. At the time the decision was being taken by the deans to act in August 1995, the deans were aware that Father McAlinden, at that stage, was not conforming to restrictions placed upon him by Bishop Leo?
A. Yes.
Q. Specifically continuing to act as a priest, notwithstanding the stripping of his faculties?
A. Yes .
Q. And in so doing, therefore, continuing to expose others to risk of offending by Father McAlinden?
A. Yes.
Q. And that, at that stage, the only procedure adopted by the deans, in this correspondence at this stage, was a resolution to a procedure that, in your own opinion, had virtually nil prospects of success?
A. As I said, the word "laicisation" does not appear here in the minute, but I did say that obviously the deans were recommending that something strong be done in order to curtail McAlinden's activities. Laicisation was certainly a possibility, but as the legal representative for another party asked me the other day, there was another process, which she alerted us to, and which in fact Bishop Clarke had written to McAlinden about, and that was - I think it was canon 1044, which was another stripping --

MS GERACE: I don't think we've heard this evidence.
MS LONERGAN: This is a matter for an in-camera hearing and there should be no further evidence on this point.

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry.
MS LONERGAN: That's not your fault, bishop.
MR HARBEN: That raises this problem: it makes it very hard for the bishop - in the cross-examining of this witness - to confine it to a procedure called a laicisation procedure when there's an inability to explore what else may have been considered.

MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, could I have a word with my learned friend?

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Ms Lonergan. Thank you, Mr Harben.
(Ms Lonergan and Ms Gerace confer)
MS GERACE: Commissioner, this raises some difficulties in terms of my questions. I've just had a discussion with counsel assisting.

MS LONERGAN: One way about it may be to close the court and deal with it in camera. That's my suggestion.

THE COMMISSIONER: Right now?

MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, the best approach would be, at this stage, to have the morning tea adjournment and then we'11 deal with it.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. I will adjourn.
SHORT ADJOURNMENT
MS GERACE: Q. Bishop, just before we broke, I asked you some questions about laicisation and the fact that the prospects of that succeeding were virtually nil?
A. Yes.
Q. You were also aware, by the time you became bishop in November 1995, that Father McA1inden had ignored the process by which his faculties had been removed and continued to act as a priest. Were you aware of that? A. In the Philippines, that had been the case, yes.

MR HARBEN: I object to that. The question involved two propositions. First, by the time he became bishop, he was aware that the laicisation procedure prospects were virtually nil, I think Ms Gerace said; and the second part of the question adopts that knowledge for the purposes of the second part of the question. My recollection of the evidence is that that belief about the laicisation procedure came later than the precise time he became bishop. He may have had some view about the possibilities. But certainly not in the strong terms put in that question.

THE COMMISSIONER: No doubt the view strengthened over some period.

MR HARBEN: That's as I understood the evidence.
THE COMMISSIONER: Ms Gerace?
MS GERACE: Commissioner, I understood the bishop's evidence to be that, even as at August 1995, he was aware that the process of laicisation was one that had virtually nil prospects of success. He has been fairly consistent on that point.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. I understand that, by the time of the deans' meeting, Mr Harben, that was a view that the bishop in formed.

MR HARBEN: Except for this - he never once said that the word "laicisation" was mentioned at the deans' meeting. In fact, the only thing recorded in the minutes is a procedure.

MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, I think there's some doubt about that. The document appears to have a typographical error, "legislation procedure", which clearly isn't correct and what appears to be a correction, and with the letter "L" or the letter "I" above it. It does appear that it was at least discussed, but in what context is uncertain.

MR HARBEN: A minute from the meeting was read out correctly by my learned friend in cross-examination. She read as if that word was not in the minute. Because clearly, it had been crossed out and the "L" --

THE COMMISSIONER: It has been replaced by someone, one might think, Mr Harben, who was unfamiliar with the word "laicisation".

MR HARBEN: No, or the "L" above the word "legislation", that it is crossed out.

THE COMMISSIONER: Doesn't that suggest to you that "legislation" is not the word, but the word that should be there is a word with as many syllables perhaps starting with "L"?

MR HARBEN: No, it suggests to me, with respect, that "L" is the initial of the person correcting it, being Bishop Leo Clarke. I thought that was why my learned friend read it out in that form.

MS LONERGAN: There's no evidence there was a correction by Bishop Clarke or that the "L" is his initial.

THE COMMISSIONER: I wouldn't accept that it was. It doesn't look like his initials to me.

MS GERACE: The bishop's evidence was also that it was fair to say that the procedure being discussed was the laicisation. That was the evidence given just before we broke.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

MS GERACE: In any event, all $I$ was doing was summarising evidence given to come back to the next points. I don't think there is anything controversial.

THE COMMISSIONER: No, that's true, Ms Gerace.
Q. Bishop, may I ask you --
A. Yes, Commissioner.
Q. -- do you think it is likely that that word was "laicisation", that the word that should be there is "laicisation"?
A. Actually, no, I don't.
Q. Thank you.
A. I think probably it might be some "legal" procedure rather than "laicisation".
Q. Yes, but whoever was taking or typing the minutes has mistakenly written "legislation" --
A. Yes.
Q. I beg your pardon, or has typed from, what, hearing the --
A. Hearing the word.
Q. I will withdraw all of that and we'll start again. Bishop Clarke didn't do his own typing, did he?
A. No, I don't think so.
Q. So someone has typed this document from what, minutes, written minutes or was the typist present?
A. They were probably originally written minutes.
Q. So one could infer that that word - the word that's been crossed out "legislation" - represents some longish word that was written by hand during the meeting?
A. It may have, Commissioner.
Q. Although you were there, you cannot now recall what it could be?
A. No, I can't recall.
Q. Thank you, bishop.
A. Thanks, Commissioner.

MR GYLES: On that topic, while you go to it,

Commissioner, the question which hasn't been asked is whether it is the bishop's role to take minutes. That may be something that needs to be addressed at some appropriate time.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Perhaps you will ask about that when the time comes, Mr Gyles. Ms Gerace?

MS GERACE: Q. Bishop, you don't alter from the evidence given by you prior to our break when I said to you it was fair to say that the procedure being discussed at that meeting was the procedure of laicisation, do you?
A. It is fair to assume that it may have been that, yes.
Q. It is also fair to say that, from your knowledge of laicisation at August 1995, that was always going to be a difficult procedure for the church to undertake?
A. I was not all that familiar with the laicisation procedure myself in August 1995. It became more apparent later on to me, from what I read or advice I received, that unless the priest himself initiated that procedure, then it had little chance of success.
Q. By the end of 1995, it was apparent to you that Father McAlinden was not going to cooperate with that procedure of laicisation, wasn't it?
A. It was always a possibility but, as I mentioned, the exchange of letters seemed to indicate that he may have been prepared to cooperate with the procedure.
Q. But you had your own suspicion by the end of 1995 that that wasn't, in fact, the case?
A. Yes, always, yes.
Q. By the end of 1995, Father McAlinden had already disobeyed or continued to practise as a priest in disobedience to the removal of his faculties?
A. He had been exercising ministry in the Philippines.
Q. And he had returned to Australia, notwithstanding at least on the correspondence you've now seen, an agreement that he return to Ireland or England and live there?
A. Yes, it would appear that Bishop Clarke had some information that he was coming back to Australia.
Q. And that, at the meeting in August 1995, a consensus was reached by the resolution that those in attendance were
of the view that Father McAlinden would not confirm to the restriction placed upon him by Bishop Clarke?
A. Yes.
Q. Can I take you to your knowledge of Father McAlinden's whereabouts by the end of December 1995. Would you look for me, please, at exhibit 78. I will ask that it be shown to you. I don't think it is in those bundles. It will need to be given directly to you.
A. Yes, I have it.
Q. That is correspondence addressed to you?
A. Yes.
Q. From Father McAlinden?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you see the writing on the top "Received 8 December 1995"?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know whose initials appears there?
A. Yes, they're mine.
Q. They're your initials. So do we take that it you had seen this document on or about that date, 8 December 1995 ?
A. Correct, yes.
Q. The address given by Father McAlinden is PO Box 305 ?
A. Correct, yes.
Q. Do you also agree that that correspondence records there a visit to a doctor, a Dr A Pang in Western Australia?
A. Yes, I --
Q. In the second paragraph?
A. Yes, I see that, yes.
Q. Does it also then discuss in the second-last paragraph "the hospitality", if I can read the line, the paragraph begins:

My immediate plan, on advice, is to
go up-country from now till after Christmas
... [to] prepare for the next operation ...
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Does he also then provide you with some knowledge about priests or areas or dioceses that he might have been visiting or intending to visit?
A. It says in the letter that he was going to enjoy the hospitality of some priests and it mentions Perth and Geraldton dioceses.
Q. They're two of the four dioceses within Western Australia?
A. They are, yes.
Q. In addition to a PO box in Western Australia, we have some additional information that suggests other contacts or persons who may know, potentially, where he is or where he might be found in 1995?
A. Presumably, yes.
Q. Bishop, I'm going back, in terms of the minutes you were just asked about - I should have asked this earlier being the deans' meeting of August 1995. Was there a standard procedure for who took minutes at those meetings, a standard person responsible for the taking of those minutes?
A. Probably there was a minutes' secretary, but I can't remember who that was.
Q. Was there a general practice by which minutes were sent to you for approval?
A. Not that I can remember. They probably would have been sent to Bishop Clarke for his approval.
Q. You were asked some questions when you first started giving your evidence about the handover from Bishop Clarke? A. Yes.
Q. You said at transcript 788 , 1 ine 23 , that you hoped there would be a more solid handover and that any secret documents might be shown to you, or at least you would be pointed in the direction in which you might find them? A. Yes.
Q. Can I deal now, firstly, with some questions about the nature of the handover and other information that you had. I'm asking you specifically about your knowledge, as at November 1995, when you took over as bishop of the diocese? A. Right.
Q. Do you understand the period I'm talking about, by the time you commenced your formal role as bishop?
A. Yes .
Q. At that stage, you knew that Father McAlinden had had his faculties removed?
A. Correct.
Q. And you had been told that by Bishop Clarke?
A. Yes.
Q. You knew from your own understanding that this was an unusual and not so frequent procedure to be undertaken?
A. Correct, yes.
Q. Also is it fair to say that you knew this was one not exercised lightly by a bishop?
A. Yes.
Q. You knew from the deans' meetings - this appears
at transcript page 787, line 42 and following - that Father McAlinden had been removed for issues of sexual abuse?
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. That the abuse had been on children - yes?
A. Yes.
Q. And that, on your own evidence, you knew of two complaints by [AK] and [AL]?
A. Correct, yes.
Q. You knew that Father Lucas had spoken to McAlinden and obtained some admissions about his conduct?
A. Yes.
Q. You also were aware that the complainants were looking to the church, to deal with McAlinden?
A. That's my belief, yes.
Q. And that at least there had been a suggestion that one of the ways it could be dealt with was that McAlinden would leave Australia and retire to Ireland, no longer acting as a priest?
A. I don't know about that, yes.
Q. But leaving aside then the agreement about returning
to Ireland, it was that he was to no longer exercise his functions as a priest?
A. Yes, correct.
Q. But you were also aware, by the time you took over, there was reasonable belief that he was in fact still acting as a priest?
A. I don't think he was acting as a priest when I took over.
Q. In - -
A. In November 1995.
Q. No, but prior to that, he had disobeyed the removal of his faculties and had been exercising priestly functions in the Philippines?
A. Correct. I knew that, yes.
Q. In terms of where to look, Bishop Clarke told you about the existence of a large briefcase in the corner of his room; do you recall giving that evidence?
A. He did, yes.
Q. Was it your belief that potentially that briefcase contained some information of a confidential nature?
A. Yes .
Q. And that that confidential nature might concern the evidence of priests within the diocese?
A. Quite possibly, yes.
Q. You knew, at that stage, of the existence of secret files or that it was common knowledge from work around the diocese that secret files might exist?
A. Yes .
Q. Also within your own office, which was former Bishop Clarke's office, there were other filing records kept there, weren't there?
A. There were, yes.
Q. When did Elizabeth Doyle commence her employment at the diocese?
A. I think it would have been before my time, in 1994, I think, from memory.
Q. So that Elizabeth Doyle, who became your secretary,
had also for a period been a secretary at the diocese to Bishop Clarke?
A. She had, yes.
Q. You were also aware, were you not, that in or about 1988, some years prior to your appointment as bishop, a Special Issues Committee had been set up by the church to deal with special issues affecting bishops, firstly?
A. I wasn't aware of that in 1988, but I became aware of it in 1995.
Q. At the time you became bishop, you knew there was a Special Issues Committee?
A. Well, yes, I did, yes, because Father Lucas had been part of that.
Q. Father Lucas had been a part of that Special Issues Committee?
A. I believe so, yes.
Q. And that one of the special issues that the committee looked at was the issue of how to deal with abuse by clergy, sexual abuse by clergy?
A. Yes.
Q. In fact, one of the main issues looked at by the Special Issues Committee was what advice should be given to bishops about how to deal with allegations of sexual abuse by the clergy?
A. I understand that, yes.
Q. You understood then - as at November 1995 - that that was the reason for the Special Issues Committee even if you did not know or were not aware of what specific advice had been provided?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. When you were asked about not looking for documents about McAlinden, you gave some general evidence about being the bishop of a busy diocese. Do you recall giving that evidence?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Do you recall giving some evidence that you didn't have time to trawl through the materials of the diocese including the archives?
A. I was referring specifically to the archives, saying
that I didn't have the luxury of time to be able to dig through those.
Q. But you had an assistant - you had a secretary,

Elizabeth Doyle?
A. I did, yes.
Q. You had a vicar general?
A. Yes.
Q. You could have asked either Ms Doyle or your vicar general to undertake searches on your behalf, couldn't you?
A. I suppose I could have, but Elizabeth Doyle did not have access to the secret files or to the files under Bishop Clarke's administration. That was only when I came along that I asked her to do that.
Q. So you did, at some stage, ask her to have access to them later?
A. I did, yes, later.
Q. But that's something you could have done as at November 1995?
A. I could have done, yes.
Q. You could have asked your vicar general to look for that material, couldn't you?
A. I could have, yes.
Q. You were aware, as at 1995, from the matters you just agreed you knew, that there may have been other documents or potentially other documents that could be searched for within your own archives?
A. In point of fact, I did not know that. The only people I knew about were [AK] and [AL].
Q. From 1 November 1995, it was your responsibility from that day onwards to make yourself familiar with all information available about Father McAlinden?
A. Yes, I suppose so, yes.
Q. So that from the time you took over, any deficiencies in the handover of Bishop Clarke were no longer relevant.
Do you accept that?
A. Yes.
Q. You were also asked last week whether you had any
personal - excuse me; I just want to be clear about this. You had given some evidence that, by the time you took over as bishop, there had been some general widespread publicity or knowledge about the problems of sexual abuse within the church from the Americas?
A. Yes, certainly from that, yes.
Q. You're also aware, on the evidence you have given today, about the existence of a Special Issues Committee set up in Australia for dealing with this problem?
A. Yes.
Q. You were aware from your time as coadjutor about the allegations against McAlinden?
A. Yes.
Q. In your role as coadjutor, you were approached by two parents who expressed concern about an overnight stay had by their children with [NP]?
A. Yes.
Q. When you went on holidays in October 1995, Father Vincent Ryan was arrested on charges of sexual abuse of young boys?
A. Correct, yes.
Q. By the time you started as bishop in this diocese, you were aware of a complaint against a priest for abuse of young girls, Father McAlinden; secondly, the charging of Father Vincent Ryan on charges of sexual abuse of young boys; and complaints made directly to you by two parents about their concerns of an overnight stay of their boys with a third priest --
A. Yes.
Q. -- [NP]. Bishop, in those circumstances, it is entirely unlikely that you did not, as bishop, make an effort to look through the secret files or other documents of the diocese to find out what was happening in your diocese?
A. I'm unsure as to whether you want me to say "Yes" or "No" to that.
Q. I'm putting to you that it was just not true that you did not look for documents to understand what was happening in your diocese in relation to sexual abuse by clergy?
A. In the case of Vince Ryan, he admitted his crimes and
the investigation that ensued was purely an investigation for the purposes of sentencing. In the case of [NP], the two people that came forward to speak with me were voicing suspicions only about questionable behaviour. The only other one was McAlinden.
Q. As at November 1995, Vincent Ryan had just been charged. He hadn't made those admissions, had he?
A. I don't know that he - I'm not sure when he admitted, but he did admit his crimes.
Q. I'm asking you about November 1995. Can I suggest to you that, coming into your diocese in November 1995 with the knowledge that you had about McAlinden, the suspicions about [NP] and the recent arrest of Vincent Ryan, that alerted you to a significant problem within the Hunter Maitland diocese of sexual abuse by clergy?
A. There was a significant concern about those three priests, yes.
Q. In your diocese?
A. We11, of course.
Q. As at November 1995?
A. Yes.
Q. I'm suggesting to you further that any suggestion by you that, in response to those matters, you did not take it upon yourself to look through the secret files or other documents of the diocese to check out what the problem was and how significant it was should not be accepted by this Commission.

MR HARBEN: Can I ask whether the examiner is putting for the second time a positive assertion of untruthfulness? She can only do that on her instructions, as I understand it. The first time she put it, it wasn't true. The second time is a form of words which means that, and if she's doing that, she's putting a positive assertion presumably on the instructions of those who instruct her.

MS GERACE: I'11 withdraw it and rephrase it. Thank you, Mr Harben.
Q. Bishop, can I suggest it is entirely improbable that you, as the new bishop of the Hunter Maitland diocese, did not, when you became bishop in November 1995, and alert to
the significant problems within your diocese, make every effort to find out about the problem of sexual abuse within your diocese?
A. Well, I certainly did not visit the files of those three particular priests, at that point.
Q. Bishop, there was no reason why you couldn't have visited those files?
A. I could have, yes.
Q. And you agree now you should have visited those files?
A. In the case of McAlinden, I was - I had enough to go on because Bishop Clarke had told me about [AK] and [AL] and we were proceeding, as we've discussed last week. With regard to [NP], they were suspicions only, which I then proceeded to speak to him about. In the case of Vincent Ryan, there was no need to go to the file precisely because he had been charged and had admitted, at some point early in the piece, to his crimes.
Q. Do you accept or otherwise my suggestion that. Alert to those problems within your diocese you should have looked, if you did not in fact, look at those files?
A. Possibly I suppose, yes.
Q. You were asked some questions earlier on about your knowledge of sexual abuse by clergy prior to becoming coadjutor and prior to becoming the Bishop of Newcastle. I'm going to take you to that question. I just want to understand your answer a bit more. This appears at page 821. At line 12, you were asked this:
Q. Were the McAlinden accusations the first time you'd heard of accusations of sexual abuse on the part of a priest, a Catholic priest?

Your answer was, to clarify:
A. In the diocese?
Q. At all?
A. Well, no. I mean, there had been
plenty of publicity from the United States and from some other places about sexual abuse by clergy, yes.
A. Yes.
Q. You were asked by way of further clarification:
Q. In Australia, was he the first you heard about in Australia?
A. I don't know really.
A. Yes.
Q. I want to be clear about your evidence. Prior to being appointed coadjutor of the Hunter Maitland diocese, or the diocese as it was known then, did you have any knowledge from personal experience of priests that you'd worked with being concerned about either their conduct around children or sexual abuse by them with children?

MR HARBEN: I object to this. This is some wide-ranging inquiry and my friend will probably say it has to do with some other issue about knowledge at that time. That's a matter for another forum, with respect. This inquiry has specific issues to develop and we're now being taken back to a time prior to any involvement with the Maitland-Newcastle diocese.

THE COMMISSIONER: And at a time when the bishop was not a bishop, but a priest.

MR HARBEN: That's right.
MS GERACE: I'11 narrow it down. It is relevant in terms of the submissions that might be made in terms of the probability, or otherwise, evidence given by the witness about what searches he took or didn't take, and also in answer to suggestions by the bishop about his knowledge, innocuous or otherwise, about the problem of sexual abuse within the clergy. I'll put it more specifically.
Q. Let me go directly to my point, bishop. Whilst you were the priest at Gosford, was it the case that a Father Paul Evans was brought in to operate as your assistant priest within that diocese?
A. That's correct, he was.
Q. At the time that he was brought in to be your assistant priest, were you also aware that Father Evans had, just prior to that, been charged with sexual abuse of young boys?

MR GYLES: I object. This has nothing to do with the four investigations that are the subject of this inquiry. It should not be given.

MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, there may be some way that it is relevant, which isn't obvious to me at this point. May I just have a quick conversation with Ms Gerace?

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
(Ms Lonergan and Ms Gerace confer)
MS GERACE: Commissioner, could I say why I say that is relevant?

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MS GERACE: It is put on the basis that it may inform the Commission about the bishop's knowledge, prior to and just prior to, in the years preceding his appointment as coadjutor, and the fact that to the extent evidence has been given that at the time in 1995 he had little or otherwise knowledge of the problem of sexual abuse and, also, in terms of potentially - I don't know what he's going to say so it is a bit difficult without having something on the record - his involvement in the management of it. It is relevant to any suggestion by the bishop that he was entirely unprepared to deal with these matters when he became bishop or he had some innocuous knowledge of the problem prior to.

It goes also to the general question that this Commission will need to look at, namely, does it accept the bishop's evidence about what he did or didn't do in or about the time of his role of coadjutor or as bishop in relation to those early complaints. His general credibility on these matters is a matter that's being asked by the Commission and I wish to explore the nature of those questions that I put to him to understand what knowledge he brought about this problem to his role as bishop.

THE COMMISSIONER: What's the name of this priest?
MS GERACE: Father Evans.
MS LONERGAN: There's some potential relevance, having
heard Ms Gerace articulate her position. The answers may lead to disclosure of certain actions that are directly relevant to these terms of reference in terms of what was or was not done by this witness. I won't say anything more than that.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Bishop, did you know that Father Evans was involved in criminal investigations into his conduct?
A. No, Commissioner, I did not.

MS LONERGAN: Could I request a non-publication order over that priest, only because we have no information regarding that, and it may be the source of the information is correct or incorrect. We have no way of looking further at that at this juncture. .

THE COMMISSIONER: Father Evans was convicted, I think.
MS GERACE: Yes, he was convicted. At a subsequent date, he was in fact convicted.

MS LONERGAN: I withdraw my application for non-publication.

THE COMMISSIONER: I will permit you to ask your question, Ms Gerace.

MS GERACE: Thank you very much, Commissioner.
Q. Bishop, is it your evidence that at the time Father Evans was brought in as your assistant priest in Gosford, you did not know that he had been charged with offences involving the sexual abuse of children?
A. That is correct.
Q. Is it your evidence that at no time were any suspicions about his behaviour or otherwise conveyed to you as the priest in that parish?
A. The only --

MR GYLES: I object to that question. This is going beyond the bounds of even the relevance articulated by my learned friend.

THE COMMISSIONER: Conveyed to? Yes, we'11 have to narrow the time frame, please Ms Gerace; that is, when

Bishop Malone was the parish priest at Gosford.
MS GERACE: Q. Excuse me, bishop. I'11 get the dates correctly.

THE COMMISSIONER: There's probably no need for you to get the dates, Ms Gerace, but to ask the --

MS GERACE: I can confine the issue.
Q. Confined to the time you were parish priest at Gosford, at the time that Father Evans was transferred into your parish and he - firstly, the assistant priest works with the priest of the parish; is that correct?
A. Correct, yes.
Q. You worked with Father Evans?
A. I did.
Q. I'm asking you from the time that he was either being transferred to you, you were advised that you were to receive Father Evans as an assistant priest --
A. Correct, yes.
Q. -- through the subsequent years when he worked as your assistant priest, did you have information conveyed to you that raised concerns about Father Evans's conduct in terms of sexual abuse of children?
A. I was unaware, as I mentioned a moment ago, of any allegations around sexual abuse of children. The Bishop of Broken Bay at the time, under whose authority I was at Gosford, phoned me one evening, I remember it well, and he said to me that he had a priest to appoint to me at Gosford parish. He said there had been some issues, but there was nothing to them and would I be prepared to accept him. I said in reply, "If you think it's all right for him to be here, then I'm happy to have him, yes", and that was the extent of it.
Q. Is it your evidence he didn't convey to you what those issues were?
A. That is correct, he didn't.
Q. Did the bishop ask you to keep an eye on him?
A. I don't recollect that, no.
Q. Just before the break, I was asking you some questions
about evidence you'd given about hyperbole in correspondence. I was specifically asking you about a document at 250. Would you look at that, please.
A. Yes, I've got it.
Q. I was asking you specifically about the paragraph, "failing this procedure those who have lodged complaints", and your evidence earlier this morning was that you had no reason to doubt Monsignor Hart's truthfulness or otherwise in that correspondence?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. Can I clarify then some evidence given by you on T819.
A. Yes.

MS GERACE: This was the part of the transcript I was intending to take witness to earlier, but I couldn't find it.
Q. You were being asked, at page 819 of the transcript about that document, 250, and you were also being asked about the nature of consultation with you. Do you see the reference "After consultation with Bishop Michael Malone", in the second paragraph?
A. Yes.
Q. Then you were asked:
... and those who have lodged complaints intend to consider instituting criminal charges. Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. You answered, "Yes, I can."

MR HARBEN: Does the witness have the document?
MS GERACE: Yes, he has the document
Q. And:
Q. And compensation charges?
A. Yes.

Then the question was put to you:

> Q. That suggests, doesn't it, that those who have lodged complaints are considering going to the police?

Your answer on that occasion was:
A. It could be seen to be that, but I did mention that, you know, both Monsignor Hart and myself were given to a little bit of hyperbole in our respective letters.

Do you now withdraw the suggestion that the comment in that final paragraph about lodging complaints and criminal charges, to the extent it could be read that your answer was suggesting that, that that was hyperbole on Monsignor Hart's position, you no longer adhere to that view?

MR HARBEN: Commissioner, it is unfair in the extreme to put that one question, relating it to the whole of that paragraph because it all has to be read together, firstly, with the two questions and answers that follow on page 819 but more specifically the answer that was specifically referred to does two things: it says that the witness says "I did mention that", and that's obviously a mention to his previous evidence, so it has to be put in context, and that previous evidence is at 794.

The second thing it refers to is specifically "we were given to a little bit of hyperbole in our respective letters". It is the whole of that material. My learned friend can't just pick and choose.

MS GERACE: I didn't pick and choose. For the record, I read all of those questions out to the bishop and to suggest that I didn't is incorrect.

MR HARBEN: Did you read on page 819 the question that followed the words "hyperbole in our respective letters", did you?

MS GERACE: I haven't got to the point because you took the objection.

MR HARBEN: That's why I took the objection because you read the one question.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Harben.
Ms Gerace, would you kindly perhaps read the question and answer that you've already read followed by the question and answer after that to the witness.

MS GERACE: Can I be heard on that point? I understand the approach and I'm happy to take it, Commissioner. The point is, on a rereading of the evidence on this point about what was known about going to the police or otherwise, it has been less than clear by the bishop. There have been statements suggesting a position and then that they may have known, they may not have known. Then there was a direct answer to the suggestion that that correspondence suggested that those who lodged complaints were considering going to the police, and the answer given by the bishop was:

It could be seen to be that, but I did mention that, you know, both Monsignor Hart and myself were given to a little bit of hyperbole ...

THE COMMISSIONER: "In these letters".
MS GERACE: It was in this letter. He was asked specifically about that paragraph. My point was that, given the evidence given by the bishop this morning, I wanted to be clear that he is no longer suggesting that that final paragraph was an instance of that hyperbole. There's nothing unfair about that proposition.

MS LONERGAN: In my respectful submission, Commissioner, it would be fair to the witness to read the next two questions and answers because, at the time he gave that particular answer, I did delve into what was meant by the "hyperbole" comment and asked for some context two questions down and got a certain answer. It may make no difference ultimately to what this witness gives by way of reply but the next two questions and answers ought to be read.

MS GERACE: I'11 take that course.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MS GERACE: Q. Following on from that question:

> Q. Is that statement in that letter inaccurate, in that those who had lodged complaints were not considering, as far as was known to you and in your discussions with Monsignor Hart, that they were not considering instituting criminal charges? A. As far as I remember they were not wanting to go to the police, yes. Q. So Monsignor Hart's letter where it states that they were considering instituting criminal charges is not true? A. That's probably a bit strong. It might have been just to scare.

That's the fullness of the answer that you gave. Putting the question that I was asking, given the evidence you've given this morning about having no reason to doubt Monsignor Hart's truthfulness - the accuracy of Monsignor Hart's statements in that correspondence --
A. Yes.
Q. -- can we be clear in understanding that you do not wish the Commission to understand that the statement in that final paragraph, "failing this procedure those who have lodged complaints intend to consider instituting criminal charges and compensation charges against the Church" was, in your opinion, hyperbole by Monsignor Hart?

MR GYLES: I object. It is the same objection I took earlier. This witness cannot give evidence of what the person who wrote the letter believed or knew and the evidence is inadmissible. This witness's belief about the truth or otherwise is another matter, but he cannot give evidence in an indirect way of what Monsignor Hart's position was.

MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, there probably need to be a preliminary question in terms of conversations that this witness has already deposed to between himself and Monsignor Hart about the letters. That may deal with the objection of Mr Gyles.

MR GYLES: This was dealt with. The questions were asked and this topic has been dealt with.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Ms Gerace, you'll still entitled
to know whether the bishop thinks that, from what he knows, that would be overstating it slightly.

MS GERACE: That's all I'm asking.
Q. Bishop Malone, it's been difficult --
A. May I answer that?
Q. Yes, you may.
A. As I mentioned this morning, I would not accuse Monsignor Hart of hyperbole, so my earlier reference to "hyperbole", if it involved both letters, would be inaccurate insofar as I certainly used a bit of hyperbole in my letter, but I can't say that of Monsignor Hart.

MS LONERGAN: For the record, perhaps it could be clarified which letter exactly it is the witness has been directed to.

THE COMMISSIONER: That's exhibit 73, the letter of 20 June 1995 from Monsignor Hart to a priest in the Philippines, Father Castillo.

MS GERACE: Q. Could I ask you briefly about [AJ]. Do you want to have a look at the pseudonym list just so you know what I'm speaking about?
A. Yes, I have it, yes.
Q. Bishop, can I ask you before we go to [AJ] - now that you've had a look at that - in the diocese, there was a finance committee; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Was there an annual dinner of the finance committee?
A. We did in those earlier days, yes.
Q. Do you recall attending a finance committee meeting at the Newcastle Club?
A. Vaguely, yes.
Q. Can I ask - and you can tell me whether you recall or otherwise the year - did you attend a finance committee dinner 2003 at the Newcastle Club?
A. I have no idea about the date but, yes, possibly.
Q. It is a long time ago.
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall that, on one of those dinners, you met [AJ]?
A. I can't recollect that I did, but if I was there and [AJ] was there, then I'm sure I would have.
Q. You knew of [AJ] separately, the existence of [AJ], by virtue of her relationship to [BS]?
A. Correct, yes.
Q. Can I put to you that, on a dinner in 2003, and I understand you don't recall that date, but in 2003, at a dinner at the Newcastle Club, you said to [AJ] something like, "I understand you're a victim of McAlinden"?
A. I can't remember saying that, but then again my memory of the evening is hazy as well.
Q. Is it possible that this conversation occurred?
A. It's possible. I mean, it sounds like a very insensitive thing to say and it doesn't sound like me, but I wouldn't want to muddy the waters with something that [AJ] may have said.

MS GERACE: Could I speak to my learned friend?
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
(Ms Lonergan and Ms Gerace confer)
MS GERACE: Commissioner, those are the questions.

## <EXAMINATION BY MR BARAN:

MR BARAN: Q. I will try and be mercifully brief, bishop. A. Thank you.
Q. Can I ask you a few questions about the Professional Standards Office whom I represent.
A. Yes .
Q. From at least your time as the bishop in the diocese, your experience with Professional Standards involved ongoing liaison and advice regarding complaints of misconduct by members of the clergy?
A. It did.
Q. More often than not, that would involve issues
touching upon sexual assault, child sexual abuse, that kind of thing.
A. Correct, yes.
Q. Those particular issues sometimes involved police and sometimes they did not?
A. Insofar as I used the good graces of the Professional Standards Office to convey information to the police.
Q. Mr Davoren was the person who you were dealing with from time to time at Professional Standards at least in 1997 onwards?
A. Correct, yes.
Q. In terms of Professional Standards and their role so far as the retainer or employment of priests was concerned, did Professional Standards have any role to play in that? A. In the employment of priests?
Q. Yes.
A. Not really, no.
Q. When it came to issues about industrial relations or internal matters that purely had something to do with the priest and whether or not he was carrying out his functions as a priest, that was something for you, I take it, or the vicar general?
A. It was certainly something for me, yes. But just for the record, for those purposes, a priest is not regarded as an employee.
Q. I was trying to find the correct word and I failed miserably.
A. But for the purposes of the Ombudsman's Act and for taxation returns, the priest is regarded as an employee. That's the anomaly of the whole thing.
Q. Again, those issues, such as matters to do with whether or not a priest was to received a certain term or condition in his or her engagement or whether or not certain actions should be taken against the priest arising out of employment, are not matters, so far as you were concerned, that would involve the influence or the advice of the Professional Standards Office; is that right?
A. That's correct, yes. I would have sought their advice if I felt the need, but otherwise it was handled internally.
Q. Can we then go, if we may, to exhibit 104 , which is volume 5, and that's tab 384.
A. Can you bear with me while I find it?
Q. Certainly. It is the second page of that document.

This is the pastoral message?
A. Yes, I have it, yes.
Q. This is the pastoral message dated 16 May 2003 ?
A. Yes.
Q. This followed upon the charging of Fletcher by police?
A. Right, yes.
Q. You set out there in the pastoral message what appears to be a series of facts that occurred, namely, that Fletcher was accused of certain matters, that the police charged him on 14 May 2003, and then you go on to say that he has been withdrawn from active ministry?
A. Yes.
Q. Just so I understand it, what does that mean in real terms when you said that "the Father was withdrawn from active ministry"?
A. That means he's unable to exercise any priestly duties at all.
Q. And what was the difference between the withdrawal from active ministry as opposed to standing down?
A. The same thing.
Q. The same thing?
A. Yes.
Q. Then if you go down the page, you address in the bullet points there a series of issues touching upon the victims, their families and also on Fletcher and how he was maintaining his position of innocence?
A. Yes, correct.
Q. In the second-last paragraph on that page, you say that you had sought advice from the New South Wales Professional Standards Office Towards Healing process and others?
A. Yes.
Q. When you said that, were you suggesting that you had sought advice from the PSO itself or that you had actually consulted the protocol, the then Towards Healing protocol? What were you saying?
A. No. I was referring there to the fact that

I contacted John Davoren by phone.
Q. In addition to the conversation that you say you had with Mr Davoren you were also, I take it, discussing this matter with the vicar general?
A. I was, yes.
Q. And you were also discussing this matter - that is, Fletcher - with the police?
A. Say again?
Q. Were you discussing the issue of standing down Fletcher with the police?
A. No. No.
Q. But the vicar general, as best as you understood it, was speaking to you on a regular basis regarding Fletcher and what to do with him in terms of the issue of his being stood down or not?
A. Yes. He was my closest confidant and we spoke about that regularly, yes.
Q. In your statement, which is exhibit 85 , at page 5 , this is the longer statement that you made in July of 2013? A. Yes, I see.
Q. Could I take you to page 5, bishop. You go on there at paragraph $6.2(\mathrm{v})$ to talk about a conversation that you say you had with Mr Davoren regarding Father Fletcher and him being stood down?
A. Yes.
Q. I don't want to be unfair to you, but was there any record made of this particular conversation, either a file note or a memo?
A. I'm afraid not.
Q. Is it possible that this particular conversation that you referred to in 6.2(v) was a conversation that you had with the vicar general, not with Mr Davoren?
A. My memory is that I spoke with John Davoren and this is the gist of the conversation.
Q. The reason why I ask that is it just appears to be that - correct me if I am wrong - historically speaking, the PSO would not get itself involved in issues of whether or not a priest would be stood down or not. They were more involved in the complaints process and Towards Healing. I'm just wondering whether or not, when you attribute this particular conversation to Mr Davoren, you may be mistaken?
A. I have a memory that $I$ rang him, and it's reflected in my statement, as you're referring to, because I felt that I just needed the advice of an outside independent kind of person.
Q. Again, it is a long time ago and I don't want to be unfair to you --
A. Thank you.
Q. -- but is it possible that the conversation you
attribute to Mr Davoren may have been a conversation that you had with the vicar general?
A. That's not my memory.
Q. Was there any follow-up correspondence between you and

Mr Davoren after this particular conversation occurred in - -
A. No, not to my knowledge there wasn't.
Q. Do I take it that, based on what is contained in the pastoral message; that is, the withdrawal from active ministry and the standing down, as it is referred to, in the statement - I think you said they are pretty much the same thing?
A. Pretty well, yes.
Q. But either way, in your pastoral statement you've said:

In accord with normal procedures,
Father Fletcher has been withdrawn from
active ministry.
One way or another he was in fact stood down?
A. Yes, correct.

MR BARAN: Thank you.

## <EXAMINATION BY MR POTTER:

MR POTTER: Q. Bishop Malone, I also would like to ask you some questions about those events in June 2002 as they related to Father Fletcher.
A. Right.
Q. You've given evidence both in your longer statement that my friend has referred to and orally to this inquiry about those events?
A. Right.
Q. You also in 2003 gave accounts of those events to two other sources, I suggest to you, the first being a statement that you gave to the NSW Police in May 2003?
A. I made a statement to the police, yes.
Q. Secondly, you were interviewed by the New South Wales Ombudsman in September 2003?
A. I thought it was probably more likely - yes, that probably would be about right.
Q. I suggest it was 2 September 2003?
A. Was it? Okay.
Q. Can I take you first to the statement that you gave to the police which was in May 2003?
A. Yes.
Q. There is a copy of that statement, I don't know if it has been admitted into evidence, but it is at tab 390. It is exhibit 87. Would you like to have a look at a copy of the statement so can I ask you some questions about it?
A. 390, yes.
Q. This statement being made in May 2003 was, you would agree, much closer to the events in mid-2002 than now?
A. Certainly, yes.
Q. What I'm asking you to accept - and you can read the statement to see if this is it true - is that nowhere in that statement do you refer to any conversation with William Callinan, the school principal, in June 2002 regarding Father Fletcher. Would you like to check that?
A. Yes, I think you're right, yes.
Q. There's no reference in there to any visit to

Mr Callinan at the school in Branxton on 20 June 2002, is there?
A. No. I don't think so, no.
Q. There's no evidence in that statement of any directive that you gave to Mr Callinan to the effect that
Father Fletcher should say away from the school, is there?
A. Not in this statement, no.
Q. And no reference in that statement to any direction that you gave to Father Fletcher independently that he should stay away from the school, is there?
A. No, there's not.
Q. May I now ask you some questions about your interview with the Ombudsman that's in September 2003?
A. Right.
Q. You told the Ombudsman that, in June 2002, you had told Father Fletcher to stay away from the school. Do you recall that?
A. Well, yes, I - I do, I recall something along those lines, yes.
Q. You also told the Ombudsman that you had not told Mr Callinan that information. Do you recall that?
A. No, I don't recall that.
Q. You never mentioned to the Ombudsman that you had told Mr Callinan not to allow Father Fletcher to come near the school?
A. I don't remember that being discussed, no.
Q. Are you saying affirmatively that you recall it wasn't discussed or you don't remember one way or the other?
A. I don't remember, yes.
Q. On Thursday counsel assisting the inquiry asked you some questions about the evidence you've given of your conversation with Mr Callinan in your statement to this inquiry?
A. Right, yes.
Q. To assist you, would you like to look at your statement to the inquiry. It is what is referred to as the long statement, the 8 July 2003 statement.
A. Right.
Q. It is in paragraph 6.2(vii).
A. On page 6 .
Q. That's right. You there give some evidence about a conversation you say you had with Mr Callinan on 20 June 2002?
A. I do.
Q. It was suggested to you by counsel assisting the inquiry that your evidence there about that conversation was inconsistent with your decision not to stand Father Fletcher down in 2002?
A. I don't know about inconsistent with it. It was - it was going hand in glove with it, really.
Q. What I'm suggesting to you is that you accepted on Thursday that there was a fundamental inconsistency in your position in, on the one hand, not standing Father Fletcher down but, on the other hand, telling Mr Callinan that Father Fletcher shouldn't be allowed near the school. Do you recall giving that evidence?
A. I recall the subject being spoken about, yes.
Q. Do you accept still that it is fundamentally inconsistent to say, on the one hand, that he should not be stood down, as you say you did, and, on the other, to give the direction to the school principal, as you say you did, that he should not come near the school?
A. When I spoke to Mr Callinan, I had spoken to him about the fact that the police had asked that Fletcher be stood aside and I was still ambivalent about whether that would or wouldn't happen and I - because of the allegations against Fletcher, it seemed evident that Fletcher should not - or should discontinue his association with the school.
Q. What I'm suggesting to you is that, for consistency, that direction should have been given to Father Fletcher? A. It was, yes.
Q. Another inconsistency in your approach, I suggest, was that, on the one hand, if you're telling Mr Callinan that Father Fletcher should not be near the school, on the other hand, you appointed Father Fletcher, the priest of the parish of Lochinvar?
A. Correct, yes.
Q. You accepted on Thursday, I suggest to you, that it was inconsistent of you not to have given to Mr Callinan's counterpart at Lochinvar the same warning that you'd given to Mr Callinan?
A. I agree with that, yes.
Q. In light of those inconsistencies between the evidence which you gave closer to the time and your current evidence, and also what I've suggested to you are internal inconsistencies in your evidence, what $I$ want to suggest to you is that you did not meet with Mr Callinan in June 2002 as you have suggested you did?
A. I'm sorry, but I have the memory that I did meet with him.
Q. I want to suggest to you that Mr Callinan was not at Branxton on that day, that at the time he was principal of two different schools. Do you know whether that was or was not the case, that he was the principal two of different schools?
A. Yes, he was, yes.
Q. One of those schools was St Brigid's primary school in Branxton; is that right?
A. Correct, yes.
Q. The other school was St Greta's infant's school sorry --
A. It was at Greta, yes.
Q. -- St Mary's infants school at Greta?
A. That's right.
Q. Mr Callinan on that day, which is Thursday, 20 June 2002, was not at the school in Branxton but was in fact at the school in Greta?
A. My memory is that I met with Mr Callinan in the latter part of the school afternoon and I can remember vividly that the parents were gathering at the gates of the school to collect their children, so that's a clear memory for me.
Q. Your memory is that that was at Branxton?

A that was definitely at Branxton, yes.
Q. What I want to further suggest is that you didn't communicate with Mr Callinan about Father Fletcher at all
in June 2002?
A. I did.
Q. And that certainly you did not tell Mr Callinan in June 2002 that Father Fletcher should stay away from schools?
A. I did tell him that.
Q. Your evidence that you've given about what happened on 20 June 2002 is based, is it not, on your diary entry from that date?
A. Yes, that helps, yes. That's where I've got the dates from.
Q. May I show you the diary.
A. (Handed to witness).

MR POTTER: To assist those at the Bar table, a copy of the relevant pages, on my note, is tab 348.
Q. Would you go 20 June?
A. Yes, I have it here.
Q. You had a copy of that diary in May 2003 when you gave your statement to the NSW Police?
A. This one? Yes, I would have, but I didn't have it with me, I don't think.
Q. You didn't have it with you, but you had access to it?
A. Oh, yes. No, it was certainly in the office, yes.
Q. You also had access to it when you were interviewed by the New South Wales Ombudsman on 2 September 2003, didn't you?
A. Yes, I, in fact, showed them a copy.
Q. What I'm going to suggest is that, on 2 September 2003, when you were being interviewed, you were asked whether there was any record of your conversation with Mr Callinan?
A. Yes.
Q. And you said to the Ombudsman there might be something in your diary?
A. Right.
Q. And that the following day, 3 September 2003, you
faxed a copy of the relevant page of your diary to the Ombudsman?
A. Correct, yes.
Q. On the relevant page it says, does it not:

Trip to Branxton to see Jim Fletcher.
Do you see those words?
A. Yes.
Q. Then after that, in brackets, are the words "+ Will C".
A. Yes, I see.
Q. Would you agree with me that the words in brackets are in a different pen?
A. I'm not a calligrapher, but, no, I can't really see that, but --
Q. Would you agree with me that those words have been added to the end of the line?
A. I have no idea. That's my writing certain1y, yes.

But, no, I don't know whether I used a different pen or what or whether it was added later. I don't - I can't say that. To me it all looks the same.
Q. It wasn't your practice, when writing your diary or otherwise making file notes, to abbreviate people's surnames, was it?
A. It depends on the - if I was making a file note, I would use their names. In a matter like this, it was simply a matter of jotting down something that happened.
Q. What I'm suggesting to you is that you jotted down something after the event so that those words in brackets "+ Will C" were added after 20 June; do you agree with that?
A. I sort of made this little note when I got back to the office on 20 June.
Q. I'm suggesting it was made later than that, in fact, in September when you were asked about these events by the Ombudsman; would you agree with that?
A. No, I would not agree with that, no.

MR POTTER: Does that need to be tendered?

MS LONERGAN: I tender the original of the 2002 diary of the bishop.

THE COMMISSIONER: Just those pages, Mr Potter and Ms Lonergan?

MR POTTER: Just that page.
MS LONERGAN: Yes, Commissioner, but I wouldn't suggest we tear the page out. I'll tender the whole diary.

THE COMMISSIONER: I'm not going to do that. The page of Bishop Malone's diary which includes 20 June 2002 will be admitted and marked exhibit 106.

EXHIBIT \#106 DIARY OF BISHOP MALONE - ENTRY FOR 20/06/2002
MR POTTER: Q. May I take you forward in time, bishop, to March 2003?
A. Right.
Q. On 19 March 2003, you had a conversation on the telephone with Mr Callinan. That conversation is referred to in your longer statement at paragraph 6.2(ix), if you would like to look at it?
A. May I look at it?
Q. Yes.
A. I see it. Number (ix).
Q. It is very briefly referred to there?
A. It is.
Q. I would ask you to expand on that conversation. What I'm suggesting is that there were four things said during that conversation by you to Mr Callinan. Firstly, you told Mr Callinan that Father Fletcher was being stood down because criminal charges again him were imminent. Do you recall that?
A. No, I don't.
Q. Are you saying that you have a memory of that conversation and you did not say that to him or that you cannot recall whether you said that or not?
A. Well, I'm saying that, on 20 June 2002, I spoke to Mr Callinan.
Q. Yes?
A. Yes. He seems to dispute that.
Q. He does, yes.
A. Yes.
Q. But I'm now asking you about 19 March 2003.
A. Right, the following year.
Q. Yes. I'm saying that, on that day, you had a conversation on the phone with Mr Callinan?
A. This is to say that Jim - that Fletcher was being stood aside.
Q. I'm suggesting that was one of the things you told Mr Callinan on the phone on 19 March 2003?
A. Fine, yes.
Q. Do you have any recollection of saying that to him on the phone?
A. It was in March, was it not, that Fletcher was stood aside?
Q. I'm asking you about what you remember saying to Mr Callinan on the phone?
A. I would have said that, yes.
Q. You would have said that?
A. Yes.
Q. The second thing that you said to Mr Callinan on the phone on 19 March 2003, I suggest, is you told him that the New South Wales Ombudsman's office was conducting an inquiry into the handling of Father Fletcher in 2002?
A. Right.
Q. Do you remember telling Mr Callinan about that?
A. Possibly, yes. If I'd known that, I would have, I'm sure.
Q. And that you further said to him that the Ombudsman was not happy with how things had been handled in 2002.
A. Mmm.
Q. Do you recall telling Mr Callinan that?
A. Not exactly, but, yes, it is all part of the same
conversation.
Q. Was it true that, in March 2003, you were aware that the Ombudsman was not happy with how matters relating to Father Fletcher had been handled in 2002?
A. Yes, for sure, yes, I was.
Q. Was it also true that, at that time, there was some criticism in the media of your role in dealing with Father Fletcher in 2002?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Is it right that, in March 2003, at the time of the telephone call, you were worried that you were going to come in for criticism over your decision to let Father Fletcher remain as a priest in 2002?
A. I knew before that that I would be criticised for that, yes.
Q. But at the time of this phone conversation I'm talking to you about, you were aware that there was a good chance that you were going to be criticised for your decision; is that right?
A. For leaving him in place?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes, that had already happened. The parish was quite divided through all that period.
Q. That was the second thing. The third thing you told Mr Callinan in that phone call was you instructed him to tell people that Father Fletcher was sick, to explain why you had now decided to stand him down and he was not going to be around?
A. I wouldn't have been that euphemistic to use Father Fletcher's sickness as a reason for him not being around. I mean, he was either charged or about to be charged by the police.
Q. You say you wouldn't have been. What I'm suggesting is that you did tell Mr Callinan, you directed him to tell people that Father Fletcher was not well or that he was sick?
A. To use that as an excuse?
Q. Yes.
A. No, I wouldn't have done that.
Q. The fourth thing is that, in that conversation in March 2003, you told Mr Callinan that - you said to him that you and he had discussed Father Fletcher in June 2002?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall saying that to him?
A. I would have, yes.
Q. You said to Mr Callinan on the phone in March 2003 that when you had had the discussion in June 2002, you had discussed Father Fletcher continuing in his role as a parish priest and within the school?
A. No. It was on the morning of 20 June 2002 that Detective Chief Inspector Fox had come to see me to inform me that Fletcher was being charged, I think, and he advised me to stand Fletcher aside. He was quite strong in that. He said, of course, he couldn't force me to, but he strongly recommended it. So, on strength of that, I was beginning to make plans to stand Fletcher aside which were later negated, but we discussed all that last week. So, in speaking with Mr Callinan, I would have said that I'd been asked to stand Fletcher aside "but I'm not sure that I will at this point"; so that was still up in the air.
Q. What I'm suggesting to you is that, in the March 2003 conversation, you referred Mr Callinan back to what you said was the earlier conversation in June 2002 and that you said to Mr Callinan words to the effect of, "You and I discussed whether Father Fletcher should stay in the school in that earlier conversation"?
A. No, I don't know that that happened. It was simply a matter of letting Mr Callinan know the situation and my advice to him then was to be careful about allowing Fletcher to have access to the school.
Q. What I'm asking is whether, in your March 2003, telephone conversation you made any reference to Mr Callinan to that earlier conversation you say you had with him?
A. Probably, yes.
Q. That reference was the first time, I suggest to you, that you had raised this issue with Mr Callinan?
A. No, I disagree.
Q. And your reference to it in that phone conversation in

March 2003 was in order to try and spread responsibility for your decision to let Father Fletcher remain in the schools and in his role as parish priest?
A. Not at all. It was my call to stand or not stand aside Fletcher. It wasn't Mr Callinan's call.
Q. In March 2003, as the bishop, you were in a position of some power over a school principal within the Catholic school system, were you not?
A. "Power" is not a word I would like to use - some authority. The primary authority came from the Catholic Schools Office and the directorate of the Catholic Schools Office. I mean I had some authority over them, of course, as well but I'm not one who necessarily uses that authority.
Q. Is it correct to say that you ultimately controlled the finances of the two schools, being St Brigid's and St Mary's, in which Mr Callinan was the principal?
A. Through the Catholic Schools Office, yes.
Q. Would it be right to say that you as bishop would, if you chose to exercise it, have the power to see that Mr Callinan lost his job?
A. Oh, that's a bit tough. I suppose ultimately I had that authority, but I'm not the sort of person who uses authority like that.
Q. I'm not suggesting that you would, but I'm talking about the structure of the system.
A. I suppose, yes.
Q. That structure, I suggest to you, made you confident in March 2003, when you said to Mr Callinan, "You and I discussed this last year", that he wouldn't question you about that?
A. No, not really, no. I mean you're suggesting that I've intimidated Mr Callinan and certainly I would never have done that.
Q. I just want to ask you one further event, which has already been touched on, which is the issue of the pastoral message on 16 May 2003?
A. Right.
Q. I think it is part of exhibit 104 and it can be found in volume 5, tab 384 at page 2. Would you like to look
that up?
A. Volume 5, yes, 384. Right.
Q. Can I take you on the first page of the message to the paragraph which is third from the bottom. You've already been taken to the first sentence of that paragraph, which is about the New South Wales Professional Standards Office?
A. Yes.
Q. I want to take you to the sentence that says:

I also consulted the Director of Catholic Schools and the local School Principal at the time and informed them of the situation.
A. Yes.
Q. The "local school principal" to whom you're referring in the pastoral message dated 16 May 2003 was Mr Callinan, wasn't it?
A. It was, yes.
Q. The "Director of Catholic Schools" was Mr Michael Bowman; is that correct?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. I'11 suggest to you now, when you say in the pastoral message that you had consulted the local school principal, that was not correct; you had not in fact consulted him at the time?
A. Maybe "informed" might have been a better word.

I mean, my relationship with Mr Callinan was open and frank. I deal with people, you know, in a way that allows them to disagree with me or whatever. Had I suggested to Mr Callinan that Fletcher be stood aside at that point, he would have had an opportunity to say, "I don't think that's necessary" or, "Yes, I think it should happen".
Q. But your evidence earlier when I was asking you questions was that the decision was yours?
A. It was.
Q. It was not taken in consultation with Mr Callinan you informed him?
A. Yes, "informed" would be a better word.
Q. As regards Mr Bowman, the most that you had said to him at the time - and "at the time" I mean June 2002 - was that there had been a sexual abuse allegation against a priest?
A. Yes, I certainly said that.
Q. You didn't say to Mr Bowman the name of the priest, did you?
A. I don't recollect that I did. I have no idea.
Q. You didn't tell Mr Bowman the nature of the allegations against the priest?
A. Well, sexual abuse.
Q. You said you did detail the nature of the allegation?
A. I think so, yes.
Q. You didn't tell Mr Bowman that the allegations involved a child, did you?
A. Sorry, involved a child?
Q. A child.
A. No, I don't know that I said that.
Q. And you certainly didn't seek any advice from

Mr Bowman about what you should do as regards
Father Fletcher, did you?
A. I don't know that I did. Perhaps "inform" might be a better word there too.
Q. So the statement in the pastoral message about your consultation with the director of Catholic Schools and the local school principal, that, if can I adopt one your words, is in the nature of hyperbole, really, isn't it? A. Only in the word "consulted" should be changed to "informed".
Q. I'm suggesting that there was in fact no consultation or even information of Mr Callinan at the time?
A. It was certainly information, yes.

MR POTTER: Would you excuse me for one moment, Commissioner.
Q. I have one further question or one matter to ask you about. In the next paragraph down, you say:

> Based on the advice I received and an assessment of the potential risk... I decided to leave Father Fletcher in place...
A. Yes.
Q. You're not suggesting there or now that you received advice from Mr Callinan to that effect, are you?
A. No, I'm not suggesting that, no. It was my decision.

MR POTTER: That's all, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Potter. I will adjourn until 10 past 2.

LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT

## UPON RESUMPTION:

## <EXAMINATION BY MR COHEN:

Q. Bishop, before the adjournment you gave some evidence. I expect it is probably most fresh in your mind so I would like to go to that first, if I may. Forgive me I don't have the transcript, but my note of the evidence was that Father McAlinden had been removed from faculty and he was, in effect, confined to barracks. Is that the gist of what you had to say?
A. I don't know about the "confined to barracks" bit.
Q. We11, the presbytery perhaps?
A. No, he had his faculties removed from him and, as far as I know, he was living privately wherever he was living.
Q. But if it is the case that that's the apparent position, if a priest in that situation doesn't cooperate, no-one comes along from the diocese and grabs him by the cuff and says, "Back to where you should be", do they? A. No, we don't - we don't have that --

MR GYLES: I object. My concern is the status of Mr Cohen in respect of asking these questions. I can understand there were some matters concerning Detective Chief Inspector Fox and Bishop Malone primarily concerning the visit to the Branxton presbytery, to the extent there are issues about that, but I would raise my concern about some wider right to cross-examine on issues that you will need to deal with, Commissioner, about which Detective Chief Inspector Fox has, at length, given evidence and put in public submissions about. That wouldn't entitle his counsel to, in another forum in effect, advocate those views.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Gyles. Mr Cohen, is this line of questioning concerning your client?

MR COHEN: It is again the difficulty with matters that touch or concern such a matter. You will understand of course, Commissioner, that Detective Chief Inspector Fox had quite a significant interchange with Bishop Malone about the issues in relation to Father Fletcher.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

MR COHEN: But it is also the case that this relevant inquiry is about the conduct of Father McAlinden and it is my submission that such a question, albeit apparently not regarded by my learned friend Mr Gyles to be innocuous, nonetheless, is a question that goes to this general proposition of the conduct of McAlinden and Fletcher in and about their position in the diocese. I was simply inviting the bishop to comment in that respect; that is to say, the ostensible does not necessarily become the real. That's point of the question. It seems to me that that must be of assistance to you, Commissioner, but I can't take it any further than that.

As to the limits upon which I can cross-examine or not, those can't be a bright line, as would seem to be implicit in what was motivating my friend to object.

THE COMMISSIONER: Doubtless, I would anticipate that the witness will say something to the effect that it happened so rarely or in his experience that he wouldn't really know what happens. Anyway, I will permit you to see whether that's the response.

MR COHEN: Q. Bishop, you almost gave an answer before the objection, I think; is that right?
A. I started to say something, but I forget the question and answer.
Q. The question is this one: having regard to your evidence about what was the ostensible position with respect to Father McAlinden, it was the fact, was it not, that if he, as he chose to do, declined to observe the spirit as well as the law of what had transpired with respect to him --
A. Yes.
Q. -- nobody came along and felt his collar and said, "Back to where you should be", did they, from the diocese?
A. Not in terms of location, no. It was --
Q. On any basis?
A. An exchange of letters was happening.
Q. That exchange of letters didn't have much in the way of teeth, did it?
A. Not a huge amount.
Q. No teeth; it was completely toothless, wasn't it?

MR GYLES: I object. I object to this line of
questioning. We know when the diocese became aware of the conduct of McAlinden in the Philippines, they did take steps and they received assurances that he would not be continuing to do what he was doing. It is entirely improper and wrong to put a question on the assumption that nothing was done.

MR COHEN: I didn't put it on that basis.
MR HARBEN: Can I join the objection. My learned friend Mr Cohen is now seeking to become a general interrogator. When I cross-examined his client, I confined that cross-examination to two discrete areas, and it could only be those areas that raise conflict in the evidence, if you like, that he would be, in my submission, entitled to address.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Cohen, whether or not it is toothless, we know the efforts that were being made and we know the bishop's level of confidence at the time that those efforts were being made. Do you have another area to ask the bishop about?

MR COHEN: I certain1y do.
Q. In the lead-up to the discussion you had, bishop, with Detective Chief Inspector Fox on 20 June 2002, there were a number of events that occurred that informed your understanding by 20 June 2002 about the affairs and conduct of Father Fletcher. That's so, isn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. One of those elements was the material concerning [AH]; that's correct to say, isn't it?
A. Hang on a second - yes.
Q. Initially, that material that you were provided in respect of the circumstances of [AH] came from [BI]; that's so?
A. Correct, yes.
Q. My purpose is to set the scene for the discussion with DCI Fox in June of that year, but the highest that was accorded to this information about [AH]'s allegations was
scepticism, wasn't it, prior to 20 June 2002?
A. Yes, yes, it was.
Q. Having regard to your evidence of last Friday, and I'm sorry I can't take you directly to the transcript, the gist of it was that there was inertia from some parts of the diocese against moving against some of these allegations; that's so, isn't it?
A. Can I ask you to explain that?

MR GYLES: I found it very hard to hear that question.
MR COHEN: I thought I was speaking straight into the microphone. I beg your pardon.
Q. Allow me to repeat it, Bishop Malone.
A. Thank you..
Q. The situation was that, in the lead-up to this discussion with DCI Fox, the circumstance, having regard to your evidence of last Friday about, "I understand, I think it is a fair label to put on it, the inertia of some people in the diocese", there was not a cultural inclination towards reporting and dealing directly with such matters, was there?

MR GYLES: I object. That is not a fair representation of the evidence on Friday. That wasn't put as in the period leading up to the bishop's trip to Branxton. It is very unspecific, in any event.

THE COMMISSIONER: Who is the inertia from, Mr Cohen? On whose part is there inertia?

MR COHEN: Q. You indicated last Friday, did you not I'm using the phrase "inertia" to illustrate a concept. You put it last Friday, in evidence you gave in response to questions from Ms Lonergan of senior counsel, did you not, that you experienced if not inertia - my term - a certain resistance from people in the diocese towards the quick and direct and clear revealing of such abuse publicly; is that right?
A. Yes, a moment ago the word we used was "scepticism" around the allegations against Fletcher and I'd stand by that. There was scepticism. If that's what you mean by "inertia", then I would say yes.
Q. Again, leading up to this point in 2002, in June of 2002 when you were confronting what was being put to you by DCI Fox, there was, indeed, a cultural disinclination within the diocese to confront such matters, was there not?

MR BARAN: I object to that if it is going to extend to the Professional Standards Office. That's, technically speaking, part of this entire process and part of the institution even though it is an independent office. If it is going to extent to my client it should be far more specific.

THE COMMISSIONER: You're saying, Mr Baran, that your client has a cultural disposition to that very area?

MR BARAN: That's right.
THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Cohen, are you prepared to exempt Mr Baran's client from that?

MR COHEN: Perhaps pro tem, Commissioner. For the purpose of the question, I thought I had. I said "within the diocese" and I'm not sure I understood that the PSO was an integrated part of the diocese, but if that's so, I stand corrected.

MS LONERGAN: I apprehended the question said, "in this diocese" at the end, in which case my understanding is that the PSO could not be included in the question.

MR COHEN: That's indeed what I thought.
THE COMMISSIONER: You're probably right, Mr Cohen, but Mr Gyles might object.

MR GYLES: I object to the question. My objection to the question is: is my learned friend talking about the period after the allegation was reported to him and he travelled to Branxton or --

MR COHEN: Q. I'm sorry. To make it clear, I thought I had prefaced the question "in the lead-up to the conversation wherein you had to confront what was put to you by Detective Chief Inspector Fox". I'm sorry if I didn't make it abundantly clear, but what I mean is up to and including the period of time that finished at 20 June 2002. I apprehend that addresses Mr Gyles concerns, but do
you have the question in the way $I$ intended it?
A. No, I --

MR GYLES: I do apologise. Is my learned friend talking about the period - does the question relate to the period between Bishop Malone being notified of the Fox allegation, in the way that we know that he was, and him having his meeting with Detective Chief Inspector Fox, or is it intending to lead to an earlier period?

THE COMMISSIONER: I believe it is up to the trip to Branxton. Is that right?

MR COHEN: Yes, that's so. Clearly it can only relate to the bishop's experiences as and from the time he became bishop, which means, I apprehend, November of 1995 and onwards, up to this point in 2002. That's a seven-year period. Maybe allow me to put this question, Commissioner.
Q. Bishop, in the period from when you commenced your episcopy and the time of having this meeting with Detective Chief Inspector Fox in June of 2002, there was enough time for you to come to an understanding of what the cultural facets of the diocese were, what made it tick, so to speak; is that a fair question?
A. To some degree, I suppose, yes.
Q. Against that background knowledge that you had, over that seven years up to this point in time in June 2002, it is fair to say, is it not, that there was then within the diocese at this time - that is, when you were speaking to DCI Fox - a cultural disinclination to reveal such matters or report them to the police; that's so, isn't it?

MR GYLES: I object. My learned friend's questions relate to the Fletcher investigation. You need to concern yourself, Commissioner, with whether, during the course of the Fletcher investigation, there was hindrance, assistance or otherwise with respect to the police investigations by church officials.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MR GYLES: The period before the Fletcher investigation commenced can be of no relevance on the matters that are relevant to this inquiry. They may be relevant to the Royal Commission. There is a line of demarcation.

THE COMMISSIONER: There is a bit of an overlap, Mr Gyles, with the McAlinden investigation which tends to take it back a bit before Fletcher. Indeed, it takes in all of that early period of the bishop's episcopy.

MR GYLES: I don't take issue with that. My concern is that the interests that Mr Cohen has cannot be related to that. His issue is in relation to the Fletcher matter. You would appreciate that we've spent a great deal of time dealing with the McAlinden issues. A number of people have asked questions about it. It has been well covered. Again, it is a matter for you, Commissioner.

MR COHEN: I believe my friend and I are at cross-purposes. I thought I had settled the ground for the purposes of finding out what, if any, cultural inclination or disinclination was. I understood from my question that I framed it so it was focused upon the time at June 2002; that is to say, having regard to what the bishop understood to be this concept, what its effect was at that time. That was my intention in the question. It certainly isn't intended to be a freestanding wide-ranging inquiry about McAlinden.

THE COMMISSIONER: I will permit you to ask the question, Mr Cohen, on the basis that any cultural inclination or disinclination that arose with regard to McAlinden might also have affected responses to the Fletcher investigation.

MR COHEN: Thank you, Commissioner. I certainly intended it to be understood by the bishop, in appreciating my question, that these were cultural issues that informed some of the judgments he made.
Q. That must be right, must it not, Bishop Malone, that the cultural issues that arose in the diocese presumably had some effect and helped you to form your views? You had regard to them, I take it.
A. I'm a bit unsure what you mean by "cultural issues".
Q. Let me be fair to you. Any organisation, you'd accept, I take it, has a culture about it?
A. Sure, it does.
Q. It's made up of people rather than institutions?
A. Yes.
Q. Those people conduct themselves in a certain way and have certain pattern of behaviour?
A. Yes.
Q. Those patterns of behaviour tend to be unique to the institution; is that a fair summary?
A. I would agree with that, yes.
Q. Having regard to that view, presumably you identified in your mind certainly cultural attributes or facets of the Maitland-Newcastle diocese once you became its bishop and once you got to know what made it tick from day to day; is that a fair comment?
A. Yes, I was coping - trying to cope with that, yes.
Q. Presumably, it was different in Maitland-Newcastle than, from, say, I believe your previous diocese where you were a parish priest, which was Broken Bay; is that correct?
A. Correct, that's right, yes.
Q. Should the Commissioner understand no two dioceses are ever alike?
A. That's true.
Q. They're like snowflakes; they have different interstitial patterns about them?
A. Different shapes, yes.
Q. My question was: in respect of Maitland-Newcastle, at this time in 2002, was the case that there was a tendency to circle the wagons with the guns pointed out? A. It's probably a little strong to say that. You know, I've testified before, last week particularly, that my response to matters of sexual abuse was a kind of a growing awareness - I think that was the phrase I used - and that a applied too with the Fletcher matter. This was an allegation against a priest that came out of left field, so we needed to cope with that as was appropriate at the time.
Q. Having set up that background information now, I propose, bishop, to take you to the particulars of the conversation you had with DCI Fox on 20 June 2002?
A. Yes.
Q. What I need to do is, I'm afraid, somewhat
laboriously, in a cumbersome way, and in a way that you've identified some of these procedures can be, is I need to put the conversation to you and I propose to do that now. At the threshold, it is a correct understanding of the events of that day, is it not, that DCI Fox attended upon you at the diocese offices?
A. Correct, yes.
Q. He was in the company of then Detective Senior Constable Joy?
A. He certainly had someone with him. I've forgotten her name, but, yes.
Q. You recall it was certainly a woman, don't you?
A. I do, I do.
Q. You were in the company of your vicar general, Father Saunders; is that correct?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. It was the four of you in the circumstances of this meeting, I take it, in your study or office?
A. That's correct.
Q. When you gathered, you four, it was DCI Fox who said in the first instance:

As you are aware $I$ am investigating sexual abuse allegations made by [AH] against Father Fletcher of Branxton.
A. Yes.
Q. Your response was:

Yes this is a very difficult situation. I have offered the church's support to both [AH]'s parents. You know [BI] works for us here at the diocese office?
A. Yes.
Q. That was said, wasn't it?
A. I think so, yes. It sounds accurate.
Q. DCI Fox responded to that proposition, "Yes"?
A. Yes.
Q. You went on to say:

That is how I learned of this matter. [BI] came to me when he became aware that [AH] had gone to the Police with his allegation. He felt that it was his duty to inform me of the matter. I understand it is a very difficult situation for him here whilst at the same time being the father of a young man who has made this allegation. I have offered him and his family the church's full support.

You said that, didn't you?
A. I think so, yes.
Q. DCI Fox responded:

Other than to say that $I$ am investigating sexual abuse allegations against Father Fletcher I am not able to disclose any specifics of the allegations.

That was the position he put to you, wasn't it? A. Yes, I think so, yes.

MR HARBEN: Could I just clarify - it may be obvious in the way the questions are being asked - as to whether the witness is being asked to identify the words read out to him as being the exact questions and the exact answers in that form or whether he is being asked whether he has a recollection of that fact. It is unclear. The witness is listening to the content of a long answer, for example, and giving some general reply. I think in fairness to everybody --

THE COMMISSIONER: That's a fair point, Mr Cohen.
MR COHEN: I'm not sure I can understand how there can be any misunderstanding. When I put the passage, I then say, "That was said, was it not, or words to the effect?" I'm not sure I understand see how that can be misconstrued.

THE COMMISSIONER: I think you must, in view of the evidence as to when these notes were made, add "words to that effect", Mr Cohen.

MR COHEN: I thought I had. I am so sorry, Commissioner.
MR HARBEN: I did not hear those words and if my learned friend said that, I have no reason to object. My point is whether it is being put to him that those were the exact words. If it is "words to that effect", then I don't object.

MR COHEN: I had understood that I had said that.
Q. So you're not misled, bishop, I'm putting to you a transcript of a conversation and I'm inviting you to accept or reject what I'm putting as accurate?
A. I'm in agreement with you so far, Mr Cohen.
Q. I'm delighted, bishop, thank you. Your response to the last proposition by DCI Fox, which was, "I can't disclose specifics", was, "Yes, I understand that. You must do your job of course." That was also said, was it not?
A. Yes, I would agree with that.
Q. And DCI Fox then went on to say:

Have you ever had concerns about
Father Fletcher prior to this incident?
Your response was:
No, not before [BI] approached me.
That was said, wasn't it?
A. I have issue with that. That's DCI Fox's recollection of that conversation. It wasn't mine. I say that because I made a statement then to DCI Fox the following year.
Q. In May of 2003?
A. Correct, yes - and the statement begins by naming some people who had in fact spoken to me about Fletcher prior to these events. For me to say no, that I had no knowledge would have been wrong. Therefore, I'm suggesting that DCI Fox asked me that question at the beginning of my making a statement at the police station the following year.
Q. Let me put this proposition to you - I'11 repeat what

Detective Chief Inspector Fox has recorded and then put a proposition to you.
A. Right.
Q. I put it to you that he said to you --.

MR HARBEN: Could I ask whether the witness could be shown this document. It is very difficult to be remembering a long question and long answer.

MR COHEN: It is exhibit 49, Commissioner.
MS LONERGAN: I agree with that, Commissioner.
MR COHEN: I'm not sure, Commissioner, whether that robs you of the opportunity to follow the text of this.

THE COMMISSIONER: No, I have it here, Mr Cohen.
MR COHEN: Q. Bishop, would it assist you to have an opportunity, because it is a lengthy document, to read it first and then me return to the questions?
A. I have seen this document.
Q. Yes, indeed, but what I'm asking you now is: would it assist you now, as you sit in the witness box, to have another opportunity to reread the document and then I'11 continue with the questions or should I press on?
A. No, no, I'm happy for you to go on, thank you.
Q. Very well. Do you see on page 1, at about not quite halfway down is the reference to yourself saying, "No, not before [BI] approached me"?
A. Yes, I see that.
Q. I understand that you debate the accuracy of that, I understand your evidence. Can I ask you in respect of that proposition, is it not the case that [BI] approached you, as I understand your evidence, in about January of 2001?
A. Oh, yes. No, that happened, certainly, yes.
Q. Having regard to that, "not before [BI] approached me" could indeed, and must on that evidence, refer to material that was provided to you some 17 months prior, must it not? A. Not necessarily, no. There was another person who came forward prior to [BI] speaking with me in 2001.
Q. A1so January 2001?
A. I don't know. It's in my police statement. I don't know that I'd put a date on it, but I think I put something in a file note in my file about that particular information that was given to me, which I followed up. I'm inclined to think, Mr Cohen, that this really does refer to my statement and the beginning of the statement rather than the conversation.
Q. I understand your position, thank you. I'11 press on. The next proposition I'm putting to you is that DCI Fox said to you:

I have learned through [BJ] that you met
with Father Fletcher to discuss this
allegation.
A. Yes.
Q. Do you accept that?
A. I do.
Q. And your response was:

Yes, I telephoned her after my meeting with
Father Fletcher to offer my sympathy and the church's assistance through any
difficult times ahead. She welcomed my offer of support and the church will be organising some counselling for her.

That was said in those terms, was it not?
A. I understand that was accurate.
Q. Detective Chief Inspector Fox went on to say:

I am pleased to hear that, however I am
more concerned about the actual meeting with Father Fletcher.

Your reply - and again I'm asking you to either except accept or reject it - I put to you, was this:

The church must be concerned for all parties involved. Father Jim was offered our support as well. He has not been a
well man. He suffered a stroke a number of years ago and I spoke to him about this and asked how he was going. I have put him in touch with some fellow priests for support through this time.
A. Yes.
Q. You said as much, didn't you?
A. Yes, I agree with that.
Q. Pausing there, can you enlighten the Commissioner as to who the fellow priests were?
A. Certainly I discussed all of this matter with my vicar general at the time, Father James Saunders.
Q. Who was there with you at the time?
A. He was, yes. Father Bill Burston was also available for some kind of advice through this and I think, for a period of time, around about this time, both Father Bill Burston and Father James Saunders were co-vicars-general together. The other was Father Des Harrigan, a personal friend to Fletcher.
Q. Am I right in understanding - if I just pause there apart from Father Harrigan - or perhaps including him but certainly as I understand, apart from Father Harrigan - all those other gentleman, all those other priests, were senior members of the diocese and advisers to you?
A. Yes.
Q. They would be in the old days consultors; is that right?
A. I didn't speak to them as consultors, but simply as my advisers who were close to hand.
Q. But at that level of seniority?
A. Oh, yes.
Q. Is that a way of understanding it?
A. Yes, for sure.
Q. If I may return to exhibit 49, Detective Chief Inspector Fox went on to say to you:

What did he say to you in regard to the allegation that he had sexually abused
[AH]?
Your response was:
Very little other than to deny the allegation. I don't know much of the allegation myself and we did not go into detail about it.
A. Yes.
Q. You said as much, didn't you?
A. I would say so, yes.
Q. Detective Chief Inspector Fox said to you:

Did you tell him that the matter had been reported to the police and there was an investigation?

And this now is over the page. Your response was:
Yes. This was on7y done because of our concern for his welfare.
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall?
A. I do.
Q. That was said, was it not?
A. I think so, yes.
Q. Detective Chief Inspector Fox went on to say to you:

That may be so, but you have by your actions alerted Father Fletcher to what is going on. The element of surprise is a legitimate investigative tool and your visit has effectively negated any advantage we had in that regard.

Your response, I put it to you, was:
I am sorry but that was not our intention.
Those word were said, weren't they?
A. I think so, yes.
Q. At this point - I'11 ask you to have regard to your recollection - the record is that - is it Monsignor Saunders or Father Saunders?
A. No, he was Father sunders.
Q. I should say this is because all of this conversation was in the immediate hearing, not just of yourself and Detective Chief Inspector Fox, but Father Saunders and Detective Senior Constable Joy; that's so, isn't it?
A. It was so.
Q. There was no point where any of the four disappeared
from the room?
A. No, there wasn't, no.
Q. Father Saunders said:

We were concerned about the police arriving on his doorstep and taking him without anyone knowing. He is not very well and this would have a very bad effect on his health. You have to understand he has been a very ill man.

At which point Detective Chief Inspector Fox responded:
We are not like the Gestapo arriving in the middle of the night and dragging him off to a cell somewhere. That is not how we do things. I am aware of his poor health and something like that would not have occurred. It was and remains my intention to contact this office or someone within the church when it is time to speak to Father Fletcher to arrange support for him. I would welcome someone being present when I speak to him and that is a mandatory option open to him. However, this may not occur for some time yet.

Those words were spoken, weren't they?
A. Yes, I remember those, yes.
Q. It was the case that that's how it occurred, wasn't it?
A. It was.
Q. Then you rejoined the conversation by saying:

So will you let us know when you go to speak with Father Fletcher?

DCI Fox said, "Yes"?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall at this point Father Saunders said a prayer?
A. No, I don't, no.
Q. But it is likely he did, I take it?

MR HARBEN: I object to that. On what basis could that be put? There's no basis for that proposition.

MR COHEN: I was not about to say it was unlikely, Commissioner, but I can if my friend wants to.

THE COMMISSIONER: The bishop can't recall, Mr Cohen.
MR COHEN: If the Commission pleases.
THE COMMISSIONER: It doesn't assist.
MR COHEN: Q. Bishop Malone, in any event, next in the conversation you were the next to speak:

Do you know when that might be?
DCI Fox responded:
We have a lot to do first.
I should identify there's a spelling error there clearly. Well, do you recall Detective Chief Inspector Fox saying "We have a lots to do first"?
A. Not "a lots", no.
Q. Very well.
A. I'm happy to say there's a typo there.
Q. The conversation was:

We have a lot to do first. I would not expect that to happen for some weeks or even months. I assure you that we will make some contact with the church around that time so that we can deal with Father Fletcher in as compassionate a manner as possible.
A. $\mathrm{Mmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. Your response:

I thank you for that.
A. Yes.
Q. That conversation occurred, didn't it?
A. Yes, I'm happy to agree with that.
Q. Then Detective Chief Inspector Fox put this to you:

Had you approached the Police Service or myself before speaking to Father Fletcher, this would have been explained to you. Unfortunately, you didn't give us that opportunity. I would have preferred you speak to me before you did anything and I could have explained all of this.

And your response was:
We were just trying to act in the best interests for all concerned.
A. Yes.
Q. You understood then, didn't you, that DCI Fox was saying that if you'd spoken with him or someone from the Police Service first, you wouldn't have made the error of disclosing these things to Father Fletcher?
A. Yes .
Q. That's right, isn't it?
A. That's how I understood his words, yes.
Q. Then DCI Fox went on to say to you:

In your conversation was Father Fletcher aware of a Police Investigation before you raised the subject with him?

Your response:
No. I don't believe so.
Do you accept those words?
A. I do.
Q. And:

In view of that would it not have been wiser to not mention the investigation to him?

Your response was, in the manner of a question:
Sorry?
Do you accept that?
A. I do.
Q. DCI Fox said:

If you had not told him there was a Police
Investigation he may not have been upset or distressed and therefore negate any need for concern over his welfare in the first place?
A. $\mathrm{Mmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. Your reply:

I see what you mean. I did not mean for that to occur, our concern was for his welfare.
A. Yes.
Q. That was said, wasn't it?
A. I believe so, yes.
Q. Detective Chief Inspector Fox went on to say:

Yes but that also had the effect of telling Father Fletcher that there was a police investigation. If someone like Richard Carleton was to interview you, I doubt that he would be as accepting of that explanation. It could be suggested that the purpose of your visit had the effect of warning Father Fletcher. Having been forewarned, he then had the opportunity to get his story sorted out before the Police arrived to speak to him.

Your response:
I hope no-one would view it that way. That was not our intention.

Those words were spoken, weren't they?
A. Yes, I'm happy to accept that.
Q. Detective Chief Inspector Fox went on to say:

I understand what you're saying but can you understand that this could be the perception?

Your response:
I am sorry if that is how it is viewed.
Do you accept those words?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Detective Chief Inspector Fox then said:

I will probably need to get a statement from you at some stage in relation to your conversation with Father Fletcher. Whatever he told you is admissible at court and may have to be given in evidence.

You replied:
I understand and am happy to do that. Just contact me when you need that to happen.

You accept that?
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A. I do.
Q. I take it by virtue of the fact that that's what occurred, is it not, in May of 2003?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. Detective Chief Inspector Fox said:

Thank you. Just before we finish I would like to discuss with you what is to occur with Father Fletcher whilst this investigation continues.

Your reply:
I was going to ask him to take a period of leave.

Those words were spoken?
A. I think so, yes.
Q. Detective Chief Inspector Fox replied:

I would ask that the church give consideration to removing Father Fletcher from his position until we resolve what is to occur.

Allow me to pause there. First, that was said, wasn't it?
A. I think so, yes.
Q. And you had a clear understanding that, while he was being respectful and deferential in his language, you understood he meant, "Stand him down. That's what we want"?
A. I did, yes.
Q. That was your clear understanding, wasn't it?
A. It was clear, yes.
Q. If I can return to the narrative, you went on to inquire of Detective Chief Inspector Fox:

As I said earlier this could be a matter of months. I cannot put a time on it at this stage.

Then you inquired of Detective Chief Inspector Fox:
Do you have concerns for other persons?
Detective Chief Inspector Fox said in reply:
I don't have any information that he is committing any offences at the present time. The allegations $I$ am investigating are very serious and relate to when this complainant was a child. There may not be any further complaints now, but how would you feel if another incident arises during our investigation? Sometimes there is just the one victim, but we know from incidents like Vince Ryan that there are often many victims.

Excuse me. I'm sorry, bishop, I think I have gone too far ahead. Allow me to withdraw that question, Commissioner, and approach it in this way.

I'm sorry, I'll start again. I went slightly off track. Allow me to correct it and approach it this way: I'll repeat two short sentences and inquire of you if they were said. You said to Detective Chief Inspector Fox:

How long would you expect that to take?
DCI Fox said:
As I said earlier this could be a matter of months. I cannot put a time on it at this stage.

That was said, was it not?
A. I think so, yes.
Q. You said to DCI Fox:

Do you have concerns for other persons?
And his reply:
I don't have any information that he's committing any offences at the present time. The allegations $I$ am investigating

> are very serious and relate to when this complainant was a child. There may not be any further complaints now but how would you feel if another incident arises during our investigation?

If I may pause there, that much was said, was it not?
A. Yes, I think so.
Q. I understand you must do the best you can and having regard to the fact that this conversation is now as much as 11 years ago --
A. Sure, yes.
Q. -- but you accept that those were the words used, don't you?
A. I'm happy to accept them.
Q. DCI Fox went on to say:

Sometimes there is just the one victim but we know from incidents like Vince Ryan that there is often many victims. I am concerned in that respect. I know Father Fletcher is still in the Branxton Parish and as such, has contact with the Catholic School there and probably other children's groups. I would feel better [if] --

There's another typographical error, I pause to say.
.. [if] he was removed from the parish and placed into an office role here at the diocese or somewhere else where he would have a minimum of contact with children.
Q. Those words were spoken to you by Detective Chief Inspector Fox?
A. I think so, yes.
Q. You were saying you feel he should be relieved of his position. That is to say, you said those word, to which DCI Fox replied:

I would. I cannot force you to do that. I don't have that power but I would
strongly suggest it to you. Ultimately it is a decision for you and the church to consider.

Those words were spoken?
A. I accept that, yes.
Q. You responded:

There is a presumption of innocence until proven guilty.

Did you not?
A. Yes, I did say that.
Q. Were you advised that that was the position by any particular person?
A. I don't think so, no. At this stage, the meeting with Detective Chief Inspector Fox was all about standing Fletcher aside from ministry and also him expressing his disappointment that I had been out to see Fletcher and warned him about things. I don't recollect seeking any advice at that point.
Q. Is it just your personal knowledge about the concept of the presumption of innocence in these circumstances or were you told that by some third person?
A. No, I understood it; it is a fairly basic platform in the Westminster law.
Q. But, in the circumstances of this priest not being stood aside, you were saying "There is a presumption of innocence until proven guilty." Is that something that just was conceptually familiar to you or had somebody said to you, "Bishop, in these circumstances, the presumption must be that there's a presumption of innocence"?
A. No, a person had not said that to me. It came from within my own head.
Q. Then Detective Chief Inspector Fox said to you:

Absolutely, but there is also a duty of care to the community and your parish.
I would hate for something adverse to occur whilst this matter is still being examined. I can tell you that I have charged a Police Officer for a sexual offence and he was
removed from general policing duties in the community and confined to a station until the matter was resolved in court.

Do you recall those words?
A. I think so.
Q. He - that is DCI Fox - went on to say:

I have also charged school teachers with sexual offences and the Department of Education in each case removed them to the District Head Office to perform administration duties away from children until it was resolved.

Do you recall those words?
A. Yes, I think so.
Q. They were said in that way, weren't they?
A. I think so.
Q. He concluded his remarks by saying:

These are standard practices for most government departments. On each of those occasions there was a presumption of innocence but the safety and welfare of the community had to take precedence. I can only ask you to consider doing the same.

Your response was:
Very well.
That's where the business of the meeting concluded, is it not?
A. Pretty well, yes.
Q. Apart from the usual pleasantries on departure?
A. Pleasantries, "thanks for coming", yes.
Q. "Call again"?
A. So to speak.
Q. You indicate in your further supplementary statement which is exhibit 86 - do you have that handy in the witness
box?
A. I do. Yes.
Q. You have indicated in paragraphs 1.1 and 1.2 , the subparagraphs of paragraph 1 on the front page of that document, that you visited Father Fletcher after receiving information with respect to the alleged abuse of [AH], from two sources?
A. Yes.
Q. First from [BI] and then from Detective Inspector Peter Fox?
A. Yes.
Q. You then go on to say:

I believed in visiting Fletcher that the Towards Healing document provided that when an allegation was made against a Priest the Priest should be informed of the allegation as soon as possible.

That belief, was that a consequence of reading the document or an understanding provided to you by some third person?
A. No, I had read the document, yes.
Q. Did you apprehend that you had some sort of discretion about just which of its terms, if any, you could apply or depart from?
A. As I go on to say, it was a mistaken reading of the Towards Healing document and that would have been the 2000 version, iteration.
Q. You accept you didn't mention anything about the Towards Healing document in your discussion with DCI Fox on 20 June?
A. No, I don't. No, I don't think so.
Q. There was no explanation given to him about your underlying conceptual motivation for the way you were approaching these things, was there?
A. I don't think that came up, no.
Q. In paragraph 1.3 of your statement in exhibit 86 , you go on to say:

To understand my visit to Father Fletcher
you need to understand the relationship between a Bishop and his Priests.

You didn't inform DCI Fox about that issue either, did you?
A. No, I didn't, no.
Q. You didn't say to DCI Fox that you hoped to obtain admissions from Fletcher, did you?
A. I can't recollect whether I did say that to him or not.
Q. You accept that he hasn't recorded that as a proposition you enunciated to him?
A. It is not in that document that we've just gone through, no.
Q. Did you make a lengthy file note at the time of the meeting on 20 June 2002?
A. With Detective --
Q. With Detective Chief Inspector Fox?
A. No, I did not, no.
Q. You told the Commissioner last week in evidence - for the Commissioner's benefit and those at the Bar table the reference is transcript page 928, that's a transcript of 11 July 2013 and, relevantly, lines 13 to 18. The gist of your evidence, I think I can limit it to the phrase, is that you said you were "scared stiff" about the possibility that Fletcher was a paedophile?
A. Did I say that? Yes.
Q. You did?
A. Okay, right.
Q. You also said - apparently, in terms of the way you expressed this proposition, at least on my reading of the transcript and perhaps other will object if I have this wrong - that you were also scared stiff about other victims coming forward. Do you recall that evidence?
A. I don't know about being scared stiff about other victims coming forward.
Q. Would it assist you to see the --
A. Did I say that?

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Cohen, frankly, the bishop only said
"scared stiff" once. And he referred to the possibility of yet another person coming forward after he was asked about Fletcher. I took that to mean - and I think it is reasonable - that it was about another perpetrator coming forward, not about another victim coming forward. If I am wrong, perhaps we ought to clarify it.

MR COHEN: Yes. I must say I read it distributively.
THE COMMISSIONER: We'11 ask the bishop to tell us which of us is correct.

MS LONERGAN: Perhaps reading the transcript would clarify it.

THE COMMISSIONER: Perhaps I could hand a copy of it to Bishop Malone.

MS LONERGAN: Yes, that would be appropriate
THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Bishop, might I refer you to lines 13 to 18 of this page, which is page 928.
A. Yes. I have read it, yes.

MR COHEN: Q. Is the correct understanding of that, bishop, that those words, particularly as they follow the phrase "scared stiff" are to be read distributively; that is to say, you were scared stiff about both of those things?
A. About both, another paedophile case as well as another victim coming forward?
Q. Yes.
A. No, I'm bit unsure as to what I might have been referring to there. Certainly I was scared stiff that he might have been a paedophile. I don't know why I would have added about the possibility of yet another person coming forward.
Q. It wasn't hyperbole, was it?
A. I don't think so, Mr Cohen, no.
Q. You clearly had a concept and a meaning in your mind when you gave that evidence?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. Is it not fair to say the better way to read that
evidence and that passage of your evidence is that you're referring to being scared stiff about both those things?
A. Yes, it's quite possible, yes.
Q. You also indicated, $I$ think in that same passage, but certainly you made reference in your evidence to there being some smoke around about the allegations involving Fletcher. Do you recall that?
A. I remember using the word "smoke". Yes, it is in the next few lines.
Q. That was not fumata bianca, was it?
A. What?
Q. White smoke?
A. I see what you mean. No. Thank you. It wasn't white smoke. I mean, there was sort of suspicions about him.
Q. Those suspicions, having regard to your evidence were as at 2001, weren't they, when they first arose?
A. Yes.
Q. Wasn't it the case that by 17 months later, by June 2002, the smoke had turned into a raging inferno - wasn't it?
A. It wasn't quite raging at that point. There had been those couple of reports earlier on, one of which could not be corroborated, the other one coming from [BI]. It was certainly gaining some momentum, I'd have to say.
Q. It was the momentum of a forest fire, wasn't it?

MR GYLES: I object.
THE COMMISSIONER: These sorts of analogies don't really assist, Mr Cohen.

MR COHEN: If the court pleases.
Q. But the primary concern you had at this time, was it not, was to avoid scandal to the church? Wasn't that so? A. It was a consideration. Whether you'd say it was primary or not is another matter, because I was still in that frame of mind where, if it was possible to sort of handle these situations without creating too much scandal, then so be it. That does not necessarily mean it was a primary consideration. It was an important consideration.
Q. Handling these circumstances without scandal has, as its necessary corollary, the avoiding of any penetration of sunlight on to the circumstance; isn't that right?
A. Not really, no, no. I mean, that was going to happen inevitably, but it was to try to - trying to handle the situation in such a way to minimise the damage.
Q. This was not due to any lack of realisation of how thoroughgoing were the crimes of Fletcher at this time, was it?
A. I didn't know what the crimes of Fletcher were at that point.
Q. You had formed the view when you were scared stiff, weren't you, that he was a paedophile?

MR HARBEN: I object to that.
MR GYLES: I object to that.
THE COMMISSIONER: That's not the evidence really. The bishop was scared stiff of another person coming forward. It is nothing to do --

MR COHEN: Very well.
Q. You were scared stiff that he was a paedophile, weren't you?
A. Well, it certainly crossed my mind, yes.
Q. In a way that loomed large in your thinking, didn't it?
A. Yes. I mean, there was not sufficient evidence yet in my mind that he was, but then again, the jury was out as to whether he was or not.
Q. Ultimately, they weren't, were they?
A. It was possible.
Q. But ultimately they weren't, were they?
A. Weren't out - the jury? That happened later, yes.
Q. You indicate, by your paragraphs 1.7 and 1.8 of your statement, which is exhibit 86, that you were motivated by pastoral concern for Fletcher in a potentially difficult situation?
A. Yes.
Q. And the possibility of extracting an admission?
A. Yes.
Q. Did it not occur to you what mattered was that the police have access to this information and that they undertake that process?
A. Obviously that should have been the outcome, yes, but it wasn't. You know, the relationship between the priest and the bishop was such that I felt that I needed to offer whatever support I could to Fletcher. As I mentioned there, and gave evidence last week, that relationship is based on a kind of a brotherhood between priests sharing in the sacrament of Holy Orders; but as well as that, as Fletcher's superior, in that sense, I thought that my mentioning the fact that an allegation had been made against him might trigger an admission, as had happened in the case of Vince Ryan.
Q. Did you hope for a Perry Mason moment, did you?
A. I don't think that's fair.

MR HARBEN: I object.
MR COHEN: Q. What was your thinking because you're not a trained investigator?
A. No, I know that - I'm not.
Q. You can't have harboured a realistic expectation that he was going to change the habits of lifetime and fess up to you?

MR GYLES: I object.
MR HARBEN: I object.
THE COMMISSIONER: We don't know James Fletcher's lifetime habits in relation to honesty. Mr Cohen.

MR COHEN: Excuse me, Commissioner. I'm just checking to see if I've missed anything.
Q. In paragraph 1.10, again in exhibit 86, you indicate that, in 2002, you had not arrived at the realisation that sexual abuse by clergy within the church was endemic. When did you arrive at that proposition?

MR GYLES: I object. It doesn't follow from what he said there that he had the alternative view at some other point. In any event, it is irrelevant.

MR COHEN: I'm just testing the evidence, Commissioner. That would seem to be a proposition that's enunciated in prospective terms.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Cohen, we have had from the bishop his journey, if you will, from that point. I don't think he has ever suggested that there was one day when he completely changed.
Q. Is that correct, Bishop Malone?
A. Yes, Commissioner, that's correct.
Q. It's been a gradual process and no-one could put a date on when you reached any particular point in this long realisation or whether, indeed, you came to that realisation at all; is that right?
A. I have given evidence, Commissioner, when asked by counsel assisting was there a moment when there was an epiphany in my understanding of these matters and I've identified around about 2004 as that awareness, that awakening in me.

THE COMMISSIONER: I don't think we can get any more specific than that, Mr Cohen.

MR COHEN: Q. Other than, at that point, you changed from church first to victims first; is that a fair way to put it?
A. I did, yes.
Q. Can I ask you, having regard to the first sentence in paragraph 1.10, is it the case that you never arrived at the realisation that there was an endemic problem with sexual abuse by clergy?
A. I did arrive at that awareness, yes, I'm saying that.
Q. That was in 2004 , was it?
A. Rough1y, yes.
Q. You accept by your evidence that you gave, I believe this morning, but certainly on Friday, in answer to questions by Ms Lonergan, that there has been ostracism of
victims by the broader members of the church, whether they be clergy or lay believers; is that right?
A. Yes. There have been incidents of that, sadly, yes.
Q. Has that ostracism extended to you personally?
A. I've already given evidence.

MR GYLES: I object.
MS LONERGAN: I object. This has been covered in quite some detail.

MR COHEN: I have no further questions.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Cohen. Mr Saidi?
MR SAIDI: I have no questions.
THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Gyles?
<EXAMINATION BY MR GYLES:
MR GYLES: Q. Bishop, you gave some evidence last Wednesday afternoon concerning some of the dealings you had with Bishop Clarke after his retirement; do you recall that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. You were asked whether you visited him. In your response - at page 795-796 - in terms of the frequency of visits, you said:
A. Yes, it wasn't regular, but $I$ would have certainly visited him on a number of occasions when he lived up at Nelson Bay and then later when he moved into the retirement village.
A. Correct, yes.
Q. Assuming that he retired towards the end of 1995 ?
A. Yes.
Q. He died in 2006?
A. Yes.
Q. It was about a 10-year period and your recollection is
that he lived for part of that at Nelson Bay?
A. Yes.
Q. And later moved to a retirement village?
A. Correct, yes.
Q. You visited him in both locations?
A. In both places. I wasn't a regular visitor, but I did visit him in both places, yes.
Q. Thank you. You were asked, during whether any of those visits, you discussed with him allegations of sexual abuse and the like - this is at transcript 797 - and your response was:
A. No, I didn't. You know, the man was retired and he made it very clear that when he retired, he was out of it.
A. Yes.
Q. What you're saying is you didn't think he would be prepared to discuss those matters with you and didn't want to?
A. Well, no.
Q. But you gave him the courtesy of not doing that?
A. Correct, yes. I mean I wouldn't appreciate it if I was quizzed, say, by the present bishop, Bill Wright, about matters that had been dealt with and water had gone under the bridge and I'd moved on - the diocese had moved on.
Q. In terms of his recollection of matters going back in the years while he was bishop, you're not able to say, are you, what his knowledge of those matters was because you didn't discuss them?
A. No.

MS LONERGAN: I object. The questions that I asked were in relation to McAlinden. They were confined. If my questions of this witness are being used as the basis for the current questions, that isn't a correct appreciation of the evidence that was given before. If it is a new topic altogether, then I don't object.

MR GYLES: I'm not constrained by the previous
questioning. My question is - and I think it follows essentially from what the bishop has said - given he did not ever discuss matters going to Bishop Clarke's time, that he's not in a position to comment as to what Bishop Clarke's recollection was in respect of those matters.

MS LONERGAN: The basis of my objection was that my learned friend took Bishop Malone to a particular part of the transcript where questions were asked regarding conversations about McAlinden.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, perhaps you can expand on that.
MR GYLES: I don't want to take a lot of time over it.
Q. You were asked some questions about whether or not matters of sexual abuse concerning McAlinden were discussed with you when you visited Bishop Clarke after you became bishop. Do you recall that?
A. I do.
Q. Your response was:

You know ... he made it very clear to me that when he retired, he was out of it.
A. Correct.
Q. The first point is: can we be confident that, first of all, you didn't raise any matters concerning McAlinden with him?
A. Yes.
Q. Would that go so far as to include matters going beyond McAlinden, ie, matters of sexual abuse generally; that was not something you discussed with him after you left?
A. I don't --

MS LONERGAN: I object. The evidence was given shortly after the questions about McAlinden that there was discussion about Fletcher. So, if Fletcher is also going to be put to one side, then the question --

MR GYLES: Could I please ask my questions.
Q. My question is: did the matters that you discussed with the bishop, after you became bishop and he left, extend to matters relating to sexual abuse concerning any priest?
A. No, except the Fletcher matter, I brought that up with him.
Q. And that was in the context of Fletcher having been charged, was it?
A. Yes, he'd long been charged by this time and I was saying to Bishop Clarke something like, you know, "You wouldn't believe what's been happening with regard to Fletcher, would you?" And he said, "No, I wouldn't." So we sympathised with one another, as it were, over that.
Q. And that was the extent of the discussions you had?
A. Yes, it was.
Q. Over that 10-year period?
A. Yes, correct.
Q. Thank you. You would agree, wouldn't you, so far as McAlinden is concerned, that because you had no discussions with Bishop Clarke about McAlinden in the period after 2005, you are simply not in a position to comment upon his recollection as to McAlinden matters?
A. No, I'm not, no.
Q. You gave some evidence about him getting a little vague about things. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. You gave evidence of the situation where he left the shower running?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall that?
A. I do recall that, yes.
Q. Can we take it that he was in a vague stage by that time, obviously?
A. Yes. After that incident, I mentioned it to one
of the priests who was acting as a quasi-carer for Bishop Clarke, and it was soon after that that he was moved from a self-care unit across into a hostel room in the same retirement village.
Q. Do you have any recollection as to when that was?
A. No idea.

MS LONERGAN: I object. This evidence has already been given. The question has been asked and the witness, at page 796 , line 38 , said.

$$
\text { Say, } 2005 \text { probab7y. }
$$

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MR GYLES: That question has not been asked, with all due respect to my learned friend.

MS LONERGAN: It has been asked.
MR GYLES: The question is: does Bishop Malone recall when it was that Bishop Clarke was moved from one part of the retirement village to the self-care retirement village to the hospice?

MS LONERGAN: I apologise.
THE COMMISSIONER: I will permit that.
MS LONERGAN: It has not been asked. Mr Gyles is correct.
THE WITNESS: I think he was in the hostel section for maybe 12 months or thereabouts, so it would have been around about 2005.

MR GYLES: Q. Thank you. Doing the best you can, would you have visited him once a year, once every six months? Can you give us an idea of how often you --
A. The frequency probably would be more like once every six months, yes.
Q. Thank you. You were taken today to the document which is at tab 256, exhibit 105, and you would recall it is the minutes of the deans' meeting on 2 August 1995?
A. Yes.
Q. Perhaps if you're able to turn up volume 3 and go to that document, tab 256.
A. Yes, I have it.
Q. You'11 see that the document is obviously recorded as
minutes. On the following page, you will see the minutes have been signed by Bishop Clarke and dated; do you see that?
A. Correct, yes.
Q. They are dated 3 October 1995?
A. Yes.
Q. Is it consistent with your recollection of the record-keeping of such minutes that they would be confirmed at the following meeting?
A. That's normally the case, I think.
Q. Thank you. If you see, for example, in the second paragraph of these minutes here, the bishop had asked that the minutes of the previous meeting be amended? It doesn't matter what it was, but you'll see that that's something that was noted.
A. Yes. Right, I see that.
Q. Is it your recollection in terms of the way the minutes of such meetings were recorded that the bishop, Bishop Clarke, would not be the one who would prepare the minutes?
A. No, he would not have been the one to prepare them, no.
Q. Is the position that someone else would prepare the minutes, and they would be provided to, obviously, Bishop Clarke, among others, for confirmation?
A. For ratification, yes, that's correct.
Q. And that process we see working in the minutes of this meeting where the minutes of the previous meeting were amended by the bishop; do you see that?
A. I see that, yes.
Q. Here we see that, in the paragraph that you were taken to earlier, that there's been a word crossed out?
A. Yes, I see it.
Q. The word "legislation"?
A. In paragraph two, the final paragraph.
Q. That's right. Then we see these minutes being confirmed ultimately on 3 October 1995?
A. Yes .
Q. So would you agree that, in terms of the preparation of these minutes, the likely sequence of events was that the meeting took place and was recorded by someone other than Bishop Clarke?
A. Right.
Q. That the minutes were then subsequently provided to persons including Bishop Clarke?
A. Yes.
Q. And then confirmed at the following meeting?
A. Yes, right.
Q. The minutes record the bishop, as in Bishop Clarke, indicating that McAlinden would arrive back in Australia on 5 August, and that is, 5 August 1995; do you recall that? A. Yes, I see that.
Q. You were asked some questions, I think by Ms Gerace, as to possible inquiries that could have been made thereafter?
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. You were taken to exhibit 78, which is not in the bundle. It is a handwritten letter from you, an extensive handwritten letter, which I don't propose to take you to. It is from McAlinden to you dated 5 December, received by you on 8 December 1995. It is a letter in which he responds - I think it is a letter you described as him possibly, I think, being canonised at the end of it? In any event, it is a letter in which he puts his case in respect to the various canons that have been breached? A. Yes, I recollect that, yes.
Q. What he records in that letter is that, on leaving the Philippines - he confirms in this letter that he's leaving the Philippines and the plan had been to retire to Ireland?
A. Yes.
Q. But because of medical issues, he returned to Western Australia?
A. Right.
Q. Is that consistent with your recollection of the 1etter?
A. Yes, it is, yes.
Q. The address given in the letter is a post office box at Jolimont in Western Australia?
A. Yes, I recollect that.
Q. He tells you that he's going up country "from now until Christmas"?
A. Yes, I saw that, yes.
Q. As far as his whereabouts is concerned, would you go to volume 4. You can put the last volume away, for my purposes anyway, please, bishop, and go to tab 277.
A. Yes, I have that.
Q. Would you have a look at the letter. I'11 draw your attention to some parts of it. It is written with the address simply of "Perth WA"?
A. Yes.
Q. On 27 February; do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. McAlinden tells you or he's informing you in this letter that he's about to leave for Ireland?
A. Yes.
Q. As had been foreshadowed in the previous letter I've just taken you to?
A. Yes.
Q. He says he hasn't got any fixed address in Ireland; do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. But he gives you a temporary address care of Father Pat Hallinan; do you see that?
A. I can, yes.
Q. Can we take it that upon receipt of that letter, that would have been your state of knowledge as to McAlinden's whereabouts at or at least shortly after 27 February 1996 ?
A. Certainly, yes.
Q. That he had left $W A$ and was heading back to Ireland?
A. Yes.
Q. He didn't have a fixed address there, but he was
giving you a temporary address where he may be able to be contacted, being the Tipperary address?
A. Correct.
Q. Could you go forward, please, in this same volume, to 283.
A. Right.
Q. You will see a letter was written by the vicar general, Father Burston, at your request, and the address we see in that is the address which was given in the letter I have just taken you to?
A. Yes, I can see that.
Q. Namely the Tipperary address?
A. Yes.
Q. You'11 see that there is a copy of that letter, which is immediately behind it, indicating that the original was returned unopened by Pat Hallinan?
A. Yes.
Q. With "Address unknown" written across it?
A. I see that.
Q. In terms of your state of knowledge as at the time this letter was returned to you unopened, which looks to be some time in July, the position was that he told you, when leaving the Philippines, he was intending to go to Ireland? A. Right.
Q. But he hadn't gone immediately to Ireland because of medical issues that needed dealt with in Western Australia? A. Correct.
Q. That he returned to Western Australia for a relatively short period while those matters were dealt with?
A. That's so.
Q. He then told you he was going back to Ireland?
A. Yes.
Q. It became apparent, didn't it, from this letter being returned unopened by, it appears, Father Hallinan, that the address that had been given was not an address that enabled you to contact him?
A. Correct, yes.

MR GYLES: I do propose at some point that they be tendered, that is, the documents I've just taken the bishop to, but we can do that at some appropriate time.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Very well.
MS LONERGAN: I will tender those, Commissioner. I will get a list from Mr Gyles and tender them at the end of his examination.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Ms Lonergan.
MR GYLES: Q. You gave some evidence, bishop, about considering in late 1996 whether you should go to the police in respect of [AL] and [AK]'s complaint. Do you recall that?
A. In 1996?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. Your decision, I think, was that you shouldn't do that because of their wishes that they didn't want you to do that?
A. That was my understanding, yes.
Q. You said that you had some discussions with Father Burston on that issue?
A. Yes.
Q. Your evidence with respect to those discussions wasn't put forward on an "I said/he said" basis?
A. No, I don't think so, no.
Q. In fact, you used the words, "I presume I would have had those discussions", and the words, "I would have had those discussions"?
A. All right, yes.
Q. Would you agree with me that the use of those words is consistent with you not having a direct memory of those conversations which may have taken place now about 17 years ago?
A. I agree with that, yes.
Q. You're not able to call upon any contemporaneous
document which recorded those in a contemporaneous way? A. No, I'm not.
Q. It is obviously a long period of time - it is obviously long ago, isn't it?
A. It is, yes.
Q. Sitting there now, the best you can really do is to say that you think it is possible, or even likely, that you had such conversations, but you're not able to be definite about it?
A. I would agree with that, yes.
Q. So you would agree that it is possible that those conversations did happen and it is possible that they didn't happen?
A. Mmm-hmm. Yes.
Q. If you had had a conversation with Father Burston at about that time concerning the matter of reporting the [AL] and [AK] complaints to the police, despite the wishes, as you understood them --
A. Yes, yes.
Q. -- that's a decision that you would have made having regard to, for example, any input you'd got from the vicar general?
A. Yes, I dare say.
Q. You may have sought legal advice about it if you were considering that position?
A. I don't know that we did, but certainly --
Q. But if you had considered it - what I'm really putting to you is that the decision you had to make, you would have informed yourself in the way you considered appropriate?
A. Yes, correct.
Q. Then you would have made the call one way or the other?
A. Yes, correct.
Q. That really remained the position, didn't it, up until, for example, 1999, when you informed or directed Father Burston to get in contact with the PSO?
A. Correct, yes.
Q. Equally, to the extent that there were discussions between you and Father Saunders or Father Burston in respect of the rumours that you've given evidence about today concerning Fletcher before 2002, as to the way in which those rumours ought to be dealt with and, again, subject to consultation with the vicars general or others, that was ultimately a decision for you to make as to how to deal with those matters?
A. I would say so, yes.
Q. The same would apply, wouldn't it, as to the decision made to leave Fletcher in his role after you became aware that the police investigation was underway?
A. It was ultimately my decision, yes.
Q. Going to Branxton to see Fletcher, that was something that was your decision?
A. Correct.
Q. Obviously Father Saunders went along with you, but it wasn't his idea; do you agree with that?
A. I think it was my idea, yes.

MR GYLES: I have no further questions, thank you Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Gyles. Mr Harben?
MR HARBEN: Thank you Commissioner. Could I just have one moment?

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Mr Doherty, you didn't have any questions, did you?

MR DOHERTY: No, Commissioner.
MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, while Mr Harben is attending to taking instructions, could I tender the documents behind tab 277 and 283 as separate exhibits. They're the documents that Mr Gyles just took the witness to regarding the location of McAlinden.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Thank you, Ms Lonergan. The letter from Denis McAlinden to Bishop Malone of 27 February 1996 will be admitted and marked exhibit 107.

# EXHIBIT \#107 LETTER FROM DENIS MCALINDEN TO BISHOP MALONE OF 27/2/1996 (TAB 277) 

THE COMMISSIONER: The letter to Denis McAlinden from Father William Burston of 16 May 1996 and the copy indicating its return unopened, will be admitted and marked exhibit 108.

EXHIBIT \#108 LETTER TO DENIS McALINDEN FROM FATHER WILLIAM BURSTON OF 16/5/996 AND THE COPY INDICATING ITS RETURN UNOPENED (TAB 283)
<EXAMINATION BY MR HARBEN:
MR HARBEN: Q. Bishop, you were shown a document which has been called in this inquiry the "I said/He said" document?
A. Yes.
Q. You were asked a number of questions about it, in particular, whether you agreed or disagreed with what you were shown.
A. Yes, that's right.
Q. When was the first time you'd seen that document?
A. The first time I saw that document was looking through
some of the paperwork in your office when we were discussing this matter.
Q. When you were asked to read it, did you have any recollection of the form of the questions that you were reading in front of you or not?
A. I did, once I - once I had started to read, my memory was jogged by what Detective Chief Inspector Fox had written.

* Q. Was it jogged as to the general content of the conversation or was it jogged as to the precise wording of either the questions or the answers?

MR COHEN: I object. I took the bishop at length, and carefully, through every passage and there is no warrant, apart from one sentence, for this to be impugned, in any way.

MR CAVANAGH: I can't hear, Mr Cohen.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Cohen, in every question that you put to the bishop, whether it was in terms or understood, it was "words to that effect", wasn't it?

MR COHEN: No, I said those words each time. Those words were said; "Yes" was the answer, with the exception of one sentence.

THE COMMISSIONER: I had understood that we had an agreement at the start that your questions were meant to be "words to that effect".

MR COHEN: I'm sorry, we were at cross-purposes. I had understood that that was not acceptable and that I had to put whether they were the words or not, not to the effect.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Cohen, we all know that there was some period between these words being uttered and their being committed to a paper record.

MR COHEN: A paper record, yes, but --
THE COMMISSIONER: You can't possibly contend for the view, can you, that it is word perfect, but for --

MR COHEN: No, I don't suggest that. What I'm suggesting is that I put the words today to Bishop Malone and, on each occasion I put them, with the exception of one sentence, I received an affirmation that those words were correct. There is not a warrant for what my friend appears to be endeavouring to undertake, which is to assert that "This is all a bit vague and you didn't really mean that, did you?"

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Cohen. I don't understand that's what Mr Harben was putting.

MR HARBEN: Could I have that question read, please, Commissioner. (Question marked * read)

MR HARBEN: Q. Bishop, did you hear that question being reread?
A. I did.
Q. Are you able to answer that?
A. Well, I understood that it was a record of
conversation, you know, based on Detective Chief Inspector Fox's memory of the conversation. I could not accept it as a record where every word is accurate. I would have accepted it as a memory of his to say that words to this effect had been said.
Q. Was that as to the actual words that were repeated to you or as to the content of the discussion that is found in both the questions and answers?

MR COHEN: I object. That is latent with ambiguity. Are we talking about when I was cross-examining or are we talking about at the time instructions were first given to my friend?

MR HARBEN: No.
Q. You understand, bishop, that I'm asking you about when the questions and answers were read to you by Mr Cohen were you accepting, when you said answers such as, "I'm happy to accept that" or "I think so", were those answers in relation to the precise words that were being read to you or was it as to the general content of those questions and answers?
A. They were with regard to the general content of the questions and answers.
Q. Thank you. You took issue with one aspect of that in particular?
A. I did, yes.
Q. Is that because you were conscious at all times that there had been some approach to you which had been investigated by you in years before? That was in relation to any - I'll turn it up. Just bear with me, bishop. Do you have the document there?
A. The document of Detective Chief Inspector Fox?
Q. Yes.
A. No, I don't have it in front of me. Oh, yes, I do.

It was presented a little earlier this afternoon. Yes, I have it now, yes.
Q. You were asked - I think it appears on the first page. The question reads:

Have you ever had concerns about

Father Fletcher prior to this incident?
Do you see that question?
A. I do, yes.
Q. And there is a recording of an answer:

No, not before [BI] approached me.
Firstly, at the time you spoke to Detective Chief Inspector Fox, some prior approach had been made to you which had been investigated in the way you have revealed in your evidence?
A. Yes, that's right.
Q. Do you say, if asked that question, you would not have withheld that information from the chief inspector?
A. No, if he'd asked that question I would have mentioned the two people who had reported matters to me.
Q. Indeed, when you look at your statement of the following May --
A. Yes.
Q. -- those matters are specifically referred to, aren't they?
A. They are, yes, in the opening statement.
Q. In addition to that, in your statement, which is exhibit 87 , on page 3 , it records:

Since Jim Fletcher was a personal friend to the [AH] family I thought that revealing the name of the complainant might trigger in Jim Fletcher a possible admission of inappropriate behaviour.
A. Yes.
Q. That's what you record in your statement in May 2003?
A. Yes.
Q. Firstly, are you able to recall whether that appears in your statement as a consequence of some direct question to you or not?
A. No, I'm not able to say, I don't think, there.
Q. Do you say that was in your mind when you went to see Father Fletcher?
A. Yes, I'd say it was. It was part of my thinking.
Q. Do you remember or not whether that was part of the discussion with Detective Chief Inspector Fox in June of 2002?

MR COHEN: I object. I asked that question and got a definitive answer.

THE COMMISSIONER: What was the "definitive answer"?
MR COHEN: I recollect it as being "No" to the question put in those terms, or very similar.

THE COMMISSIONER: I will allow Mr Harben to put it again.
MR HARBEN: Q. Do you recollect whether that came up in the discussion between you and Detective Chief Inspector Fox in June of 2002, or can't you recollect?
A. No, I don't - I don't remember that it did come up in that discussion.
Q. You have been shown during the course of today's evidence a pastoral message --
A. Yes.
Q. -- which is dated 16 May 2003. It is exhibit 104 and it appears at tab 384 of volume 5 . Firstly, what did you understand as the normal custom for the distribution of material such as that pastoral message?
A. The normal custom with regard to the distribution of a pastoral message, media releases and so on, was that copies of the statement would be sent out to all of the clergy of the diocese, to the heads of religious congregations, to the heads of department in the chancery area and beyond, at head office, and then the bodies that receive copies of those statements would more often than not send them out to their membership.
Q. Did that membership include the schools?
A. Catholic Schools Office received a copy of that, yes, and their custom was to send that statement out to all of the schools.
Q. Did that include the principals?
A. Yes, very much so, yes.
Q. Does that general description, which you've just given, encapsulate the term "diocesan community" which appears in the email sending the material to the PSO?
A. It does, yes.
Q. Following the distribution of the pastoral message, did Mr Callinan ever ring you up and object to handing the pastoral message out to the parishioners or the members of his area of the diocese because of anything in it?
A. No, no, he did not.

MR HARBEN: I have no further questions.
MS LONERGAN: Could we have a five-minute adjournment? I just want to raise a matter with my learned friend Mr Harben.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
SHORT ADJOURNMENT
<EXAMINATION BY MS LONERGAN:
MS LONERGAN: Q. Bishop, you gave some answers in response to some questions asked by Mr Gyles regarding your understanding that [AL] and [AK] in 1996 did not wish to take their complaints about McAlinden to the police?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you yourself talk to [AL] or [AK] in 1996 or 1995?
A. No, I'd say not. I only met [AL]. I never met [AK].

I would have met [AL] once Zimmerman House had been under way, so more than likely around about 2006 or so I would have met her for the first time.
Q. Is it fair to say the basis of your understanding as to what [AL] and/or [AK] wanted in terms of reporting their complaints to the police was based on what somebody else told you?
A. Yes, Bishop Clarke had told me that that was their wish.
Q. Thank you. When Zimmerman Services or Zimmerman House was set up in about 2005 --
A. Correct, yes.
Q. -- did you instruct staff of Zimmerman House or any of your staff to trawl the archives to find anything regarding McAlinden to put into material to be held by Zimmerman House?
A. No, I didn't, no.
Q. Did you give staff from Zimmerman House a copy of the bishop's file, as it then was, or the confidential file regarding McAlinden at the time Zimmerman House was set up or shortly after?
A. I'm a bit unsure about that, but there was a very open relationship between myself and the director of
Zimmerman House and I'm sure if that had been requested, it would have been easily given.
Q. Is it fair to say that the attitude you had in 2005 was that Zimmerman House should have access to any material about McAlinden if it assisted in the way they were dealing with his victims at the time?
A. Yes, any material to anything really.
Q. You were asked some questions about the minutes of the deans meeting in August 1995?
A. Yes.
Q. I will just take you to that. I'm going to ask you some questions about the persons listed as being in attendance. It appears behind tab 256 in volume 3.
A. Yes, I have it.
Q. Do you see that, apart from yourse1f and Bishop Clarke, there's Monsignor Hart?
A. Yes.
Q. And the deans are listed as Monsignor P Simms - is he still alive?
A. He is, yes.
Q. T Brady?
A. Yes, he also is alive.
Q. $\quad$ Callinan?
A. Yes, him also.
Q. G Nugent?
A. No, George has died.
Q. And Father Saunders we know is alive.
A. Yes.
Q. From your recollection at that time, did any of those persons whose names I've just drawn your attention to perform the role of secretary of the deans?
A. One of them would have, for sure, but I have no idea which one.
Q. Are you able to assist with the handwriting of the letter - it is a bit of a big ask, I know - above the word "legislation" that has been crossed out? Do you see there's what appears to be a letter or a scribble?
A. Yes, I see that. No, I --
Q. Are you able to assist?
A. No, I have no idea how that - who wrote that.
Q. You answered some questions raised this morning by Mr Gogarty regarding what risk assessment you did regarding Fletcher?
A. Yes.
Q. You will agree with me that your evidence was that you did that risk assessment some time early in 2003, perhaps about March; is that your evidence?
A. Well, yes and no. Again, I'm a bit unsure because I didn't date that handwritten note.
Q. Yes.
A. I'm wondering to myself whether it might have been produced as a result of the Ombudsman's inquiry which happened a bit later in 2003.
Q. Could I get you to close up the volume you've got open and go to tab 338 which is in volume 5.
A. Yes.
Q. Behind that tab there's a selection of your handwritten notes?
A. Yes, that's mine.
Q. Are they the notes you were just talking about as ones that you think may have been made about the time of the Ombudsman's inquiry?
A. Yes, I'm inclined to think that's probably more
accurate.
Q. On pages 942 to 944 of the transcript last Thursday I asked you a series of questions about those handwritten notes?
A. Yes.
Q. Your answers were to the effect that although you couldn't pinpoint when individual entries were made, at least, at your best estimate, none of them predated 2003; is that a fair summary?
A. Yes, I'd say that's a fair summary.

MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, I tender the documents behind tab 338 to be described as "Miscellaneous notes by Bishop Malone regarding Fletcher from 2003".

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Thank you, Ms Lonergan. Those miscellaneous notes regarding Fletcher will be admitted and marked exhibit 109.

## EXHIBIT \#109 DOCUMENTS DESCRIBED AS "MISCELLANEOUS NOTES BY BISHOP MALONE REGARDING FLETCHER FROM 2003" (TAB 338)

MS LONERGAN: Q. You were asked some questions regarding a conversation you say you had with Mr Callinan in June 2002. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. You gave evidence to the effect that present with you on the day you travelled out to speak to Fletcher at Branxton was your vicar general Father Saunders?
A. Correct, he was, yes.
Q. You also gave evidence to the effect that you didn't take Father Saunders with you to the school to have the discussion with Mr Callinan?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. Did you discuss with Father Saunders the contents of your discussion with Mr Callinan after you had met with Mr Callinan?
A. I could have said something on the way back in the car perhaps when we headed back to the office after we'd seen Fletcher. I don't remember having done so but the chances are that that was said.
Q. The chances are quite high, are they not, because he was your vicar general and he would have needed to know? A. Yes, that's right.
Q. Particularly, given that you had put certain limitations on what Fletcher was allowed to do in terms of his ministry?
A. Yes.
Q. You agree with me that the odds are high you would have discussed it with Father --
A. I think so, yes.
Q. As I understand your evidence, you don't actually recollect doing so?
A. No, not in as many words, no.

MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, other than one matter I will go to, unless there are any further questions that you wish to take the witness to --

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Ms Lonergan, there are.
Q. Bishop, I wonder if you would be so kind as to give me your views on a couple of matters?
A. Certainly, Commissioner, if I can.
Q. Thank you so much. Do you believe that the incidence of clergy child sexual abuse was greatly out of proportion in the diocese of Maitland-Newcastle than, say, in other dioceses, or is it something of the same order?
A. Commissioner, I can't really speak for other dioceses because I don't have a firsthand knowledge of the number of cases that they may or may not have had. Certainly, I think the volume of cases that we had in Maitland-Newcastle diocese from my understanding, and it is a personal observation, did outweigh cases from other diocese, yes.
Q. Because, of course, you were a priest for over 30 years in dioceses outside Maitland-Newcastle; that's right, isn't it?
A. I was, yes, that's correct.
Q. And you didn't become aware, I expect, in those times, and perhaps it was because of the time, of anything like the scale in other places?
A. No. You know, I didn't have any position of responsibility in those other places where I'd been, apart from being the local priest or parish priest, so I wasn't really a party to some of the inner knowledge that might have been in the hands of the bishop.
Q. Yes. Can I ask you then, even though it is not clear whether the incidence was of much greater amount in this diocese, but is there something different about the diocese of Maitland-Newcastle from other dioceses that you've been in? For example, is there a greater proportion of Catholic people in the population?
A. I'd say not. The way the early settlers kind of settled in their various communities often divided into religious groupings. Catholics would settle in Maitland, for argument's sake; Anglicans would settle in Morpeth; the town of Gloucester was a very Anglican town, and still is to a large degree; so there were those natural kind of divisions that separated communities one from another.
Q. Do you believe that there was a very much larger proportion of vocations to the clergy from the people of Maitland-Newcastle compared to other areas of Australia? A. I know that there was a period of time from say the mid-1950s to say the late 1960s, say, a period of ten to 15 years, where vocations generally across the board were very high. I mean, that was the era that I became a priest, for example, during that time, and there were a number of vocations from Maitland, as it was known then, probably out of proportion to the vocations that are appearing now certainly, and at one point at the height of its history the Maitland diocese had, so I was told, something like 120 priests and I would think that a lot of the parishes that were established by the bishops at the time were to give some of these priests a job. Little country settlements had a priest in residence or a parish priest and nowadays, of course, that would never happen, but back in those days when there were plenty of priests it did happen.
Q. Thank you, bishop, that's of some interest.
A. I'm not quite sure what it means.
Q. Of course, it may be that the incidence of clergy sex abuse is on a par here as it is with other dioceses.
A. Possibly.
Q. And that it has only been uncovered because of
circumstances that have evolved or because some of the victims have been more willing to speak out than in other areas.
A. Yes.
Q. Or it may be that if there was a particular problem here, that it is being addressed certainly.
A. If there was a problem, I'm unaware as to its nature exactly. It's a puzzle.
Q. Thank you very much. I just thought I would ask you, bishop, in case there was anything further that you could assist us with.
A. Thank you very much.
Q. Thank you very, very much for your evidence and for putting up with some very long days.
A. Thanks, Commissioner.

MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, I understand that
Bishop Malone would like to make a statement that he has prepared.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, bishop, by all means.
THE WITNESS: May it please you, Commissioner, and the Commission and ladies and gentlemen. I just have a prepared statement to conclude my public evidence.

I thank Commissioner Cunneen and members of the Special Commission for giving me an opportunity to make a prepared statement as I conclude my public evidence. I also commend the Commission for conducting a thorough and wide-ranging inquiry.

My 17 years as bishop of the diocese of Maitland-Newcastle saw a gradual awakening in me to the horror of sexual abuse in the church. During those years the diocese moved from shock and disbelief to an angry rejection of such criminal behaviour of some clergy and church personnel.

Any organisation runs the risk of becoming a cold and indifferent bureaucracy and that includes the Catholic Church. In such a bureaucracy its leaders can spend more time protecting the organisation than lovingly serving the faithful men and women who constitute it. When
this happens, vulnerable children and adults can fall through the cracks. Their deep needs remain unmet and, as we have found, even criminally exploited.

Constant vigilance and authentic accountability can mitigate the tendency to exploit. Church leaders, most of whom are wonderful committed people, must be transparent and put in place processes and procedures which genuinely protect the young and vulnerable.

Fortunately, here in the diocese we saw the need to do just that and put in place an effective Child Protection Unit now known as Zimmerman Services. Since 2005 the diocese, through this unit, has attempted to redress past failures and neglect by offering effective training of church personnel, prompt attention to cases of abuse, support for victims, and healing for fractured families and communities.

It will probably take some years to rebuild lost confidence in the Catholic Church. Healing and reconciliation can come about when people see that things are different and that their genuine needs are met in an open and compassionate way. I pray daily for the victims of sexual abuse, asking God to grant them peace of mind, healing and reconciliation with all people, including the Catholic Church.

Bishop Bill Wright, the current bishop of Maitland-Newcastle, made a heartfelt apology at the opening of phase 2 of this inquiry. I welcome his apology and add my own sincere sorrow that any actions of mine may have added to the pain of victims and to their families and this includes a flippant comment of mine late last week when I spoke of not destroying secret documents. My words then were insensitive and I apologise.

The evils of sexual abuse should never have happened but they did. With better systems in place, may they never happen again. Thank you, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you so much, bishop.
MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, may I inquire of Bishop Malone whether he is prepared to have that statement tendered as an exhibit as part of his evidence to assist this Commission's inquiries?

THE WITNESS: By all means, yes.
MS LONERGAN: I tender a copy of Bishop Malone's statement.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Ms Lonergan. Bishop
Malone's statement of this afternoon will be exhibit 110.
EXHIBIT \#110 PUBLIC STATEMENT BY BISHOP MALONE
MS LONERGAN: Can Bishop Malone be excused?
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, thank you very much, bishop.
MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, I should say, before I have you excuse the witness, that he is excused from the public hearing. There will tomorrow morning be further private hearings conducted and it is proposed that the public hearing continue at 2 pm tomorrow to allow various private hearings to be conducted in the morning.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Yes. Thank you so much, Bishop Malone.
A. Thanks, Commissioner. Thank you very much.
<THE WITNESS WITHDREW
MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, it should be noted that the next witness will be Father Saunders at $2 p m$ tomorrow in public.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Ms Lonergan.
MS LONERGAN: I should also note for the record that there has been a request by the media for access to copies of exhibits 102 to 109 inclusive. Could we be informed by 4.30 whether there's any objection to those exhibits being re1eased?

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. I will adjourn.
AT 4.12PM THE COMMISSION WAS ADJOURNED TO TUESDAY, 16 JULY 2013 AT 2PM
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