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MR HUNT: Commissioner, I apologise for the slightly late start. There were some matters that properly needed to be attended to amongst the practitioners.

THE COMMISSIONER: I understand. Thank you, Mr Hunt.
MR HUNT: This is a public hearing commencing with
evidence from Father James Joseph Saunders.
THE COMMISSIONER: Good morning, Father Saunders.
FATHER SAUNDERS: Good morning.
MR HUNT: While Father Saunders is coming up, can
I indicate that the witness is in his late 70s and I've indicated to him that if he needs a break before the scheduled morning tea break, he might indicate that and you're likely to grant a short break.

THE COMMISSIONER: Of course. Father, please tell us if you're discomforted in any way and you can have a break at any time.

FATHER SAUNDERS: Good. That's fine, thank you.
MR GYLES: Could it be noted please, Commissioner, that Father Saunders takes section 23 protection.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Gyles. That is noted.
<JAMES JOSEPH SAUNDERS, sworn:
[10.27am]
<EXAMINATION BY MR HUNT:
MR HUNT: Q. Is your name James Joseph Saunders?
A. It is.
Q. I'm going to show you two documents to consider, if you would, in the witness box there, Father Saunders. One is your statutory declaration made on 26 June 2013 made for the purposes of this Commission. Do have a copy of that? A. I have.

MR HUNT: I propose to tender it, but perhaps the witness could just review it.

While that is happening, I have indicated to the
parties that there is a confidential exhibit in relation to this witness, which relates to some subjective matters on1y. I tender that as a confidential exhibit.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Hunt. That confidential document will be admitted and marked confidential exhibit JJ.

MR HUNT: I ought to indicate that although the witness is aware there is such a document, he hasn't seen the report that I'm tendering as a confidential exhibit.

CONFIDENTIAL EXHIBIT \#JJ REPORT
MR HUNT: Q. Father, are the contents of your statutory declaration made on 26 June 2013 true and correct?
A. They are.

MR HUNT: I tender that.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Hunt. The statement by Father James Saunders will be admitted and marked exhibit 111.

EXHIBIT \#111 STATUTORY DECLARATION OF JAMES JOSEPH SAUNDERS DATED 26/6/2013

MR HUNT: Q. Would you also have a look at this document.
A. Yes.

MR HUNT: I propose to tender this document, which is a record of the witness's appointments within the diocese, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Hunt.
MR HUNT: Q. Father, I'11 take you to some particular entries in that, but I have provided that to you to assist you in terms of the dates that you were at various places if it becomes relevant, do you understand?
A. Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: Father Saunders' history of appointments in the diocese of Maitland will be admitted and marked exhibit 112.

## EXHIBIT \#112 FATHER SAUNDERS' HISTORY OF APPOINTMENTS IN THE DIOCESE OF MAITLAND

MR HUNT: Q. Father, you were ordained as a Catholic priest on 22 May 1963?
A. That's correct.
Q. You have since that date remained incardinated to the Maitland-Newcastle diocese?
A. That is right.
Q. Currently, I think you describe yourself as
semi-retired and living in the Swansea parish; is that right?
A. Swansea is part of a larger parish called East Lake Macquarie parish.
Q. Could you give the Commissioner some idea of your weekly duties as a semi-retired priest?
A. Yes. Well, I haven't got to do administration, but I say masses, visit people, take calls to hospital, if asked to, perform baptisms and funerals and so on.
Q. Thank you. I just want to step through some of the matters on your document of appointment as to particular relevant dates?
A. Yes.
Q. Before we come to that, I think you first came to know Denis McAlinden when he was a priest at Raymond Terrace; is that right?
A. That's right.
Q. What were the circumstances, in brief, of you knowing him then?
A. Well, I was 13 or 14 at the time, belonged to the parish of Raymond Terrace, lived on a farm just outside of Raymond Terrace, so I would have known him for a bit over a year, I suppose.
Q. And then did you move elsewhere?
A. We moved elsewhere, yes.
Q. Was your next regular involvement with McAlinden - I'm going to refer to him that way --
A. Right.
Q. -- when you shared a parish together at Belmont?
A. That's right.
Q. Did you commence as the parish priest at Belmont in 1977?
A. That's right.
Q. Can you remember now what period it was that McAlinden was also at Belmont?
A. I think it was 1981.
Q. At the time that McAlinden came to the Belmont parish, did anyone within the church hierarchy give you any information about there being concerns about McAlinden relative to young children?
A. No. Bishop Clarke made a remark that I can scarcely remember, like, he might be a difficult man, or something nothing that would alarm me, certainly.
Q. In terms of your dealings with McAlinden when you shared that parish, what was your view about what the "difficult man" suggestion related to?
A. Well, he did have a rather ferocious temper and - but he was good enough to live with.
Q. Was there anything back in those days, apart from this comment of Bishop Clarke that he could be a difficult man, that put you on any kind of notice that there might be problems about McAlinden and young children?
A. No.
Q. Is it a fair proposition that, in terms of doctrinal matters, you were a little bit more modern than McAlinden was?
A. That's true.
Q. Did you have differences in relation to matters of interpretation about what the right way was to proceed in certain matters of doctrine and the like?
A. That would be right, yes.
Q. Did you ultimately form the view that he would have preferred, if he wasn't in a parish by himself, to be with somebody of his vintage rather than a younger priest, as you were in those days?
A. I couldn't say that.
Q. Is it the case that - you can have reference to your list of appointments on page 2 if you need to - on 5 June 1979 you were appointed as one of the diocesan consultors for a period of four years?
A. Yes, I see that.
Q. Do you see that you were appointed to the Council of Priests for a five-year period on 1 January 1987?
A. That's right. I see that.
Q. You were again reappointed as a diocesan consultor on that same date?
A. That's right.
Q. Would you briefly outline for the Commissioner's benefit the different tasks that the consultors have as opposed to the Council of Priests?
A. The Council of Priests assists the bishop in the governance of the diocese. They would assist the bishop on matters that the bishop would require assistance with. It could be pastoral matters, could be administrative matters; whereas the consultors are more likely to be focused on the appointment of priests. Now - sorry, go on.
Q. Are the consultors or were the consultors back in, say, the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s likely to be involved in at least approving or agreeing with the movement of priests sometimes on a regular basis from parish to parish?
A. Not so much approving, offering advice to the bishop, receiving - hearing what the bishop had to say, but, of course, the final decision would be the bishop's choice.
Q. So it is the bishop's call but sometimes informed by discussion amongst the consultors?
A. That's right. That's right.
Q. Could you tell the Commissioner whether there's another distinction between diocesan consultors, Council of Priests and Council of Deans. Is Council of Deans a third body?
A. I'm not sure whether it is the Council of Deans to be technical.
Q. Or a meeting of deans?
A. A meeting of deans, yes. The deans have more a role of being concerned with the particular area of the diocese, concerned with the welfare of priests within the diocese,
concerned with the meetings of priests and people within that particular area. It is, let's say, a pastoral role and not necessarily connected with the appointment, say, of clergy or advice given to the bishop by the clergy.
Q. Would the deans, when they met, sometimes consider matters that related to the welfare of priests and the way that the priests were discharging their own ministry in a pastoral sense?
A. Yes, but only, of course, within that particular area.
Q. I understand, thank you. I'm hoping that you can turn up - perhaps the court officer might assist. I'm wanting the witness to see tab 121, which I think might be in volume 2.

Would you look at the item that's behind tab 121, Father Saunders. Do you see up the top highlighted in yellow is a heading that indicates it is the minutes of the College of Consultors of the diocese of Maitland, as it was then?
A. Yes, that's right.
Q. Held at the bishop's office on 2 January 1986 ?
A. 1986, that's right.
Q. Do you see amongst those present are Bishop Clarke, presiding, Monsignor Kennedy was, at that stage, the vicar general, and that Fathers Levy, Burston and yourself were present?
A. That's right.
Q. Moving down, do you see that there's a section highlighted that says this:

Father D McAlinden seems to be taking things quietly at Merriwa, but has a problem with the extreme cold; he will be asked for a doctor's report about the problem.
A. I see that.
Q. Does that represent a standard kind of notation that might have been made at a meeting of consultors back in those days about a priest agitating for a change and the consultors wanting, effectively, or the bishop wanting to
see some evidence as to why there needed to be a change? A. Yes, that's right.
Q. Similarly, although I won't take you to it, you will see around there, there is a number of similar notations where there are indications about things that are happening personally for a priest and how it might affect their suitability for a parish and the like?
A. That's true, yes.
Q. Then could you turn now to tab 128, which is just a few tabs --
A. 128. Thank you.
Q. Do you see, looking at the heading at the top, that that's a meeting of the College of Consultors, or minutes of the meeting of College of Consultors held at Maitland on 3 June 1986?
A. That's true.
Q. With the exception of Monsignor Kennedy, the same personnel are present at that meeting by the notation?
A. That's right.
Q. It follows there that the business was that the vacant parishes of Adamstown and Morisset were discussed and that applications had been received from Reverends McAlinden, Callinan, Gahan, P Malone and Haggerty. Do you see that? A. That's right.
Q. Do you have any memory of this meeting yourself?
A. No.
Q. The minute would seem to suggest that, after a discussion and several proposals being put forward, the one that was finally recommended to the bishop was that
Reverend Gahan would go to Merriwa, McAlinden would go to Adamstown and Callinan would go to Morisset; do you see that?
A. I see that, yes.
Q. Does it prompt your memory if I suggest that Father Gahan replaced McAlinden at Merriwa and McAlinden at the same time went to Adamstown.
A. I couldn't recall.
Q. Do you have any recollection at all about the
circumstances that led to that change?
A. No.
Q. If there were question marks about a priest's performance back in the 1980s or there suitability for a particular parish, is that something that generally would be minuted in a consultors' meeting, in your experience?
A. Yes, I'd say so.

MR HUNT: I tender those two tabs, Commissioner. Tab 121 and 128.

THE COMMISSIONER: The minutes of the College of Consultors of 2 January 1986 and the minutes of the consultors on 5 June 1986 will be together marked exhibit 113.

## EXHIBIT \#113 MINUTES OF THE COLLEGE OF CONSULTORS DATED 2/1/1986 (TAB 121); MINUTES OF THE COLLEGE OF CONSULTORS, DATED 5/6/1986 (TAB 128)

MR HUNT: Q. Father I want to ask you some questions about another document which is behind 159. In fairness to you, I want to make it clear to you that these are minutes of a meeting that you'll see from the apologies you and Monsignor Cotter were not present at?
A. Very well.
Q. I'm not expecting that you will remember this particular meeting, but because of the way matters are recorded, I want to ask if you have any memory of it. If you go over to the second page, you will see at item 3 there are some details that are headed this way:

The following details about priests were discussed ...
A. Very well, yes.
Q. And then under (a) there's something about Father Pat Callinan that has detail about what that's about, to do with a request for money to build on to his nephew's house in Ireland. I presume that probably relates to some retirement plan. Father Pat Flynn, in (b), there's some indication about his desire for retirement at a particular date and some detail about that; do you see that?
A. That's right. That's right.
Q. At (c) there is some discussion about the illness of various priests mentioned there. And then (d) simply says:

Further report on Father McAlinden was given by the Bishop.

The way that's expressed suggests that reports on Father McAlinden had been an ongoing issue for the consultors?
A. Yes, it seems likely, yes. That's what it seems --
Q. Do you agree with the sense of that?
A. I agree with that, yes.
Q. I want to come to this: did you have any memory of that being a topic that was being discussed in the late 1980s, the topic of McAlinden?
A. No, I can't recall that.
Q. You understand the point that I'm seeking to draw out is: in relation to the other priests there's some detail about what the issue is for discussion; whereas it seems rather more oblique, if I could use that word, about Father McAlinden?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you able to assist the Commissioner as to why it might be that matters to do with McAlinden are recorded in an oblique fashion in that consultors' minute?
A. No, I have no recollection. Sorry, am I answering your question there?
Q. Yes.
A. Fair enough, okay.
Q. Do you generally have a sense that, by the late 1980s at least, innuendo or rumours about McAlinden being problematic were being raised?
A. Yes, but $I$ can't recall details and I can't recall details from these particular meetings.
Q. When I'm asking you about whether by the late 1980s difficulties about McAlinden becoming known, I'm not talking, you understand, about difficulties to do with his fiery temper?
A. No, that's right.
Q. I'm talking about difficulties in terms of his behaviour with children?
A. That's right.
Q. When you said to me that you agreed that there was some knowledge of that in the late 1980s, it was about that issue, about possible problems with the way McAlinden behaved with children.

MR GYLES: Commissioner, I object to that question. I'm not sure Father Saunders agreed there was knowledge about that matter.

MR HUNT: I'11 fix it up.
Q. When I say "knowledge", I'm talking about rumour.
A. Yes.
Q. I think you agreed that you knew that there was at least rumour in the late 1980s about McAlinden and difficulties?
A. That's right, yes.
Q. What I'm just getting you to understand is that rumour was about difficulties in terms of his possible behaviour with children rather than the other kind of challenges with McAlinden?
A. That's right, yes.
Q. You understand?
A. Yes.

MR HUNT: I tender that document. It is not adopted by the witness, but given I've examined on it I think that I ought to tender it for completeness. It is tab 159, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Hunt. The material behind tab 159, being minutes of the meeting of deans and consultors of 8 and 9 September 1988, will be admitted and marked exhibit 114.

EXHIBIT \#114 MINUTES OF MEETING OF DEANS AND CONSULTORS OF 8/9/1988 AND 9/9/1988 (TAB 159)

MR HUNT: Q. Father, could you look back at your
appointments document. That whole folder can go away now, please, and perhaps you could get out tab 256 , which is in the next volume. Father, could you look at your appointments. You will see you were appointed dean of the northern deanery for three years on 1 February 1995?
A. Yes. That's right.
Q. To the extent that you're able to take your memory back to 1995, I wonder whether you're able to indicate when in 1995 Bishop Michael was ordained as coadjutor bishop?
Can you remember when that was in 1995?
A. Yes. I was going to say June 1995, but I'm not sure of that now. It might have been earlier. Let's say February 1995.
Q. If you take from me that the other evidence indicates it was February 1995, does that help you become more confident?
A. Yes, it does. February, yes; February it was.
Q. Is it your recollection that by, say, November 1995 Bishop Leo Clarke retired?
A. He did, yes.
Q. And Bishop Michael Malone took over as the full bishop as it were?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you able to help us with whether you had reason, because of your different jobs and appointments on councils and committees, to be around the chancery a fair bit in 1995?
A. I'm not sure of around the chancery in 1995. Probably not, although - did I become a - if I became a consultor on the Council of Priests from there, I would have had more to do with the chancery; but, no, I can't recall offhand whether I had much to do with it.
Q. I'11 ask you the particular question that I want to know whether you can help us with.
A. Sure.
Q. Can you comment on how involved Bishop Michael seemed to become administratively as the coadjutor bishop in 1995? Can you comment on that?
A. No. I recall his coming up to Bulahdelah and Tea Gardens and I recall my asking him about whether we
should sell some land at Tea Gardens and, therefore, I knew he'd be indicating - it was indicative that he was interested in where we were, what we were doing. So I take from that that $I$ knew he was interested in the running of the whole diocese.
Q. Was the view - and say if it wasn't - when he was appointed coadjutor bishop that Leo Clarke was heading towards retirement?
A. Yes, because it would have been unusual to appoint a coadjutor.
Q. Did you know anything yourself about Leo Clarke's health in 1995 when he was still the bishop?
A. Not particularly, no.
Q. Could you look at tab 256. For the benefit of those in court, these are the minutes of a deans' meeting held at the chancery office on Wednesday, 2 August 1995. Father, do you see there that along with Bishop Clarke, coadjutor Bishop Malone, Monsignor Hart as the vicar general, you, along with the other deans, were present at that meeting with the exception of Father Cahill?
A. I do see that, yes.
Q. Do you see, moving down, there's a section of the minutes that deals with correspondence and item 1 has been redacted out because it is not anything to do with this Commission's interest.
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. First of all, I'm just going to read out to see if you agree with what's recorded there and then I'm going to make a couple of suggestions to you. Do you see under the heading of "Correspondence", at point 2, it says:

From Bishop Bantigue of the Philippines
regarding Father Denis McAlinden and enclosing a letter from Father Denis.
A. That's right.
Q. I'm going to go through it for the sense of it first and then I'm going to ask you some particular questions, if I might, Father Saunders. The second paragraph - do you want to stop to or yourself some water?
A. That's fine. Keep going.
Q. Pour yourself some water and then we'll go on. Minutes are never that stimulating that we can't stop. Do you agree that second paragraph says:

Discussion took place, the Bishop indicated that Father Denis would arrive back in Australia on 5th August.

In other words, within a number of days of this meeting?
A. I see that, yes.
Q. And then:

It was resolved that we move towards a --
And then there's a word crossed out --
procedure, since Father Denis would not confirm to the restriction placed upon him by Bishop Leo.

Do you see that there?
A. I do, yes.
Q. I discussed this minute with you very briefly this morning in a conference before court, didn't I?
A. That's right.
Q. You told me at that time that you didn't have your own memory of this meeting?
A. That's true.
Q. I think you agreed with me that in context, that last sentence should read.
... since Father Denis would not conform to the restriction placed upon him by Bishop Leo.
A. That's right.
Q. Do you now know what restriction it was that Father McAlinden was operating under that had been placed on him by Bishop Leo in 1995?
A. No, I can't recall that.
Q. Is it fair to say that you cannot now say what the word should have been that's in that sentence where the word "legislation" has been struck out?
A. Yes.
Q. Is it a fair proposition that that would likely refer to some kind of canonical procedure in the context of the minute?
A. That is true.
Q. I asked you to react this morning to a suggestion that that in context might have related to a laicisation procedure?
A. Yes .
Q. Is this fair: first of all, you don't remember from your own knowledge whether there was talk of a laicisation procedure?
A. No, I can't recall.
Q. I think the position is that, if it were the case that McAlinden had had his faculties removed and was not conforming to that, the idea of laicisation would make some sense to you as an alternative, first of all, in the context of the sentence or the context of the minute I'm first asking you about?
A. Yes. I'd say it would be more likely to refer to removal of faculties rather than laicisation. Laicisation is a far more - certainly a more radical procedure than removal of faculties, which is significant enough, but laicisation is another step, so that could well refer to removal of faculties rather than laicisation.
Q. Your position is you don't put yourself out as being an expert in canon law; correct?
A. That's true. That's right.
Q. Would you briefly in a couple of sentences describe to the Commissioner your view about the difference between removal of faculties and laicisation?
A. Yes. Removal of faculties means that a priest cannot exercise his ministry; for example, he wouldn't be able to hear confessions. He wouldn't be able to administer sacraments, but he would still be a priest. Now, laicisation is no longer deemed to be a priest and that's more serious than having your faculties removed. Faculties can be removed and then restored for a particular period.
Q. If, by August 1995, Bishop Clarke had removed McAlinden's faculties and McAlinden was failing to honour that removal, in other words, failing to conform to the restriction placed on him, do you remember there being talk of other things that might be done to McAlinden to limit him or control him?
A. No, I can't recall that.
Q. Do you remember from your own memory whether McA1inden in fact re-presented to the diocese having come back from overseas in 1995?
A. I can't recall that.

MR HUNT: I think that tab is already an exhibit.
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, it is exhibit 105, Mr Hunt.
MR HUNT: Thank you, Commissioner.
Q. I think at some stage Sister Patricia McCarthy said something to you or you heard something about McAlinden from her?
A. Yes, that's right.
Q. First, was that nun a principal of a primary school?
A. She had been a principal of our - of some of our primary schools, as I recall. When she made the remark I think to which you were referring, she might not have been a principal then, I'm not sure of that.
Q. When you heard this remark, before we go to what it was --
A. Yes.
Q. -- can you now work out where in the time frame you heard that remark?
A. No, no.
Q. Is it fair to say you can't work out now whether it was a remark of her knowledge or concerns about McAlinden at the time of those concerns or looking back historically; is that right? It could be one or the other?
A. That's what - I think I understand your question. You see, she could have been acting on her own observation. She could have been repeating hearsay. I don't know.
Q. What was it that she said or you heard her say about McA1 inden?
A. That you had to be careful with him around children, and that's as close as I can get to it.
Q. Did you understand it to be in the school context that it was an observation about him around --
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. Is it a fair proposition that generally the position is that parish priests, at least back in the 1980 s and so on, were welcome in parish schools?
A. That's true.
Q. So it would have been something memorable that a principal was saying that a priest should be watched around primary school children?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. I want to move to ask you some questions about

Father Fletcher. First of all, before various allegations became known about Father Fletcher and then ultimately his charge and conviction, before any of those things happened, how would you describe your relationship with Father James Fletcher? Were you a close friend of his, a colleague, an acquaintance? How would you characterise your dealings with him?
A. Not a close friend. There's no implication that there was a distance between us, I mean, unfriendliness, but we worked in different parts of the diocese. I knew him. I would have met him at meetings, for example, but I didn't have a lot to do with him in the early years.
Q. You were the parish priest at Branxton/Lochinvar from January 1989 until January 1995 when you moved to Bulahdelah?
A. Yes. I'm not sure whether I was parish priest of Lochinvar all that period, but certainly Branxton for those six years and Lochinvar at least part of the six years.
Q. So it is likely that the "Lochinvar" after Branxton has been added to your appointment at some stage?
A. It could well have been, but I wouldn't be sure of that.
Q. Fletcher followed you at Branxton/Lochinvar after you moved to Bulahdelah in 1995 ?
A. That's right.
Q. Did that mean you knew more about him because he succeeded you in a parish?
A. I would have known him a bit - got to know him more.
Q. On 1 January 2001, you were appointed vicar genera1 by Bishop Michael Malone?
A. That's right.
Q. That was an appointment that was for five years?
A. Yes.
Q. Was that an appointment that was served out, in the sense you were his vicar general for those five years?
A. That's right.
Q. The general position is, isn't it, that generally a priest would be appointed vicar general once, serve that term, and generally wouldn't be reappointed as vicar general?
A. That varies with the bishop. Bishop Malone's idea was to have an appointment, say, for five years, but other bishops could well appoint a vicar general for a longer period.
Q. In any event, not really related to the facts that are concerning this Commission's inquiry, you were appointed again by Bishop Malone acting vicar general --
A. That's right.
Q. -- between August-September 2008 and June 2009?
A. That's right.
Q. And that was in circumstances where Brennan had been stood aside from that role for various reasons?
A. That's right.
Q. I want you to focus your attention on the period that you were vicar general to Bishop Michael Malone from January 2001.
A. Very well.
Q. Would you describe for the Commissioner the division of tasks broadly; that is, what sort of things would you do for the bishop or in the diocese as part of your function as vicar general?
A. Well, a vicar general can do as much as or as little as the bishop asks him to do. Do you want me to proceed with that? I'm not sure.
Q. I do.
A. Right, okay.
Q. What I want to you to do is proceed in terms of your experience of being Bishop Michael Malone's vicar general, how much were you allowed to do and how much did you do not exhaustively, but the broad way in which you were asked to perform the role of vicar general?
A. All right. We11, I'd come into the diocesan office and do the administrative work as required, as indicated by the bishop or the secretary. I would see people whom the bishop might not be in a position to see. I would do confirmations when the bishop wasn't able to do confirmations, go with the bishop to see priests from time to time, be with the bishop for various diocesan meetings.
Q. I'11 get you to pause there for a minute. In terms of going to see priests with the bishop, would that be for a range of different reasons?
A. That's right.
Q. Would that include pastoral visits?
A. That's right.
Q. Disciplinary visits?
A. Yes.
Q. Sometimes a disciplinary visit dressed up as a pastoral visit?
A. Yes.
Q. In terms of your working relationship with

Bishop Michael Malone, did he delegate slabs of
responsibility to you or was he more a bishop who kept his hands on the reins and then delegated tasks to you rather than areas of responsibility?
A. Yes, that would be a better way of putting it.
Q. Ultimately, decisions about big issues were his alone;
is that how it worked during his --
A. Yes, that's right.

MR HARBEN: I object to the descriptive term. I
understand we have an answer, but I take objection as to the descriptive term, whatever "big" means. I don't know what that means.

MR HUNT: It was rather meant as a preparatory question. Not a lot was going to fall on the question or answer, but I'm happy to --

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Hunt.
MR GYLES: With the last question, I'm not sure. There were two propositions put and the witness said, "That's a better way of saying it." I wasn't sure whether he was addressing himself to the first or second option. It is probably the second, but it might be unclear.

MR HUNT: Q. Father Saunders, I understood you to be saying that Bishop Michael was more likely to keep control and delegate you particular tasks --
A. Yes .
Q. -- as opposed to you disagreed that he would delegate whole areas to you to look after yourself?
A. That is true.
Q. Can you remember whether, when you commenced to be vicar general, Bishop Malone provided you with any kind of briefing about issues about the behaviour of particular priests?
A. There's reference in the statement about Fletcher. Other priests I can't just, at the moment - maybe, but I can't recall off the top of my head.
Q. I mainly do want to ask you about Fletcher, but I want to ask you one thing about McAlinden. I accept it is more challenging now to remember the actual detail, but is it fair to say that, back in 2001, when you became vicar general you would have had some knowledge about McAlinden from those meetings of consultors and so on?
A. If I did, I can't recall that knowledge now.
Q. But do you accept as a general propositions it's likely that you had your own knowledge?
A. Yes.
Q. At that time?
A. Yes, that's right, yes.
Q. We'll come to Fletcher in a minute.
A. Right.
Q. Do you remember whether Bishop Michael Malone gave you any briefing as to where the McAlinden issue was up to when you started being VG?
A. No, I can't recall that, and I'd say that would be unlikely that he did.
Q. We'11 finish dealing with McAlinden and then we'11 come back to Fletcher.
A. Righto.
Q. When you were VG, were there continuing actions taken, to your knowledge, by people in the chancery trying to work out where McAlinden was at that stage?
A. No. I have to think about that one. Off the top of my head, certainly not. Okay, that's as - no, I can't recal 1.
Q. Can you remember whether Bishop Michae1 Malone ever asked you, while you were the VG, up until when McAlinden was known to be in Western Australia in 2005, to make inquiries as to where he was?
A. No, I can't recall.
Q. Isn't that likely be something you would recall if it was one of your jobs as vicar general?
A. Yes. That would --

MR HARBEN: I object. He has been asked if he can recall. He said he can't recall. The question is a purely hypothetical question.

THE COMMISSIONER: Perhaps not, Mr Harben. For Father Saunders' own reasons, he said he thought it would be likely that he would recall and he has given the answer.

MR HARBEN: But there's no basis for that.
THE COMMISSIONER: Well, there may be.
MR HARBEN: I'm talking about the question, the first question, which was "Do you recall?" "No, I don't." Then the hypothetical was posed, which invited a simple "Yes" or "No" response. There was no basis for it put in the
question.
MR HUNT: I can make a basis. It is answered, but I can make a basis.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Hunt. Mr Gyles has a problem too.

MR GYLES: The witness has a tendency to use the words, "That's right" and I'm not certain that he's answering "Yes" to the question by using that expression.

THE COMMISSIONER: On this occasion he simply said, "Yes."
MR GYLES: Did he? All right.
MR HUNT: I don't really want to take it a lot further, but if Mr Harben is wanting the remedy of my exploring why it might be so --

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I invite you to do so, Mr Hunt.
MR HUNT: Q. Father Saunders, you've just indicated these things to me I think: you don't have a memory of being asked by Bishop Michael Malone to make inquiries about the whereabouts of McAlinden?
A. That's true.
Q. Then I've asked you do you think it is likely, had you been asked, that that's the kind of thing you would remember and you agreed with that?
A. That - I agree with that, yes.
Q. What is it about the task of being asked to try and find a priest incardinated to the diocese, but not in contact within the diocese that makes you think it's something that you would be likely to remember?

MR GYLES: To be fair to the witness, is the question whether he remembers that now in 2013? Is that the question?

THE COMMISSIONER: No, it is about the likelihood of remembering such inquiries.

MR GYLES: I appreciate that, but remembering when remembering now or remembering at an earlier time?

THE COMMISSIONER: Now; that must be so.
MR HUNT: It must be now.
Q. Do you understand that I'm asking you about your memory now, Father Saunders?
A. That's right, yes. Yes.
Q. Are you able to answer the question?
A. Perhaps we'd better start the question again.
Q. By way of history, you've agreed that you don't remember being asked by Bishop Michael Malone to make inquiries about McAlinden's whereabouts?
A. Yes.
Q. You've agreed that you think it is likely that that is something that you would remember?
A. That's right, yes.
Q. Can you tell us why you think it is likely that that is something that you would remember?
A. Well, it'd be a bit out of ordinary, wouldn't it, if there was a priest, as you say, incardinated in the diocese but living somewhere else and I was asked to look him up or find out something about him? I think that's the kind of thing I think I would recall.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Father Saunders.
MR HUNT: Q. Were you ever asked to find any other priest while you were vicar general? When I say "find", I mean work out the whereabouts of any other priest?
A. Not that I can recall.
Q. I think there was a time when you came to know where McAlinden was living and his state of health?
A. Yes, that's about the time he died.
Q. Did you come by that knowledge at a time that the bishop was on holidays and you were taking his responsibilities?
A. That would be right.
Q. Because of that?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you now remember how you came to know that McAlinden was unwell and living in Western Australia?
A. No, I can't recall that.
Q. You can recall that you did something with that information, though?
A. Yes, that's right.
Q. What did you do with that information?
A. As far as I can recall, I reported the matter to police authorities.
Q. Did you know that the police had an interest in him, that's McAlinden?
A. Yes, I would have, otherwise - well, that's why I reported it.
Q. Do you remember whether you ever knew that McAlinden had been charged with a criminal offence in Western Australia?
A. No, I was confused about that when I was in the other hearing.
Q. You are referring to a private hearing before the Commission?
A. That's right, yes.
Q. There's nothing since that's refreshed your memory in any way about that?
A. No, that is true.
Q. Coming to Fletcher, I think one of your answers suggested that you might have received some kind of briefing from Bishop Michael Malone about concerns about Fletcher when you did start as VG?
A. That's right.
Q. Can you remember in general the kinds of things that you were told about those concerns about Fletcher?
A. May I report what I - the statement I made?
Q. You rely on what you've put in your statement?
A. Yes, that's right, to Detective Fox:

After I took up the position as vicar general in 2001 Bishop Malone appraised me

> that there had been some vague assertions in relation to Father Jim Fletcher. I understood that these assertions were examined but did not amount to anything significant that required further investigation at the time, but he was making me aware of the assertions should anything further ever come to notice.
Q. All right. You adopt that bit of your statement given to then Detective Sergeant Fox?
A. That's right.
Q. We'11 do a bit of housekeeping, but first of all, you have in front of you a copy of your statement made to then Detective Sergeant Fox on 21 May 2003?
A. Right.
Q. Have you had cause to read it fairly recently or review it fairly recently?
A. I have.
Q. Were you doing your best to tell the truth when you gave that statement to Detective Fox?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you adopt the contents of that statement as true and correct for the purposes of your evidence before the Commissioner today?
A. That is true.

MR HUNT: I tender that, unless it has already been tendered, it has a tab number. Tab 391, volume 5, it is.
Q. I won't get you to turn it up in the volume because you've got your own copy there, Father Saunders, in the witness box.

THE COMMISSIONER: In fact it is already an exhibit.
MR HUNT: Exhibit 52? I don't tender it then. Ms Needham is asserting it has another exhibit number as well.

THE COMMISSIONER: Exhibit 53, I thought.
MR HUNT: And possibly 111. We're nothing if not thorough at this Commission.

THE COMMISSIONER: 111 is the current affidavit.
MR HUNT: Q. I just want to ask you a couple of questions, Father Saunders, about the paragraph that you've just adopted.
A. Yes.
Q. Is it the case that your understanding was that it was Bishop Malone who had examined the assertions that had been made about Fletcher?
A. Yes. Maybe he got information from Bishop Clarke, so - I wouldn't be sure where he got his information from. That would be a better answer, I think, yes.
Q. The fact that you're not sure and it might even have included information from Bishop Clarke, does that --
A. Could have.
Q. Does that mean you didn't know how recent those suggestions were about Fletcher?
A. That's right, I didn't know how recent they were.
Q. In paragraph 5 of your statement to Detective Fox, you indicate that, at the time you made the statement, you remember seeing a program on the 60 Minutes --
A. Strictly speaking, I didn't see the program. I knew the program was on, but I didn't see it.
Q. You didn't sit down and watch it?
A. No.
Q. But you knew of it?
A. I knew of it, yes.
Q. Some time after that, Father Harrigan reported something that he'd been told by Fletcher?
A. Yes, shortly after that.
Q. And it wasn't too long after that that you had a meeting with Bishop Malone on the issue of Fletcher?
A. That's right.
Q. Because you express yourself in this way as "soon after that" and "that" was something that happened a day or two after 2 June 2002, is it a fair proposition that, even when you made this statement in 2003, you couldn't be clear
of the exact day that you went up - that you first of al 1 met with Bishop Michael Malone?
A. That's right.
Q. And then went up with him to see Fletcher?
A. $\quad \mathrm{Mmm}$-hmm
Q. Is it the situation that you knew - you understand about the use of pseudonyms? I've had a discussion with you?
A. That's right. Yes.
Q. I think you know the person who has the pseudonym [BI]?
A. That's right.
Q. You knew from Bishop Malone that he and [BI] had had a discussion with each other?
A. That's right.
Q. Do we you understand that you weren't there for that discussion?
A. I wasn't there at the discussion.
Q. But did Bishop Malone give you the effect of that discussion, when you met with him, about Fletcher?
A. Yes, that's in here, yes.
Q. In paragraph 8 of your statement - that is your statutory declaration, I'm sorry, Father Saunders, rather than your police statement - you say this:

Shortly after that Bishop Malone told me he was going to speak to Fletcher and requested $I$ accompany him.
A. Yes.
Q. You've already given evidence that one of your roles as vicar general was to go on visits to priest, whether they were pastoral, whether they were disciplinary or whether they were a mixture of both?
A. That's right.
Q. Did you know yourself the purpose of the visit to Fletcher when Bishop Malone asked you to go?
A. Yes. He was going up to raise the matters that were
raised just a couple of days before.
Q. Did he tell you in broad what he was wanting to achieve by going to see Fletcher?
A. No. I said there that - no, in broad, no, I can't would you like to ask another question about that? I'm not sure I'm answering you correctly.
Q. I'11 ask you this question.
A. Yes.
Q. In paragraph 9 of your statement you say something that, although it is in quotes, it conditioned in this way, that "Bishop Malone said to me words to the effect of" --
A. Yes, that's right.
Q. -- the thing that's in quotes?
A. That's right, I said that, yes.
Q. The words that are said there are these:

If I was under investigation, I would like to know.
A. That's right.
Q. Can you say whether those were words that were said by Bishop Malone to you when it was just the two of you?
A. Yes, that'd be my recollection.
Q. Are you able to say whether those words were said en route to Lochinvar?
A. Branxton.
Q. To Branxton, I'm sorry?
A. That's my recollection, that it was said en route, but I wouldn't go to the barricades on that, but that's my recollection.
Q. In paragraph 10 - I just want to read out to you and then ask you a couple more questions about it - you say, and this in the context, I assume, first of all, of having arrived to Branxton presbytery; is that right?
A. That's right.
Q. Can you remember, when you arrived with Bishop Malone at Branxton presbytery, whether Fletcher was alone there or
accompanied at that stage?
A. I'm not sure. I'd say there were two meetings up at Branxton. My recollection would be that, at the first meeting, it was Fletcher, Bishop Malone and myself. In the second meeting, I think Father Des Harrigan was around. That's as close as I can get to it.
Q. I just want to read out what you say at paragraph 10:

I do not now recall the specifics of the conversation when we met with Fletcher ...

This is the first time?
A. Yes.
Q. :
... but I do recall the Bishop put to Fletcher the [AH] allegations, which were strongly denied ...
A. Yes, right.
Q. Then you go on to make some observations about

Fletcher's reaction and health, et cetera. Are you able to help us at all any more with what else might have been said in that part that you summarise as:
... I do recall the Bishop put to Fletcher the [AH] allegations, which were strongly denied ...
A. No. Maybe some specific question could draw more out, but I just - globally, no, I couldn't.
Q. Can you remember whether the bishop put details as to what the bishop understood [AH] was alleging?
A. Yes.
Q. Did those details include material about the acts that were alleged against Fletcher?
A. Yes, there was sexual assault, yes. That's right.
Q. Did it seem to you that Bishop Malone was trying to evoke an admission out of Fletcher had one been forthcoming?
A. Yes, that could be a - yes, a good interpretation of
it.
Q. Is that something - help us with this, and I don't know whether you can or not in terms of your memory - you now see as being a reasonable proposition, or back then you thought that was something that the bishop was trying to do, was have Fletcher confess to it if - I don't mean that in the religious sense?
A. No, that's right. That's right. That's right. I can see that now as a plausible explanation, a plausible approach. Whether I thought it at the time whether he was trying to evoke - is that the word? - a confession, maybe, maybe, yes.

MR HUNT: Is that a convenient time, Commissioner? I've taken a little longer than I thought with the witness.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Hunt. I will adjourn.

## SHORT ADJOURNMENT

MR HUNT: Q. Father, could you look at your statutory declaration, paragraph 12.
A. Yes.
Q. In summary, you say there that you were told by Bishop Malone some time after that first visit that you and he had up to Fletcher at Branxton --
A. That's right.
Q. -- that a meeting had been arranged with the police?
A. That's right.
Q. You have a recollection of being at the meeting?
A. That's right.
Q. That was the meeting that included Detective Chief Inspector Fox?
A. That's right.
Q. Can you remember whether there was another police officer in attendance?
A. Yes, there was. It's in the statement. Where was that? In the police - yes, Detective Ann Joy.
Q. You remember there being a woman police officer there?
A. There was, yes.
Q. The way you summarise that episode is that you don't remember the details of the conversation, but you expect it was Bishop Malone that did the talking?
A. That's right.
Q. Were you ever, back then, asked to acknowledge in writing in some way a summary of the conversation that had happened by either of the police officers?
A. No.
Q. I just want to show you a document to try and put a time. I think you agree that you went to see Fletcher again - paragraph 13 of your statutory declaration?
A. That's right.
Q. There's not a date there. I assume that means you were not able, at the time you prepared your statutory declaration, to fix a date on it?
A. But we can compare that with the statement I made to Detective Fox.
Q. Yes, and at paragraph 9 of that statement you say it was 20 June or the following day?
A. That's right, yes.
Q. Given that that statement was made in 2003 , we're safer to prefer that detail as being correct?
A. Yes, that's true.
Q. I'11 show you another document to give you some confidence that that is right. I have opened for you volume 5 and it is open at tab 351.
A. Yes, 24 June.
Q. Is that what looks like a fax letter that's come from Branxton presbytery? It looks like it was sent on 25 June although the letter was written on 24 June 2002? Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. It is marked at the bottom, "Attention: Reverend James Saunders Vicar General"?
A. That's right, yes.
Q. And in a familiar fashion it is signed "Jim Fletcher" and addressed to "Dear Jim"?
A. That's right.
Q. It says:

Just a line to say thank you for your visit with Bishop Michael last Friday.
A. Yes.
Q. That would seem to be in context some date before

24 June that you went up there in 2002?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you see that Fletcher goes on to say this:

I have given thought to the suggestion you made to me regarding residence at the Cathedral for a time.
A. That's right.
Q. Then he says:

I have decided that $I$ would feel much better and $I$ would prefer to remain here at Branxton.
A. That's right.
Q. Does that detail, recorded by Fletcher after the visit in a note of thanks to you, evoke memories of the kinds of things that were discussed when you and the bishop went up there around 20 June 2002?
A. Yes, and --
Q. Do you want to look at paragraph 9 of your Fox statement as well?
A. Yes. Yes, paragraph 9 of the statement I made to Detective Fox:

It was either the 20th of June or the
following day ... the Bishop discussed with
Jim that there was a police investigation and asked if he would like to be relieved while this was occurring.

That's right.
Q. Is it fair that it was an invitation to be relieved rather than some direction that he ought to take leave? A. My recollection would be that the bishop wanted to remove him, but Jim wanted to stay and the bishop, as it were, say relented. That's my - as close as I can get to it.
Q. I want to ask you, can you remember of your own memory who the principal was of the infants school at Greta and the primary school at Branxton back in 2002?
A. It probably was Will Callinan, yes. Yes, that's --
Q. Thinking about Will Callinan --
A. Yes, go on.
Q. -- and that visit of the bishop and yourself to Fletcher around 20 June 2002, do you have any memory of either you going to see Will Callinan or the bishop going to see Will Callinan or both of you going to see Will Callinan on that trip?
A. I can't recall going, my going or the bishop's going, but that's not denying it had happened, but I can't recall immediately.
Q. Do you now remember or are you able to summon up any discussions or memories of discussions about whether Fletcher ought to stay serving as a priest at that time? A. Discussions with Bishop Malone, do you mean?
Q. Yes.
A. I can't recall; no, I can't recall discussions. We could well have discussed it, of course, but $I$ can't recall.
Q. Did you ever come to you understand that Peter Gogarty had come forward as a victim of Father Fletcher?
A. I certainly know it now. When I was first aware of it, I wouldn't know.
Q. Another victim came forward in 2004, who goes in this Commission by the pseudonym [AB]. Do you know who I'm talking about?
A. No, I don't think so.
Q. Just have a look at this document and have a look at number 1 on the list.
A. Okay. Thank you.
Q. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know who I'm talking about?
A. Oh, I don't know the person.
Q. No, but you --
A. The name, I --
Q. While you were the vicar general you came to know that a person with that person's actual name had come forward complaining that he'd been abused by Fletcher?
A. I couldn't - I can't recall that now, no.
Q. Okay. It doesn't ring a bell at all?
A. No. The name rings a bell, but where that comes from, I don't know.
Q. The fact of somebody, apart from the original victim [AH], and apart from Mr Gogarty, the fact of somebody else coming forward in 2004 is something you remember?
A. No, I can't remember - well, whether I could remember it in - do I remember it now going back to 2004? No.
Could I - could I have been aware of it then; is that --
Q. Perhaps we could do it this way: you remember going to Fletcher's committal hearing; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. You didn't go to his trial?
A. I didn't go to the trial, yes.
Q. You now know that you didn't go to his trial, though, I gather?
A. Yes, I definitely didn't go to the trial. Yes, that's right, I didn't go to the trial.
Q. You remember the fact of him being convicted?
A. Oh, yes, I remember he was convicted, yes.
Q. What I'm exploring with you is: there was a time when there was one known victim?
A. That's right.
Q. And Fletcher was defending the charges?
A. That's right.
Q. Did you have a view back then about whether it was likely, probable, definite, questionable, whether he was guilty when there was one victim?
A. My original view was that he wasn't guilty.
Q. I think the position is you absolutely accept the genuineness of the verdict that was entered against him; is that fair?
A. I certainly accept - "absolute" is a very high and a very --
Q. I might be overstating it. I don't want to overstate it.
A. Yes.
Q. What is your position in terms of your acceptance as to whether Fletcher was guilty or not?
A. I think as you people would say, beyond reasonable doubt.
Q. What I'm examining with you is that, as vicar general, was there a time when it started to look like there was more evidence against Fletcher than had been first thought? A. That's right.
Q. Suggesting to you that it would have been pretty remarkable that another victim came forward in relation to Fletcher, and are you saying you don't have a recollection of that being an event that happened while you were vicar general?
A. Oh, yes. You were mentioning a name. I couldn't and that name rings a bell. Whether that was the person concerned we're talking about, that I don't know.
Q. We might be as cross-purposes. You have a challenge about being able to identify --
A. A person.
Q. -- a person?
A. Yes, that's right, but I was aware later on that there were further allegations, yes.
Q. That's the thing I thought you didn't have a recollection of.
A. No, no, no, that's right. Oh, yes, I was aware of
that.
Q. Do you remember as part of your duties as vicar general being obliged to contact the CCER organisation in relation to that new victim coming forward?
A. I don't remember that.
Q. What I want to do, in fairness to you, is have you you remember I went through an exercise where I had you read some minutes even though you weren't at the meeting? A. Yes.
Q. I want you to read something that is somebody else's record about a communication with you?
A. Yes.

MR HUNT: You're going to have to forgive me, Commissioner, I've lost my tag number. It is tab 415 of --

MR GYLES: Volume 6.
MR HUNT: -- volume 6. I thank my learned friend
Mr Gyles for his mastery of the brief and, of course, the diocesan records.

THE COMMISSIONER: Well done, Mr Gyles.
MR HUNT: Q. Father, in fairness, I haven't shown you this document this morning, so would you just take your time. You will see that the subject is Father Jim Fletcher?
A. Yes.
Q. It's an email from somebody in the CCER to personne1 at, at least the Professional Standards Office?
A. Yes.
Q. Take your time and read the material, if you would?
A. I think it's okay.
Q. You have read that?
A. I have glanced at it, yes.
Q. I don't want you to glance at it. I want you to read it, if you could. Take your time. There have been people who have been in that witness box for half an hour reading, so take your time to read it.
A. (Witness does as requested). Okay. See how we go.
Q. First, I'11 go through a number of propositions ad seriatim with you, if I might, father. The first is whether reading that email excites memory about the things that are described in it?
A. No.
Q. Was it within your responsibilities, as you remember them, that a call of the nature that's described would have fallen within your responsibilities; that is, to put THE CCER on notice about a further allegation about a priest? A. I couldn't imagine my doing that off my own bat, on my own initiative.
Q. It is something that would have been done at the delegation of your bishop?
A. Yes, I'd say so, yes.
Q. Is that because of the seriousness of the step that that's an important notification to make? Is that why you think that?
A. Yes, that's plausible, yes.
Q. The writer of the email reports to the people that he's communicating with:

Father Saunders wishes to contain the matter insofar as is possible and prefers not to provide even a dot-point report at this time.
A. Yes.
Q. Does that particular sentence remind you of either your attitude to this further disclosure or anything that the bishop might have instructed you about containing the matter?
A. No, it doesn't evoke any more memory.
Q. What about the reference to Father Glen Walsh in paragraph 2 as being in some way connected in terms of progressing the matter with Peter Fox? That's in relation to this new allegation or another allegation; does that refresh any memory? Do you have any --
A. I'm afraid not.
Q. Not even of G1en Walsh's involvement at all?
A. No. No. No.
Q. I've finished the questions I want to ask you about Fletcher.
A. Yes.
Q. I want to go back and ask you about that minute of the meeting of deans on 2 August 1995. You will remember that you gave some evidence that you thought that an application to remove faculties --
A. Faculties, yes.
Q. -- would be a preferable procedure to laicisation for a priest that was being delinquent in some aspect?
A. Yes. Well, yes, or a prior procedure, a first step.
Q. What I want you to accept for the moment is if you accept that in 1993 Father McAlinden's faculties had been removed by Bishop Clarke --
A. Righto.
Q. -- and that there was some suggestion that he was
failing to conform to that restriction by undertaking priestly activities --
A. Yes.
Q. -- would laicisation then be another step that might be considered?
A. Yes. Yes, it would.
Q. Can you remember at all any suggestion at any time in the 1990s of McAlinden having had his faculties removed?
A. No, I can't recall that now.
Q. I think it follows from that, you can't recall now whether there were suggestions about laicisation procedures?
A. I can't - I can't recall.
Q. Or other canonical procedures against him?
A. I can't recall.

MR HUNT: That's the evidence-in-chief, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much, Mr Hunt.

MS NEEDHAM: No questions.
THE COMMISSIONER: Nothing along the front row? Mr Cohen?

## <EXAMINATION BY MR COHEN.

MR COHEN: Q. Father, I would be grateful if I could take your memory back, to the extent that you have a current memory, to the events of 20 June 2002?
A. 20 June 2002, okay.
Q. Particularly the date that Detective Chief Inspector Fox, Detective Sergeant Fox as he then was, attended upon yourself and Bishop Malone at the offices of, I think, the chancery at Newcastle. Do you recall that day?
A. I do.
Q. Do you have a recollection of any particularity of the conversation that ensued? Please, if you don't, tell the Commission?
A. That's right, yes. My recollection would be, at that meeting, Detective Fox asked the bishop or suggested to the bishop that Fletcher should be removed. Now, I think it occurred at that meeting.
Q. Would it assist your recollection to see a document that is a record of the discussion of that day?
A. Very well, yes.

MR COHEN: Might Father Saunders be shown what is now exhibit 49, please, Commissioner. If that's of assistance. I'm sorry, what I don't have is an immediate cross-reference to the position in the bundle.

THE COMMISSIONER: I don't know if it is even in it.
MR COHEN: I'm not so sure myself. I must confess, Commissioner, I don't recall that it's in there.

THE COMMISSIONER: No, I don't think so.
MR COHEN: For the assistance of those at the Bar table, if they haven't already caught up, it is exhibit 49.
Q. Father Saunders, would it assist you to read that first? If you might do that, thank you.
A. Yes.
Q. Father, just before you embark on the detail?
A. Who are the "Hes" and the "Is" --
Q. I was about to indicate to assist you. This is a record of the day where there's a meeting involving yourself and Bishop Michael Malone, Detective Chief Inspector Fox --
A. Yes.
Q. -- and another detective senior constable, by the name of Ann Joy. Do you remember it involving those four people?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. The "I said" and "He said" are, respectively, Detective Chief Inspector Fox, "I said" --
A. Yes.
Q. -- and Bishop Michael Malone?
A. Oh, Bishop Michae1 is the "He said".
Q. Yes, save for one occasion where there's a cross-reference to you. On the second page, the short cross-reference is identified by "Saunders said" to assist you?
A. Right, okay.
Q. If I could ask you to read the entirety of the document and let the Commissioner know when you've had an opportunity to do that, and if you might read it --
A. Sorry, quietly.
Q. That is simply because, if you speak, the words will be captured on the transcript.
A. Okay, thanks.

MR HUNT: Commissioner, could I, not to interrupt what is happening, but to fill in a little time, indicate that there has been a request from the media for exhibits 111 through to 114 inclusive. Could those at the Bar table let me know of any difficulty when we break at 1 o'clock; otherwise they will be released very shortly thereafter. They're fairly unproblematic documents, I would have thought.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Hunt.

MR GYLES: While the document is being read, Commissioner, as to what the witness might take from the document, it may be appropriate that, in terms of context, he is told what the document is and who prepared it.

MR COHEN: I already have. I've already done that.
THE COMMISSIONER: I thought you did that, Mr Cohen
MR COHEN: I did.
THE COMMISSIONER: I believe, because Father Saunders, most perspicaciously said, "Who are the 'Is' and the 'Hes'?", Mr Cohen has told him those people and even indicated what is said to be what Father Saunders said as being on the next page. I think Father Saunders is aware of that.

MR GYLES: The question was, "Who prepared the document?"
THE COMMISSIONER: "Who prepared the document?" I'm sorry, from Gyles.

MR GYLES: I have said that in case there's some issue that's thought about that. I appreciate what you've just said to me about the individuals having been identified.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Excuse me, Father Saunders, if I could interrupt you, Mr Gyles has suggested that it be made to you that this document was prepared by Detective Chief Inspector Fox.
A. Thank you.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR COHEN: Q. Thank you, Father Saunders. This is certainly not a memory test, and memory is a fragile thing. Indeed, I have difficulty recalling what I had for breakfast this morning and perhaps --

MR HARBEN: I can't hear Mr Cohen.
MR COHEN: I beg your pardon.
Q. Father Saunders, do you object to any of the statements, the recordings, that are recorded within that document as unlikely or unattributed to persons, or do you have no recollection? What is your position, having read the document?
A. Substantially I would accept that. I would quibble with a couple of points, but substantially.
Q. The points with which you would quibble, are they of any moment or substance to you?
A. No, I don't think so. I thought it was I, for example, who asked Detective Fox whether we were legally obliged to remove Fletcher. I think the detective put that slightly differently; but, no, substantially not.
Q. Notwithstanding the emphasis of whether it was either yourself or Bishop Malone --
A. Yes.
Q. -- conceptually you don't object to the propositions that are contained within the document?
A. That's true.
Q. That's a fair statement to you?
A. It's a fair statement, yes.
Q. Can I ask you, in respect of your statement to the police - this is, for the purposes of those at the Bar table and the Commissioner, exhibit 52 - I believe you have that in the witness box with you; that is to say, your statement of 21 May 2003 given in police format to then Detective Sergeant Fox?
A. That's right, yes.
Q. Do you still have it with you in the witness box?
A. I have, yes.
Q. Could I direct your attention to it, particularly paragraph 4 in that statement. Do you see that in the third sentence of that statement in paragraph 4, you say:

After I took up the position as vicar general in 2001 Bishop Malone appraised me that there had been some vague assertions in relation to Father Jim Fletcher.
A. That's right.
Q. Is it possible that that was around about January of that year; that is, January 2001?
A. That's possible.
Q. Is it likely or is that a memory you don't have?
A. I took up the position on 1 January 2001, so, yes, that's possible, that's --
Q. It is likely?
A. That's likely; yes, likely, that's the word.
Q. Is that the first occasion, therefore, that you became aware of, if I can use, hopefully, a neutral term, concerns about Father Fletcher?
A. That is the first occasion.
Q. Can I ask you if you would look - again, this is still in paragraph 4, as I read your statement - at the top of the second page. For transcript purposes in exhibit 52, is the top of the page is marked page 2 and has, at the foot of the page, a reference 1038?
A. Yes.
Q. Just to help you identify it, do you have that page? Do you see at the very top it says page 2?
A. "I understand that these assertions were examined"?
Q. That's it.
A. That's fine, good.
Q. When you make the statement there your understanding was the assertions were examined but did not amount to anything significant, what exactly were you referring to as not amounting to significant?
A. I don't think I could improve about that - improve on that.
Q. That is to say, your recollection now is no better than it was at the time; is that what you mean?
A. That is true. That is true.
Q. So for the Commissioner's purposes now, those words convey whatever meaning can be divined from them now?
A. Yes.
Q. Can I ask you this question, please: having regard to
the position in what was June 2002, when you had this discussion with Detective Chief Inspector Fox - I'm sorry, I keep saying that, but then Detective Sergeant Fox?
A. That's right.
Q. At that time, June 2002, did you have an appreciation of the relevant child protection obligations that were imposed upon the diocese by the appropriate legislation?
A. I would - from - I wouldn't - I couldn't say now what I was aware of then, no. My instinct would be I wouldn't have been very au fait with them, but that's - that's as close as I can get to it.
Q. Is it fair to say a passing understanding, but nothing of substance or particular detail; is that what you mean?
A. That's what I mean, thank you.
Q. But you were aware that there were obligations that may be or were applicable and operative at the time?
A. Yes, but I would be hazy on the details.
Q. You've indicated that Bishop Malone was minded to stand Father Fletcher down?
A. Yes .
Q. I regret I don't recall the exact term you used, but the gist of it, I think, was he was talked out of it; is that the way you put it?
A. Not quite, no.
Q. He relented?
A. Relented is closer, yes.
Q. Was that relenting because of views that were brought to bear on Bishop Malone at the time, in your understanding?
A. No, I think he was - he accepted Fletcher's strong wish to stay at the parish.
Q. Is it your understanding that that was the predominant factor against all other factors at the time, that were being weighed in the balance, so to speak?
A. Well, yes, but we're trying to surmise what

Bishop Malone was thinking, but that's my - yes, my -
what's the word I want? That's my assessment of it.
Q. Your assessment having regard to what you knew and
what you saw and what you heard at the time; is that right? A. That's right.
Q. So it wasn't mere idle wondering by you; you had a positive process of thinking about these things and coming to that conclusion you just expressed now?
A. Yes.
Q. At the time in 2002?
A. Yes, as close as I can get to it now.
Q. You were taken to a document a little while ago by my learned friend Mr Hunt when he was taking you, through your evidence-in-chief, to use the phrase we employ. You were asked about a document that attributed to you a wish to contain matters and not even to reduce it to writing by way of dot points. Do you recall that document?
A. That's right.

MR GYLES: I object to this topic. This is not a topic that my learned friend, in the interests of Detective Chief Inspector Fox, should be able to embark on this. It has been dealt with by counsel assisting.

MR COHEN: With respect, it goes directly to it. The very document identified then Sergeant Fox. This is the document that's at tab 415. It is an email that was sent, apparently from the CCER to people involved in the CCER with the subject of Father Jim Fletcher. It identifies, amongst other things, allegations the subject of investigation by Peter Fox.

MR HUNT: I support Mr Gyles's position. The fact that the email mentions Mr Cohen's client doesn't, of itself, excite an interest that relates to his client. The reason it has some potential relevance to your determinations, Commissioner, is the witness's possible attitudes at that time to containing information about [AB]'s allegation to child protection notification agencies rather than matters that directly devolve in relation to Detective Chief Inspector Fox's then investigation. I can't see how --

THE COMMISSIONER: But, Mr Hunt, isn't it a matter that, putting aside whether Mr Cohen explores it, is relevant to my ultimate determinations; that is, what Father Saunders's attitude was at the time to containing matters?

MR HUNT: It is clearly relevant and that's why I asked Father Saunders some questions. The question is whether it is relevant to Mr Cohen's client's interests. My contention is, unless he can submit further as to why that is so, the fact that his client is mentioned as being in the text of the email doesn't do it. I think I cut across Mr Gyles, who I was agreeing with, but he might be saying some other things, but I --

MR GYLES: No, I don't say it is not relevant. It is a question of Mr Cohen standing to deal with it when it's already been dealt with.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Cohen, would you permit me to ask a question of Father Saunders?

MR COHEN: Certain1y, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Father, would you be so kind as to tell me whether it was true that you conveyed to these people at the CCER that you wished to contain the matter insofar as is possible and you preferred not even to provide a dot point report at the time? Do you have it there? Perhaps you don't.
A. It's here somewhere.

MR COHEN: It is document 415, Commissioner, if that assists, behind tab 415.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Father, the lady next to you will pass you the document.
A. Thank you. Yes. Thank you. Your question please, Commissioner?
Q. If I may refer you to the fourth paragraph in the body of that communication.
A. Yes. Very well.
Q. Father, are you able to tell us now whether it is true that you said to someone you wished to contain the matter insofar as is possible?
A. I can't recall the conversation I had. Therefore, I can't comment on my - what my thought processes were some nine years ago.
Q. Of course, but do you recall having a wish to contain the matter insofar as is possible at the time?
A. No. All I can go on is what's written there. I have no - I think you said - independent memory now of the conversation.
Q. Thank you, Father Saunders?
A. Thank you.

THE COMMISSIONER: I think that's about all we can do with it, Mr Cohen.

MR COHEN: Other than perhaps you might permit me this question, although I think I can hear the objections forming already.

THE COMMISSIONER: They can't hear you, so that might avoid it.

MR COHEN: Q. Father Saunders, does this attribution to you of a position, if $I$ can put it as neutrally as that, in 2004 reflect a cultural disposition in the diocese with regard to such matters?
A. About the --
Q. About the idea of disclosure of sexual offences by priests?
A. Oh, I see. It refers to "provide even a dot point report at this time." Well, it seems to me that I was reluctant to provide additional information to the CCER over and above what was already given to them, namely, that there was a further allegation. So "contain" - actually, these are not my words, they're someone else's words, I take it that I wanted to disclose as little as possible and let the police get on with their investigations and not for us to provide a blow-by-blow report of what was happening. That's my sense, just reading that there.
Q. But does that portray a view that you harboured at the time that it was better not to let the police know about these things?

MR GYLES: I object to that. This very communication is a communication to the authorities in respect of this new victim.

THE COMMISSIONER: In fact, the last answers from Father Saunders, Mr Cohen, indicate that precisely the opposite was true.

MR COHEN: Very well. I'11 come back to my question of a few questions ago.
Q. Was there a cultural disinclination within the diocese that, in your understanding, prevented or retarded communication of these things where it involved sexual offences committed by priests?
A. I couldn't say there was. No, that's - I'd have to reflect on that answer - reflect on that position.
Q. Reflecting, if you can, in the witness box now -A. Well, I might not be answering your question, but there was trouble when the bishop and myself went to see Fletcher and then the information was disclosed and there was trouble about that. So I suppose the attitude was if you're going to err on the side of giving information, less is better than more, and it was ourselves, vis-a-vis the CCER, so why would we be, as it were, obliged to supply a dot-by-dot report as to what was happening with the allegation.
Q. The trouble to which you referred in your last answer, I take it, was the controversy that arose out of Bishop Malone informing Father Fletcher of the identity of the complainant; is that what you meant?
A. That's right, yes, and I might be reading too much into that, but - okay.
Q. As to either of Father Fletcher or Father McAlinden, do you have any recollection of whether or not either of those priests were moved between parishes or to other locations?

MR GYLES: I object to the question. This has nothing to do with any dealings between Detective Chief Inspector Fox and Father Saunders.

THE COMMISSIONER: That's true, isn't it, Mr Cohen? Are you perhaps restricting your inquiry to once your client was involved in --

MR COHEN: It was a lead-up question to that proposition, but I confess that I'm - perhaps this is the most neutral term - sensitive ground in this respect. I'm alive to the objections that are taken to me, as it were, poking my nose in. I don't propose it is anything other than to establish
a basis for asking a particular question, but I'm alive to the difficulty.

THE COMMISSIONER: It is about McAlinden and Fletcher and I expect you're asking Father Saunders about his time as vicar general.

MR COHEN: Yes, that's so.
THE COMMISSIONER: All right. I'll permit you to ask it.
MR COHEN: Let me set it up that way, Commissioner.
Q. Father Saunders, apart from a further period that you've identified when you were, as it were, relieving in the position, the standing role you occupied as vicar general was from 2001 to 2006; that's so, isn't it?
A. To the end of 2005 .
Q. Thank you very much. A five-year period essentially?
A. Yes.
Q. In that period, was it your perception that there was an accommodation of priests, particularly McAlinden and/or Fletcher, that they were moved around between parishes or perhaps to other locations to keep them out of sight?

MR GYLES: I object. This is not within my learned friend's leave; to the extent he has leave to appear in this part of the inquiry, this is not within that leave. He is not a general interrogator. This has been done to death, this point, with all due respect.

THE COMMISSIONER: I don't think that it was "necessarily keep priests out of sight"; that's not what you mean Mr Cohen, but to keep them away from current allegations.

MR COHEN: Q. The Commissioner, of course, is where she is because she puts things so elegantly. You understood the question, didn't you, Father Saunders? Did you catch what was --
A. Yes, I understood the question.
Q. Do you have an answer to the proposition in those terms?
A. That there was a culture of movement from one place to the other, I'm not aware --
Q. To avoid --
A. To avoid.
Q. -- the publicity that attended these things?
A. No. I can't comment about McAlinden, but Fletcher I wouldn't be aware of his being moved from one parish to another because of sexual difficulties, putting him to another place. I'm not aware that that was a modus operandi. May I refer back to this document for a moment?
Q. Exhibit 49?
A. That's right. So there was nothing I objected to, or something like that. I'm not asserting that that is accurate because I wouldn't - because of my memory with it. I'm not asserting either that it is inaccurate. There was nothing in it that I substantially objected to. How accurate the report was, I wouldn't be prepared to say, but there's nothing per se about that that I would object to.
Q. Is there anything in it that excites you to want to take issue with it, if I can put it hopefully on that neutral basis?

MR HUNT: I object to that. The difficulty with "take issue "is it is hard to know what it means, whether it means accuracy of transcription, accuracy of memory, accuracy of --

THE COMMISSIONER: I think Father Saunders has already mentioned the area with which he would quibble.
Q. But I don't think you could take it any further, could you, father?
A. That's right. I'm not asserting its accuracy or inaccuracy, but as such, I wouldn't quibble with it.

MR COHEN: Q. You would not assert, in the scale of these things, that it is outrageously wrong, I take it? A. Okay. I would say that, yes.
Q. Therefore, am I right to conclude, the next step is, is it substantially correct?
A. Whether it was substantially correct reporting, I don't know, but just simply reading it for the first time, there's nothing I would jump up about.
Q. In fairness to you, so it is very clear to all, I take it as a record of the events of the day of that meeting involving yourself, Bishop Malone, then Detective Sergeant Fox and Detective Senior Constable Joy, that is, for your purposes, a satisfactory account, is it?
A. Well --

MR HUNT: I object to that.
THE WITNESS: I can - yes, go on.
MR HUNT: Don't answer. The problem with "satisfactory" is, once again, it is hard to tell whether that's a satisfactory transcription. It sounds like a satisfactory way a conversation could have happened, notwithstanding that I don't remember the conversation. I don't think it adds to the evidence, frankly.

THE COMMISSIONER: I agree, Mr Hunt.
MR COHEN: I have no further questions.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Cohen. Ms McLaugh1in, do you have any questions?

MS McLAUGHLIN: I have no questions.
MR BARAN: I have some questions, but $I$ do notice the time.

THE COMMISSIONER: We will adjourn for an hour for 1 unch.
LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT
UPON RESUMPTION
<EXAMINATION BY MR BARAN:
MR BARAN: Q. Father, I want to ask you some questions about your general duties as the vicar general during your term. You told us today that part of the duties involved the disciplining of priests; is that right?
A. Well, in the end, that's after the bishop, of course, but if he was going to correct a priest, sometimes he might bring me along.
Q. So there have been these visitations from time to
time, where there could be some counselling or there would be some other issues discussed to correct something that had been done by a priest?
A. Yes.
Q. In answer to a question you were asked today about the attitude that you had about the conviction of Fletcher, you used the term "beyond a reasonable doubt"?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you remember saying that?
A. That I do.
Q. As at 20 June 2002, do I take it that, in addition to the term "beyond a reasonable doubt", you were also familiar with the term "the presumption of innocence"?
A. Yes.
Q. As a layperson, as at 20 June 2002, the presumption of innocence to you, I take it, meant that a person was assumed to be innocent unless they were proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt?
A. That's right.
Q. Something to that effect?
A. Yes, that's right.
Q. When you had the discussions with Father Fletcher on 20 June 2002 with the bishop, do you remember that this issue about the presumption of innocence was raised? A. No, I can't recall that.
Q. It was your view at the time, doing the best you can, was it not, that certain1y, as at 20 June 2002, there had been no charges laid against Fletcher at that time?
A. 20 June? I don't think so. They were pending.
Q. Yes.
A. Yes. Oh, no, certainly no charges. They didn't come along until months later.
Q. That's right.
A. That's right. That's right.
Q. Given that that was the position, did you form the view, doing the best you can, as at that time, that in terms of Fletcher, he was entitled to the presumption of
innocence?
A. Yes .
Q. Is it something that you may have discussed with the bishop?
A. We could have. I - no, sorry, go on.
Q. Can I take it to the next point?
A. Go on, yes.
Q. Certainly the police, via Detective Fox, had made reference to whether or not Fletcher should be stood down?
A. That's right.
Q. Did you have some discussions with the bishop about that particular issue?
A. No. I was at the meeting, of course, but I don't recall discussing the matter with Bishop Malone.
Q. Just so I'm clear, I'm not asking you to give me precise words or precise conversations?
A. No, that's right.
Q. Is it possible that the issue may have been raised, doing the best you can?
A. It's possible, but I'd say unlikely that we discussed that in any - we discussed it, leave it like that.
Q. Is this a fair comment, that as at 20 June 2002, the issues that had been raised by the police were issues that were discussed between yourself and the bishop?
A. Yes.
Q. And yourself in the company of the bishop and Fletcher?
A. Yes.
Q. Putting aside the police, was there any other external organisation at that time which was involved, to your know1edge?
A. To my knowledge, no.

MR BARAN: Thank you.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Baran. Mr Harben?

MR HARBEN: Q. Father, you were asked some questions about a document that was identified to you as being prepared by Detective Chief Inspector Fox?
A. Yes.
Q. Described as the "I said/He said" document?
A. That's right.
Q. I think you answered variously but I think - is this fair to say? - that you couldn't vouch for the accuracy of any of the specific words in the document but conceptually you couldn't disagree with most of its contents?
A. Well, I have very little recall of the contents of the meeting now and, therefore, to make a comment on its - the accuracy of that would be beyond my capacity. When I say I'm not questioning the accuracy, but $I$ just haven't sufficient memory to comment a lot - comment on it.

* Q. Does that mean that your comment about the document goes no further than to say that you have no recollection of the meeting, therefore, you cannot say whether any of those matters was discussed?

MR COHEN: I object. The evidence that fell from the witness earlier was not to that effect, and indeed, the line of questioning, I submit - I concede immediately I don't have the transcript - was to the contrary and that that proposition conceptually was adopted by the witness. This is an endeavour to undermine that and should not be permitted, having regard to the evidence that's already been received.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Cohen. Mr Harben, I will allow you to ask the question. It is important we have the best possible appraisal from Father Saunders of the material.

MR HARBEN: Thank you, Commissioner.
Q. Do you remember my question, Father Saunders?
A. No. You'd better repeat it, please.
Q. Perhaps I'11 re-put it, probably not in precise terms. A. Righto.

THE COMMISSIONER: Would you like it read back, Mr Harben?
MR HARBEN: Perhaps that would be easier, Commissioner, yes.
Q. Do you actually have exhibit 49, that document?
A. I haven't it with me. That's the one we're referring to at the moment.
Q. Yes?
A. No, I haven't.

MR HARBEN: Could the witness be given the document, please.
(Question marked * read)
THE WITNESS: I have a recollection, of course, of the meeting, but my recall of chapter and verse from that meeting would be pretty poor.

MR HARBEN: Q. When Mr Cohen asked - that's the gentleman in the front row - some questions before lunch, he used the word "conceptually" as to the contents of the document referring to your acceptance of it? Do you remember that? A. Go on, sorry.
Q. What I'm asking you is, for example - firstly, you understood the "I said" part of the document is referring to something being asked by Detective Chief Inspector Fox?
A. That's right.
Q. And the "He said"?
A. By Bishop Malone.
Q. By Bishop Malone unless otherwise stated?
A. That's right.
Q. One of the concepts, I want to suggest to you, that was discussed was the concept of Bishop Malone offering support to the family of [AH]. Do you remember that being discussed in a general way in that conversation?
A. At the meeting, no, I don't recall that.
Q. You don't remember that?
A. No, I don't recall that.
Q. Do you remember as a concept that Bishop Malone suggested to Detective Chief Inspector Fox that he must get on and do his job, of course; do you remember that?
A. No. It's plausible, plausible; but can I recall that?

No.
Q. When you say it's plausible, is that because it is your recollection at the time that Bishop Malone and yourself were being cooperative with Detective Chief Inspector Fox?

MR COHEN: I object.
THE COMMISSIONER: Perhaps you could just ask why is it plausible, Mr Harben and whether Father Saunders was being cooperative with --

MR HARBEN: I was going to come to that.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR HARBEN: Q. You, of course, for yourself, so far as you had any part to play in this conversation, were being cooperative with the detective chief inspector?
A. Yes.
Q. Is this the case: in terms of you travelling with Bishop Malone to see Father Fletcher earlier on, you were not attempting to hinder any investigation or the like?
A. Definitely not.
Q. From your discussions, I want to suggest to you, with Bishop Malone, whenever they took place, before that meeting with Father Fletcher, there was no suggestion that Bishop Malone was trying to hinder any police investigation?
A. No suggestion of that either.
Q. Would it be fair to say that Bishop Malone expressed to you at that time his concern for both Father Fletcher and the family of [AH]?
A. Could you repeat that question, please?
Q. Would it be fair to say that at that time

Bishop Malone expressed to you concern for both Father Fletcher and the family of [AH]?
A. Yes.
Q. Would it also be correct to say that one of the motivating concerns was the health of Father Fletcher, as known to you?
A. That's right.
Q. That health had been a concern for some time in your mind?
A. Yes, he had a serious - well, he had a stroke some years before.
Q. Would it be fair to say that that was a matter that you were aware from your conversations with Bishop Malone was something that exercised his mind?
A. Yes. I couldn't, once again, quote chapter and verse about that, but I say it would be highly likely.
Q. You were asked some questions about what was put to Father Fletcher about the allegation and you were specifically asked whether the detail of the allegation was put to Father Fletcher. Do you remember that question?
A. I do, yes.
Q. I think you answered in two ways, but the second answer you gave was something to the effect that it was about sexual abuse?
A. Yes.
Q. I want to suggest to you that there was no further detail than that; in other words, no detail of the precise acts that constituted the offence?
A. That is true. That is true.
Q. Do you have the document there? Would you turn to page 2. Do you see there are some words attributed to you?
A. That's right.
Q. Do you have a recollection, firstly, of you saying anything in the conversation with Detective Chief Inspector Fox?
A. Yes. My recollection is that I asked Detective Fox whether the bishop was required legally to stand down Fletcher.
Q. I see. You remember that being part of your inquiry? A. Yes.

* Q. I take it you asked that question as part of the process of the determination as to whether Father Fletcher needed to stand down?

MR COHEN: I object. The evidence earlier received is that that was not a question for this gentleman. It was a question for Bishop Malone alone. That question elides and conflates a series of propositions suggestive of this gentleman, this priest, having --

THE COMMISSIONER: Having the final decision.
MR COHEN: Yes.
THE COMMISSIONER: I don't think that's necessarily the case. I'll permit the question.

MR HARBEN: Thank you, Commissioner. Could the question be read, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Harben. It takes just a minute to bring it up.
(Question marked * read)

MR HARBEN: Q. Is that correct, Father Saunders?
A. I'm sorry, I missed that question.
Q. The Commissioner is going to read my question.
A. Oh, yes, please.
(Question marked * read)
THE WITNESS: Yes, yes, that's right.
MR HARBEN: $Q$. That was some positive input you had into the conversation that you remember?
A. That's right, yes, that's right.
Q. I think you said earlier that your position was that the bishop would speak to you about various things including disciplining of the police --
A. Disciplining of --
Q. Disciplining of the priests?
A. Of priests, yes.
Q. Is this the case: the final decision on those matters rested with the bishop?
A. That's true.
Q. But you were from time to time called on for input in terms of advice to a assist with that decision-making process?
A. That's right.
Q. When the trip was made to see Father Fletcher, I think you said your understanding was that Bishop Malone was going to ask Father Fletcher to stand down - that is the second trip?
A. That's the second trip. That's true.
Q. Indeed, in effect, that's what he did, isn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. After a discussion with Father Fletcher, there was some change to that?
A. Yes.
Q. That Bishop Malone made?
A. Yes.
Q. This second discussion took place at Branxton, didn't it?
A. That's right.
Q. It is the case, isn't it, that after that discussion with Father Fletcher where he indicated he didn't want to stand down, Bishop Malone went over to the school to see the school principal? Do you remember that now?
A. No. It's - I think Bishop Malone said he went over. I can't recall that. I'm not denying that he went over, but I can't recall his going over.
Q. In any event, the second trip to see Father Fletcher was undertaken by you and Bishop Malone; that's right, isn't it?
A. That's right.
Q. Is that right?
A. Yes, that's right, sorry.
Q. It was not undertaken by you and Bishop Malone and Father Burston?
A. I don't recall Father Burston being there.
Q. When you were shown the document, the "I said/He said" document, which is exhibit 49, other than evoking a memory of the concepts, did it jog your memory as to the precise words that were used in the conversation or not?
A. Having read this document?
Q. Yes.
A. No.
Q. You have been taken to your statutory declaration?
A. Yes.
Q. Which is the second of the documents that you completed. I'm sorry, do you have that there?
A. I do.
Q. Down the bottom, as part of paragraph 9, you include some words in quotation marks.
A. Yes.
Q. Defining them as words being said "to the effect of"?
A. That's right.
Q. Can I take it, then, that those weren't the - first of all, you're not saying that they were the exact words?
A. No, but as close as I can get.
Q. Something to the --
A. To the effect, yes.
Q. Similar to that effect?
A. As close as I can get as a summary, yes.
Q. You're not suggesting, are you, that that's the only thing that was said in your trip to Branxton?
A. Oh, no, no.
Q. The trip to the Branxton is about 40 minutes or so?
A. Yes, that's - well more than that really.
Q. When were you first asked to recall any words that were spoken on that trip to Branxton?
A. When I was interviewed by Detective Fox on the 20th where is it? On 21 March - May, 2003.
Q. I see. When you refer to those "words to the effect of", are you saying that those words, to your observation at least, were said as part of Bishop Malone's concern for Father Fletcher?
A. That's right.
Q. So that we have it clear, which car trip are you talking about that those words or words to that effect were used?
A. I'd say the first trip.
Q. You were asked some questions about 2005, coming into possession of some information about Father McAlinden in your capacity or whatever capacity you had in the diocese at the time?
A. That's right.
Q. Just looking at your CV, as it were, firstly, is it the case that once you were ordained a priest, from then on you have been part of the Maitland-Newcastle diocese?
A. That's right.
Q. And stationed in various places in the diocese?
A. That's it, yes, that's right.
Q. So you've had a long association with the diocese?
A. I have.
Q. From the time you were parish priest, did you then advance through the ranks, as it were?
A. Well, I wouldn't quite put it that way.
Q. Is a parish priest different from a vicar general? A. Well, a vicar general may be a parish priest. A vicar general is to assist the bishop in the governance of the diocese. A parish priest governs, if I can use that word, his own parish; whereas vicar general has a more general role for the diocese.
Q. And that role, correct me if I am wrong, enabled you to liaise with the bishop on a regular basis?
A. That's right.
Q. Indeed, that's what you did it in the years you were vicar general?
A. That's right.
Q. Before you became vicar general did you have another title? Was it dean or --
A. I think I was a dean for a short time when I was up at Bulahdelah parish. Before that I was parish priest.
Q. You were dean of the --
A. Myall deanery, I think it is.
Q. Myall deanery?
A. That's right.
Q. What about the Northern deanery?
A. Northern, yes, the same - yes, the same area.
Q. What geographical area is the Northern deanery?
A. Bulahdelah, Taree, Forster, Gloucester.
Q. Is a dean different from a parish priest?
A. A dean has a supervisory role over various parishes and various - and within the deanery there would be perhaps seven or eight priests most of whom would be technically parish priests, but they are different roles. The dean has a - would be usually a parish priest, but he has a supervisory role over his particular area.
Q. Because of that supervisory role, is that why the deans met together with the bishop from time to time?
A. That's right.
Q. To discuss the business of the diocese?
A. That's right.
Q. That discussion would include many things including matters of discipline relating to priests?
A. It could.
Q. And matters of conduct relating to priests?
A. Yes. That's more, however, the role of the diocesan consultors rather than the dean. The dean is more in the capacity of a pastoral person.
Q. Do you remember you were shown some minutes of a deans' meeting this morning?
A. I was.
Q. You were at that meeting?
A. Yes.
Q. That's a meeting that you could see from the minutes where particular priests were discussed?
A. Yes.
Q. That's the sort of thing that you had been doing from time to time in your capacity as a dean?
A. Yes.
Q. In relation to McAlinden, you said that, having come to that information about his whereabouts, you reported it to the police?
A. As I recall, yes.
Q. I take it that you did that because you had some knowledge of an inquiry by them or a need for that to be done?
A. Yes, and the bishop was absent then.
Q. But regardless of whether the bishop was absent, you must have had some knowledge about the need to pass that information on to someone?
A. That's right, yes.
Q. You would have had that knowledge because of your position in the diocese?
A. That's right.
Q. I take it that, having had that knowledge and becoming aware of that information, you passed it on as soon as you could?
A. That's right.
Q. You weren't aware of any efforts to hide that sort of information from anybody?
A. No.

MR HARBEN: Yes. Thank you.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Harben. Mr Gyles?

## <EXAMINATION BY MR GYLES:

MR GYLES: Q. Father Saunders, with respect to a number of the answers that you've given, you have not been able to recall certain events?
A. That's right.
Q. Including events of the 1990s and back through the 1980s and 1970s?
A. That's right.
Q. Is a lack of memory something that you've suffered from?
A. Yes, memory can be a very strange thing. Some part of the memory is good enough I think, but recaling events that happened in the past, often a poor recall.
(Transcript suppressed from page 1212, 1 ine 12 to page 1213, 1 ine 20)

MR GYLES: Q. You were asked some questions about this document at tab 451, Father Saunders; do you recall that? A. I do.
Q. As I recall your evidence, particularly when the Commissioner asked you about the fourth paragraph, you were not able to recall by way of independent recollection what was in your mind at the time that you wrote that?
A. That is true.
Q. Then you were asked some additional questions about it by Mr Cohen; do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. You were asked essentially as to what you might have been intending by the use of those words?
A. Yes.
Q. To be fair to you, Father Saunders, can I please try to put this document in its context and can I take you back to the previous document in the bundle. Would you go back to 414. This may allow you to have a better understanding of what you might have been thinking at the time. The document at 415 is not your document?
A. Right.
Q. But you can assume that it is a file note prepared by Bishop Malone? Do you see that?
A. I see that, yes.
Q. What it says is that, the first sentence:

Father Jim Saunders phoned on a mobile at approximately 9.00am today.

Do you see that?
A. That's right, I do, yes.
Q. Bishop Malone was on his way to a funeral in Sydney and you were saying to him that Father Glen Walsh wanted to speak with Bishop Malone. Do you see?
A. Yes .
Q. Is it the case now you don't have an independent recollection of that conversation?
A. That is true.
Q. For the purpose of the contextual background to what's reported as to what you said to Mr Batty, can you assume that that happened?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you assume that the position was that Bishop Malone then spoke to Father Walsh?
A. That's right. He's got it here.
Q. It was reported to him that "Glen", ie, Father Walsh, was able to persuade "him", that is, the victim, to allow Father Walsh to go to the police on his behalf?
A. Yes.
Q. And that Father Walsh was to do that after the conversation and at the urging of Bishop Malone, do you see?
A. Very well, yes.
Q. You can assume that that was the position as well -A. Righto.
Q. -- that this matter, the matter that had come to the attention of Father Walsh and had been passed on through you to the bishop, was something that was being passed on to the police on 27 April 2004?
A. That's right.
Q. If you go to the bottom of the file note, you will see that Bishop Malone recalls that he phoned you and asked you to report the allegations to the CCER?
A. I see that, yes.
Q. Again, I'm not calling upon your independent recollection. Could you assume that that happened and you were asked to get in contact with the CCER?
A. Yes.
Q. If you go forward to tab 416, which is the document after the email, we can see that, on that very day, 27 April 2004, Bishop Malone sent to the CCER, attention Mr McDonald, a child protection information detail Ombudsman Act 1974 form. You see that?
A. That's right.
Q. And that's a document which you see is about an eight-page document which is attached to the facsimile of Bishop Malone; do you see that?
A. I see that.
Q. That is a document, do you see, that Bishop Malone, on 27 April 2004, sent on to Mr McDonald; right?
A. Yes.
Q. You see that the document itself, being the attachment, the eight-page standard form notification, was in fact prepared by Bishop Malone. Do you see that?
A. Yes, I see that.
Q. You see in it there are various references to the matter, ie, the complaint by this victim having been reported to the police?
A. Yes.
Q. And reference being made, for example, on page 1122 and 1123 at the bottom, to Detective Sergeant Fox of Maitland police being the name of the police officer that was handling the matter?
A. Yes .
Q. Can I suggest to you this sequence of events was that, you, having been asked by Bishop Malone to make contact with the CCER to report this new complaint --
A. Yes.
Q. -- obviously on that day Bishop Malone was able to have access to the relevant piece of paper, the relevant disclosure form, to provide to the CCER?
A. That's right.
Q. We see from the email from Mr Batty of the CCER that you had made contact with him?
A. That's right.
Q. Would it be consistent with your understanding with the way things would have worked in terms of reporting that it is likely, as a consequence of your telephone call, the form which Bishop Malone filled in was provided to you?

MR COHEN: I object. We haven't yet got to the level of understanding. If a serious proposition is being put, my friend should start with an assumption and work through a series of documents.

MR GYLES: I'm happy to do it on the basis of assumption.
MR COHEN: But I maintain my objection: there is still no basis for any understanding.

MR GYLES: This is outrageous. My learned friend has put to this witness, with no context at all, what he thought when he wrote this letter. When one sees the context of it, it is not only beyond criticism, it is entirely helpful in terms of what was being provided. It is a matter of fairness to this witness, who cannot recall what was in his mind, and we should put this in context, to be fair to him. My learned friend has opened up this question and at the moment --

THE COMMISSIONER: Continue, Mr Gyles.
MR GYLES: Thank you.
Q. First of all, you can assume that obviously this form was in Bishop Malone's hands on 27 April 2004?
A. That's right.
Q. And it was provided to the relevant authorities on that day?
A. Yes.
Q. If one accepts the email from Mr Batty as being
accurate, you rang Mr Batty?
A. That's right.
Q. On that day?
A. Yes.
Q. And reported that there was another allegation relating to Fletcher?
A. That's right.
Q. The CCER requested to be kept informed of the progress about that?
A. That's right.
Q. The means by which the CCER was to be provided with the initial information was the form that Bishop Malone filled in?
A. Righto.
Q. That's correct, isn't it?
A. Well, yes.
Q. Could you assume, please, that the sequence of events was that, as a consequence of your telephone call to Mr Batty, this form arrived on 27 April to be filled in? A. Righto. Very well.
Q. Can you also assume that the position was, as at the time you telephoned Mr Batty, the first assumption you can make is that you had not yourself spoken to Father Walsh about this new victim?
A. No, I can't recall speaking to Father Walsh.
Q. You can assume that you didn't; all right?
A. Yes.
Q. Secondly, you can assume that you yourself hadn't spoken to the victim at this stage?
A. That's true.
Q. Can you assume the extent of your knowledge of this matter was that you had received a message that Glen Walsh wanted to talk to the bishop about something?
A. That's right.
Q. And that that discussion had taken place without you but you were then asked by the bishop to get in contact
with the CCER to enable the relevant notification to be made?
A. Very well.
Q. On those facts, the position was, wasn't it, at the time that you had your conversation with Mr Batty, that you simply were not in any position to provide any detail about the circumstances of this victim?

MR HUNT: I object to that. It is clear that what is being put in this form to the witness is something that's available to my friend in submissions, but asking him to accept a whole lot of propositions from the documents and then asking him to draw a conclusion as to what would have been his actual state of knowledge, I think is one bridge too far. Clearly the submission is available, but I would object to the utility of dealing with it in this way given the witness's professed lack of memory about the whole thing.

MR GYLES: In my respectful submission, I am perfectly entitled to do this because he was asked what his state of mind may have been by Mr Cohen and he has given an answer and it wasn't in context. If it turns out that the context I'm putting is not - I accept that, in submissions, this context will need to be made good or at least made good as a possible or even probable scenario.

MR COHEN: Might I be heard on that? It is being asserted that $I$ didn't put anything in context. With great respect, that's exactly what I did when I took the witness to the document that's behind tab 415. I took him to the paragraph in the document and then asked him what his understanding at the time was. This reconstruction that's going on is simply not a proper basis to assert that I put something that wasn't justified.

THE COMMISSIONER: Very well, Mr Cohen, you put it in some context. Mr Gyles is putting it in greater context; is that right?

MR GYLES: That's correct. I'm just trying to be fair to the witness.

THE COMMISSIONER: Do you apologise to Mr Cohen for saying he put it in no context?

MR GYLES: Yes, I apologise for that.
MR COHEN: I'm indebted to my friend.
MR GYLES: I'm trying to be fair to the witness, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Gyles, I will permit you to ask the question and I take your point that all of the assumptions would have to be made good ultimately.

MR GYLES: Yes.
Q. If that was the extent of your knowledge, whatever was said to you, my question was that you were in no position to provide any detailed information to the CCER about this particular victim, were you?
A. No, I wasn't in a position.
Q. When it came to fill out the form, you weren't the one who did so?
A. No, I didn't fill out the form.
Q. In terms of another context, this was April 2004?
A. Yes.
Q. You will recall that, in June of 2002, you and Bishop Malone had gone to the Branxton presbytery and had the conversation or the meeting with Jim Fletcher?
A. That's right, yes.
Q. It was apparent, wasn't it, by 20 June 2002 that Detective Chief Inspector Fox was very critical of you and Bishop Malone for having done that?
A. That's right.
Q. Because he was telling you that that may have impeded the work that he was doing with respect to the investigation that he was undertaking?
A. That's right.
Q. And not only did Detective Chief Inspector Fox make that clear to you in terms of the criticism he was making, but in fact that matter had been the subject of a complaint, hadn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. Doing the best you can, is it likely in that context that would you have been very concerned at this time not to trample across what Detective Chief Inspector Fox was doing on this very investigation?
A. That's true.
Q. Because that was the thing you had been criticised for in respect of the first Fletcher investigation?
A. That's right.
Q. In that context, can I suggest to you that the containment of the matter that you refer to could possibly have been referring to you wanting to leave the matters of investigation of this matter to Detective Chief Inspector Fox?
A. Yes.

MR COHEN: I object. Commissioner, that's uniquely a question for you.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Cohen, in fact, Father Saunders had adverted to that very response earlier in his evidence, so I will permit Mr Gyles to pursue that.

MR GYLES: Thank you.
Q. What I was putting to you was that it was entirely possible that your use of the word "containment of the matter" may have been containing it in a way to ensure it didn't impede upon what Detective Chief Inspector Fox was doing?
A. May I just make an observation there? "Containment" is not necessarily my word either.
Q. That's a very good point. Thank you.
A. I didn't write the report.
Q. What I'm putting to you or suggesting to you is that given the criticism that had been made in respect of the previous investigation, you would have been very sensitive to doing anything with respect to this victim --
A. That's right.
Q. -- and you making your own investigations because you wouldn't have wanted to expose yourself to the same criticism you'd been exposed to previously?
A. That is true. That is true.
Q. In effect, what you might have been doing here --

MR HUNT: I object at this point. The proposition has been put four times. The witness has accepted it four times. I think point has been made.

THE COMMISSIONER: I think so, Mr Gyles, thank you.
MR GYLES: Q. You spent two periods of time as vicar general, one in the role on your own and at another short period --
A. Not exactly on my own. Father Bill Burston was also a vicar general when I was vicar general in the first instance; in other words, there were two of us.
Q. Whether there was one or two of you, practically speaking, you would understand that role to essentially involve from time to time attending meetings with the bishop --
A. That's right.
Q. -- as I think you've told us. You may also from time to time be a confidant of the bishop and be there to discuss and provide input into matters the bishop wanted to discuss with you?
A. That's right, yes, sorry, yes.
Q. From time to time you would become aware of information which was relevant which you would pass on to the bishop as part of the role?
A. That's right.
Q. For example, you said sometimes you saw people yourself and if there was something relevant, you would then pass it on to the bishop?
A. That's right.
Q. Where the bishop made a decision that something had to be done or would delegate a task to you, then you would action that task?
A. Mmm, that's right.
Q. Did you agree with that?
A. Yes, sorry, I did.
Q. Matters such as the decision that was made which
you've spoken about to where Fletcher was left in his role during the course of the police investigations, that was typical of a matter in which you may have provided some input in terms of that decision, but ultimately that was a matter for Bishop Malone?
A. That's right.
Q. Indeed, it wasn't your idea to go to the Branxton presbytery when you went there. You went to accompany Bishop Malone?
A. That's it.

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

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Gyles.
MR HUNT: Nothing arising, thank you, Commissioner. Could the witness be excused?

THE COMMISSIONER: Father Saunders, thank you so much for coming here to give your evidence. You are excused, thank you.

THE WITNESS: Thank you, Commissioner.
<THE WITNESS WITHDREW
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Kell?
MR KELL: Commissioner, I call Father Bill Burston.
<WILLIAM JOHN BURSTON, sworn:
[2.54pm]
MR GYLES: Commissioner, could it be noted the witness takes the section 23 protection.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Gyles.
<EXAMINATION BY MR KELL:
MR KELL: Q. Father, your full name is William John Burston?
A. Yes.
Q. You are a Catholic priest incardinated to the Maitland-Newcastle diocese?
A. Yes.
Q. You presently hold the position of parish priest at Mayfield?
A. Yes.
Q. You have been a priest of the diocese for over 40 years?
A. Yes.
Q. Father, can I hand to you a history of appointments document and a copy to the Commissioner. I'm going to start with some matters of background and your appointments and then we'll fill some of the picture in. You began training as a Catholic priest in about 1958; is that correct?
A. Correct, yes.
Q. In December 1963 you were ordained as a priest?
A. Yes.
Q. That happened in Rome, did it?
A. Yes.
Q. But you were ordained and incardinated to the Maitland-Newcastle diocese from that time?
A. Yes.
Q. And then undertook studies in Rome?
A. Yes.
Q. You have a degree in psychology?
A. Yes.
Q. From University College Dublin?
A. Yes.
Q. And also a masters of psychology?
A. Yes.
Q. From the same institution?
A. Yes.
Q. That was completed in about 1970?
A. Yes.
Q. As part of your skill-set, as it were, for the
diocese, you have provided psychological services from time to time?
A. Yes.
Q. We'll come back to that in a moment. Could I just ask, in terms of your studies and training in psychology, did any of that involve or touch upon issues relating to awareness issues relating to the sexual abuse of children?
A. No, I didn't, no.
Q. Not back in the 1960s?
A. Not back in the 1960s.
Q. Do you continue to be a qualified psychologist?
A. No, I've let the registration lapse for the last 15, 16 years.
Q. So when did you cease being a qualified psychologist?
A. 1995 .
Q. 1995, thank you. In October 1970 you arrived in the diocese?
A. Yes.
Q. Was your first role as parish priest at Maitland?
A. No, assistant at Maitland.
Q. Assistant parish priest at Maitland, and that was in December 1970?
A. Yes .
Q. Then was it subsequently you were positioned at Waratah?
A. Yes.
Q. Was that also as an assistant parish priest?
A. Yes.
Q. Then Hamilton from October 1974?
A. Yes.
Q. Again was that assistant parish priest?
A. Yes .
Q. Then in 1975, you were appointed as a director of the Catholic Welfare Bureau?
A. Yes.
Q. That is the predecessor to Centacare?
A. Yes.
Q. You held that position, did you, for something like 21 years?
A. Until December 1995, yes.
Q. Could you tell the Commissioner whether that was a full-time position or a part-time position?
A. A full-time position.
Q. In that position with the Catholic Welfare Bureau did you provide psychological services or managerial type services?
A. A bit of both, yes.
Q. What was the nature of the psychological services you provided?
A. Usually individual counselling, yes.
Q. Who were the patients, as it were?
A. Whoever wished to come in, yes, there were no --
Q. Did that extend to including providing psychological services to priests of the diocese?
A. In theory, yes; in practice, no.
Q. Why no, in practice, if you're able to say?
A. I think it raises issues of being in the same diocese as the client, if you like. It makes it difficult, so --
Q. Thank you. At the same time as being a director of the Welfare Bureau, you remained incardinated as a priest of the diocese?
A. Oh, yes.
Q. You held particular positions, which we'11 come to, with the diocese at the same time?
A. Yes.
Q. Looking at the appointments document, as an example from June 1981, you held the position as one of the diocesan consultants?
A. Yes.
Q. That is on the second page there. It appears to have
a start date of 1 June 1981?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you able to tell the Commissioner how long for that period of time - that is the period starting June 1981 - you were a diocesan consultor?
A. Offhand, no. I'd have to look up or see records. I can't recall.
Q. Do you see immediately under it, it shows a further record of diocesan consultor commencing, it seems, on 1 January 1992?
A. Yes.
Q. And for a period of five years?
A. Yes.
Q. Looking at that second period, did you hold that position for about five years?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. From 1992 through to 1997?
A. Well, until the end of 1995 and the beginning of 1996, when I was appointed vicar general and automatically a consultor, yes.
Q. So that period of time you were a diocesan consultor under Bishop Clarke?
A. Yes.
Q. And then continued under Bishop Malone for a period of time until you became vicar general, which we'll come to?
A. Yes.
Q. Doing the best you can, that earlier period of time where you were a consultor in 1981, did that extend for a period of some years or was it a short appointment?
A. Without checking records, I'd say five or six years, but I'm not perfectly sure.
Q. Thank you. And then immediately under it there's an entry for "PP". Do we take that to be "parish priest"?
A. Yes.
Q. From December 1992?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that Mayfield West?
A. Mayfield West, yes.
Q. Mayfield West. So that was an appointment as a parish priest at the same time as you were the director of Centacare and at the same time as you were a diocesan consultor?
A. Yes.
Q. Then continuing through the appointments, is it the case that you were appointed vicar general for five years from 1 January 1996?
A. Yes.
Q. So that extends up until just the very beginning of 2001?
A. Yes.
Q. And that was all under the bishop-ship of Bishop Michael Malone at that point in time?
A. Yes.
Q. Immediately under it, it indicates you were a member of the Council of Priests for five years?
A. Yes.
Q. That commenced, did it, on January 2001?
A. Yes.
Q. Similarly, you were a dean of the Newcastle deanery for three years?
A. Yes.
Q. From January 2001?
A. Yes.

I'11 come back to some of those terms shortly, and, Commissioner, I tender that document, the appointments.

THE COMMISSIONER: The appointments of Father Burston in the diocese of Maitland document will be admitted and marked exhibit 115.

EXHIBIT \#115 DOCUMENT RELATING TO THE APPOINTMENTS OF FATHER BURSTON IN THE DIOCESE OF MAITLAND

MR KELL: Q. Father Burston, in your capacity as a
psychologist, we've come to understand that you've provided some psychological assessments for students for the priesthood; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. When did you do that?
A. 1971 until I think around about the mid-90s.
Q. The mid-90s?
A. Yes.
Q. So a period of over 20 years?
A. Twenty years, yes.
Q. Was that on a statewide basis or was that simply for this diocese?
A. For this diocese and on request from other parts of the country, yes.
Q. Was that directed at assessing the suitability of potential candidates for priesthood in the sense of a vetting process?
A. An assessment rather than a vetting, but, yes. Yes.
Q. To whom did you provide your assessments of various candidates?
A. To the bishop.
Q. The bishop of the particular diocese?
A. Of the particular diocese, yes.
Q. Were you involved in addition to that assessment in providing any teaching or training of new priests in terms of awareness issues in relation to the sexual abuse of children?
A. No, not that I can recall, no.
Q. Touching on one other matter that I think relates to your psychological skill-sets, could I ask you to go to volume 3 of the materials. On your right there, you'll see an ominous looking collection of seven folders. There should be one that's got volume 3 marked on it.
A. Right.
(Transcript suppressed from page 1228, line 45 to page 1230, line 19)
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Q. You mentioned that you were a member of the diocesan consultors --
A. Yes.
Q. -- for two periods of time - June 1981 and also for five years from January 1992?
A. Yes.
Q. Is it the case that the consultors were a body of priests that provided advice to the bishop of the diocese?
A. Yes.
Q. I wonder if you could expand on that for the Commissioner as to the role of the consultors in 1981 and 1992, the types of matters that were dealt with?
A. Basically, they're matters that the bishop refers to the group, perhaps appointments of priests, it may be other appointments within the diocese. Maybe - that seems to be the - at immediate recall, that's the most that I can come up with immediately, and basically what the bishop wants advice about.
Q. Regular meetings were held, were they, of the consultors?
A. At times irregularly - when the bishop called them.
Q. The bishop was always present to receive the advice
that was given?
A. As far as I recall, yes.
Q. Were matters of pastoral care relating to priests dealt with from time to time at the meeting of consultors?
A. They could have been, yes.
Q. Similarly, from time to time, issues relating to potential discipline of priests, was that the sort of thing that might arise or did arise from time to time at meetings of the consultors?
A. I can't recall it arising directly, no.
$\wedge$ Maybe to here end redaction
Q. Can I take you to a couple of minutes in volume 2 of the bundle. Could I ask you to turn to tab 121.
A. Yes.

MR KELL: Commissioner, I'm taking the witness to exhibit 31.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Kel1.
MR KELL: Q. You will see there that's minutes of the meeting of consultors held at the bishop's office on 2 January 1986?
A. Yes.
Q. You are indicated as being one of the five persons present?
A. Yes.
Q. You'11 see, if you quickly scan down the business of those minutes, that there are references to particular issues touching upon particular priests?
A. Yes.
Q. You will see, at about three-quarters of the way down the page, there's a reference to Father Denis McAlinden?
A. Yes.
Q. Seeming to be taking things quietly at Merriwa?
A. Yes.
Q. But having a problem with extreme cold?
A. Yes.
Q. If I ask you to jump to tab 128, you will see that
there are further minutes of 5 June 1986 ?
A. Yes.
Q. Again, you're indicated as being one of the persons present?
A. Yes.
Q. Along with Bishop Clarke on each occasion?
A. Yes.
Q. There's reference there, you'11 see, to discussion following and proposals being put forward in relation to what seems to be the location of particular priests at particular parishes?
A. Yes.
Q. Reverend Gahan at Merriwa and, at that stage, Reverend McAlinden at Adamstown?
A. Yes.
Q. Without wanting you to try to put your mind back to those meetings at this stage, is that indicative of the sorts of things that came up from time to time at the diocesan consultors' meetings?
A. Yes .
Q. In those situations, would the bishop be looking to advice from the consultors as to where particular priests might be moved or was it more a notification process?
A. Sometimes one, sometimes the other.
Q. If it were the case from time to time that priests were the subject of disciplinary action by the bishop, would that sometimes be, to your recollection, recorded in diocesan minutes - of consultors?
A. My recollection is not very clear on that. Sorry, I cannot answer directly on that. My guess is that the bishop - bishops didn't always bring those matters to consultors' meetings, they dealt with them separately, but I can't recall any occasion when that did come up, sorry
Q. You were a member of the Council of Priests for five years from January 2001?
A. Yes.
Q. Were you a member of that body at any earlier point in time, or not, that you can recall?
A. I was, but $I$ can't recall the timings, no.
Q. Perhaps if you could explain for the Commissioner in summary terms the distinction between the diocesan consultors and the Council of Priests?
A. Probably the basic distinction is that the Council of Priests was an elected body. The consultors were very often chosen directly by the bishop. Sometimes there was an overlap in personnel. Bishop Malone made the Council of Priests automatically his consultors, so there was total overlap. Bishop Clarke, I think, had a separate arrangement.
Q. Apart from the basis on which they were drawn, that is to say, one being appointments by the bishop and one being popularly elected, was it, by the priests of the diocese?
A. By the priests, yes.
Q. Were both bodies there to provide advice to the bishop?
A. Yes.
Q. And did they cover the same sorts of areas or was one related more to spiritual matters. It is hard to give a clear answer on that. It depends again what the bishop was asking for from each particular group.
Q. I want to ask you in general terms, and then we'11 come to the specifics, about whether you're able to indicate for the Commissioner when it was that you first, as best you can, recall there being any concerns in relation to Father McAlinden and proximity to children? A. Sorry, I cannot recall when I first heard that, no.
Q. We'll come to some documents shortly that deal with your role as vicar general.
A. Right.
Q. You're aware, I take it, from seeing some of those documents in more recent times, that you had a role in relation to action that was being taken against Denis McAlinden in 1996 onwards?
A. Yes.
Q. Putting that to one side, are you able to say. Working back from 1996 when you had that role, whether it was many years before that time when you first began to
hear of concerns relating to Father McAlinden? Are you able to assist us on that aspect?
A. I'm sorry, I can't. I cannot - I simply cannot remember.
Q. Do you think, doing the best you can, it was some period of time before then?
A. It could be, but, as I say, I can't recal1.
Q. Are you able to assist as to the context in which that came up, where - the source when you first heard that? A. No, I can't.
Q. Are you able to assist, if not the source, then the nature of the complaint that you first heard about Father McAlinden at that particular time?
A. I'm sorry but none of that - none of that comes back to mind, no.
Q. Father, doing the best you can, was it the case that Denis McAlinden was the first priest of the diocese that you became aware of as having presented a danger in terms of sexual abuse of children?
A. Sorry, would you mind rephrasing --
Q. Yes. At some point in time you became aware that there were concerns relating to - and I'11 just refer to him as McAlinden for ease of reference - McAlinden and the specific dangers that he posed for children?
A. Sorry, the question is whether that was the first sorry.
Q. I'm leading up to that. At some point in time, you became aware that McAlinden posed or was considered to pose potential dangers for children?
A. Right.
Q. You agree with that?
A. Yes.
Q. Without fixing that at a particular point in time, was McAlinden the first priest from the diocese that you had heard raise such potential concerns?
A. I think so, but I'm not perfectly sure. I think so.
Q. This is before the arrest of Vincent Ryan in 1995?
A. Sorry, I can't be perfectly precise about that.

I can't recall.
Q. But doing the best you can, you think that McAlinden was the first of the priests of the diocese of which you became aware there were concerns raised?
A. Al1 I can say is I think so, yes.
Q. Isn't the situation that if you think that is the case, that is more likely to be a date that might remain in your memory as to when that occurred?
A. I don't know. I'm sorry, I can't recall it, no.
Q. Just so it is clear for the Commissioner, you're doing the best you can to assist, are you, with your knowledge of McAlinden and the timing of knowledge of his potential dangers?
A. Yes.
Q. And you're not trying to distance yourself in any way from any knowledge or association relating to McAlinden?
A. No, I'm not.
Q. In 1996 you were appointed as the vicar general?
A. Yes.
Q. That was from 1 January?
A. Yes.
Q. You'd never been vicar general in the time of Bishop Clarke?
A. No.
Q. Is it correct that the control of vicar general is that, essentially, in some senses, you're the second in charge of the diocese; would that be a fair description?
A. In one sense, yes, but it depends on what - you know, depending on the particular bishop what the role is or the extent of the role.
Q. And sometimes described as being the alter ego of the bishop?
A. Well, that description is used, but I wouldn't always apply it.
Q. Can we narrow in, in terms of the role as it was applied in yours case with Bishop Malone. We will come to the specifics relating to McAlinden, but in terms of your
role as vicar general for Bishop Malone, what were some of the things that you did on a day-to-day basis as vicar general?
A. There were not a lot of specific things. We were together on a number of committees. I can't - honestly, I can't immediately think of any specific role, you know.
Q. Was it part of your role to provide day-to-day advice to the bishop about matters that could come up?
A. If he asked for it.
Q. Was Bishop Malone the type of bishop who did, in fact, ask for advice on a regular basis when you were vicar general?
A. We had regular meetings, yes; but whether you would call that asking for particular advice may be putting it a bit too strongly, to put it that way.
Q. Did you regard yourself as having a good working relationship with Bishop Malone when you were vicar general?
A. A reasonable working relationship, yes.
Q. As vicar general do you have physically have your own office in the chancery building?
A. Yes.
Q. Positioned somewhere close to the bishop?
A. Yes.
Q. When you came and started in January 1996, Monsignor Hart had been the previous vicar general?
A. He had, yes.
Q. Was there any handover from Monsignor Hart to you in terms of you stepping in and taking up the role?
A. No. Not that I recall, no.
Q. Was there any gap between vicars general or did you start immediately on the expiration of his term?
A. Yes, as far as I recall, yes, he finished on

31 December, I started on 1 January.
Q. When you say you don't recall whether there was any handover, you don't recall any particular discussions that you might have had with Monsignor Hart?
A. No.
Q. Putting to one side the text of any of those discussions, are you able to assist and tell us whether there was in fact some process where Monsignor Hart told you, "These are the matters that need attention" and "These are the files", for example, "that you need to take forward"?
A. No. No.
Q. You're confident that didn't happen?
A. I'm pretty confident that didn't happen, yes.
Q. So on your first day as vicar general, you come into the office and does the vicar general's office have files of particular matters that aren't under the carriage of the vicar general?
A. I don't think so. There was a filing cabinet there, but how much was in it I - I don't think there was very much in it at all. I think the files were generally kept el sewhere.
Q. Did you receive a briefing from Bishop Malone, then, in terms of the matters when you first arrived as vicar general?
A. "Briefing" is probably too strong a word. We certainly had discussion about it, but there was no - he did not provide me with a clear, precise, "This is what I want you to do."
Q. I might ask you to turn to volume 4, of the tender bundle, tab 283. I will ask you to quickly have a look at that, which is a letter from you to Denis McAlinden on 16 May 1996?
A. Yes.
Q. Father, was it the case that one of the matters that you were involved in from an early time as vicar general for Bishop Malone was corresponding with Denis McAlinden in relation to the potential laicisation of McAlinden?
A. Yes.
Q. If we just look at that letter there, you'll see that you've addressed it to McAlinden in an address in Tipperary, in Ireland?
A. Yes.
Q. You have addressed it "Dear Denis"?
A. Yes.
Q. Do we take it that McAlinden was a friend of yours?
A. Not by that address, no.
Q. No?
A. That would be a normal form of address for another priest in the same diocese.
Q. Can I ask this: had you known McAlinden from your time as a parish priest in the 1970s?
A. Not very well, no.
Q. Had you ever worked together at the same parish?
A. No.
Q. But you'd met him from time to time at diocesan functions?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you describe him, as at 1996, as being a friend of yours?
A. No.
Q. You say that with some force. You're nodding?
A. Well, he was not a friend. I would not have called him a friend, no.
Q. Just exploring that a little, was there any instance that occurred that you're able to assist the Commissioner with that gave you an insight into the personality of McAlinden prior to 1996 ?
A. An incident that occurs to me is, in a sense, a trifling one, but it was of some physical carpentry that he did in a certain church.
Q. When was that?
A. Oh, golly, late 1950s, I should think.
Q. Late 1950s?
A. Yes. I think it was late 1950s. When he asked a professional builder what he thought of the work and the professional builder reminded him that he didn't do a certain thing the proper way, McAlinden didn't speak to him after that. So he wasn't a - he was a difficult customer, I suppose.
Q. That was an incident where you were present, was it?
A. I think I was - either that or heard it immediately afterwards from the builder. I can't remember being - yes.
Q. The impression created was that he was a rude and overbearing man, was it, from that tale?
A. Well, he wasn't very happy being corrected.
Q. I think you referred to the late 1950s.
A. Yes.
Q. I think you told us that you came to the diocese in 1970?
A. No, hang on, I didn't. I returned to the diocese from studying overseas in 1970, yes, but I was born in the diocese.
Q. So this was at a time before you became a --
A. My recollection is, yes, yes. It was, yes, it was.
Q. Thank you. In the letter, if we just look at the letter of 16 May 1996, which is exhibit 108 --
A. Sorry? Exhibit?
Q. Tab 283?
A. Tab 283, but exhibit --
Q. Just tab 283.
A. Right. Got it.
Q. You indicate there:

Dear Denis,
As you know, with Bishop Michael's
succession to the diocese a new
Vicar General has been appointed, namely yours truly.

The bishop has also decided to continue with the case begun by Bishop Leo for your laicisation, and he has asked me to get in touch with some canon law advisers for you.

You indicate your understanding that he's still in Ireland using a particular address. You refer to a particular gentleman that's agreed to put him in touch with a canon
lawyer. You indicate at the end there:
I am sorry that our first contact after so
many years has to be about so sad a matter.
A. Yes.
Q. Are you able to assist us as to what the reference to "so sad a matter" is in that letter?
A. Well, that the bishop was seeking his laicisation would probably be the view that I came to.
Q. Rather than the reasons underpinning the laicisation?
A. Well, it could be. I don't know. The whole thing was
a sad matter, you know, both of them: I'm not distinguishing.
Q. And it was a sad matter because of the reasons underlying the move to laicisation included, as you understood, allegations that McAlinden had sexually abused children?
A. Yes.
Q. To be fair to you, if you turn to the next page, you'll see a note, I think, in your handwriting at the bottom - is it?
A. Yes.
Q. It says the original was returned unopened by Pat Hallinan, in an address unknown, and you've initialled that 22 July 1996?
A. Yes.
Q. Could I ask you to turn to tab 284, which is another letter from you of the same day.
A. Yes.
Q. Look at some of the correspondence that you've written at the time to see if it assists in jogging your memory as to the events at that time and the process that was being undertaken. You will see there that's a letter to the chancellor of the diocese of Dublin, addressed to, "Dear Alex" and in the first paragraph you refer to a telephone conversation you've had with him?
A. Yes.
Q. You thank him for so freely sharing his expertise and
experience in the matter?
A. Yes.
Q. Then you indicate:

The priest who we are having difficulties with is Father Denis McAlinden ...
A. Yes.
Q. And that he's now about 70 years old and you give reference to a particular contact address in Tipperary. Again, appreciating that it is some correspondence from a number of years ago, are you able to indicate what the reference to "having difficulties" with is in your letter? And just read the rest of it for context if you need to? A. I think one of the difficulties was in fact in contacting him, yes.
Q. Yes.
A. And the need for, you know - and getting him to cooperate with the process of laicisation.
Q. Is it your recollection that that became a continuing difficulty that you were facing in terms of the laicisation process with McAlinden?
A. Yes.
Q. That in a sense, in large part, it depended upon his cooperation?
A. Yes.
Q. And as correspondence eventuated, he wasn't willing to in fact cooperate with the process?
A. That's my understanding, yes.
Q. You will see in the next paragraph you indicate:

We are applying to have Denis dispensed from priesthood ...
A. Yes.
Q. Is that a reference to laicisation, as you understood it?
A. Yes.
Q. I think we will come to some correspondence that refers to withdrawal of the faculties for a priest?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you able to indicate to us the difference, if any, between the withdrawal of faculties and laicisation, as you understand it?
A. The withdrawal of faculties is a decision which the bishop can make to prevent a priest from functioning as a priest in his area because that's the - laicisation is simply applying to have the person returned to the lay state so that he's no longer a priest anywhere, any place.
Q. Is one difference that the removal of faculties can be reinstated by the will of the particular bishop at any point in time?
A. Yes.
Q. And also that it is directed at the public manifestations of being a priest?
A. Yes.
Q. Withdrawal of faculties doesn't prevent a priest from performing a private mass, for example?
A. It would depend on the way in which - on the particular decision or the way the bishop has applied it, but that can sometimes be the case, yes.
Q. Laicisation is a much more permanent state of affairs?
A. Certainly, yes.
Q. You indicate there that:
... I gather that the previous bishop ...
And that's a reference to Bishop Clarke?
A. Clarke, yes.
Q. "And VG"
A. Yes.
Q. And again, that's your reference, is it, to Monsignor Hart?
A. Yes.
Q. Continuing:
... were made aware that it is not the best way to go ...
A. Yes.
Q. Is that you referring to laicisation as being not the best way to go?
A. My recollection is that would be referring to bishop applying to have him laicised rather than the person applying for laicisation himself. It would be much harder - in those days within the church it was much harder for a bishop to have a priest laicised than it would be if the priest himself had applied for laicisation.
Q. Is your reference to a bishop applying for laicisation a reference to a bishop progressing or instigating a canonical process involving the priest?
A. Yes.
Q. Can I just ask whether you have any background in canon law?
A. No.
Q. Just the working knowledge of a priest working in a diocese?
A. It's a working knowledge, yes.
Q. Is your reference there that:
... the previous bishop and VG were made aware that it is not the best way to go, but in the circumstances thought it wiser to go down that path.

Do we take it that that's a reference that a decision had been made by Bishop Clarke that progressing a canonical forced process might be in some way problematic?
A. That's my understanding, yes, but I'm speaking for somebody else.
Q. And that it was better to see if McAlinden could be co-opted into voluntarily agreeing to leaving the priesthood by the process of laicisation?
A. Yes.
Q. And then you indicate:

I'11 let you know how we get on.
A. Yes.
Q. And there you're recording what you gathered to have been the view from the previous bishop and the vicar general. Sitting there now, do you have any recollection as to whether you shared the view that you've expressed in the letter, or whether it was simply that you were recounting what you understood to have been a decision that had been made?
A. I would say simply recounting a decision that had been made, yes.
Q. I will turn shortly to some correspondence that's later in time. Can we take it that when you became vicar general, Bishop Malone, do we understand, had given you the task of corresponding and dealing with McAlinden in relation to the laicisation? I think you've indicated that was the case.
A. Simply to get in touch with him and try to, yes, find out where he is and get him to - get himself a lawyer and get back to us, yes.
Q. Do we take it that to put yourself in a position to correspond with McAlinden and take charge of that matter, that you would have taken and did in fact take steps to look at what had been the previous correspondence dealing with McAlinden and this topic?
A. I would not describe myself as taking charge of the matter. I was simply trying to get in touch with him and find out where he was. I wasn't managing the matter.
Q. By that you're indicating, are you, that you were assisting the bishop with a particular task that he'd given to you?
A. Yes.
Q. In a delegated fashion?
A. Yes.
Q. As you understood it, the bishop remained involved in the process?
A. In the process, yes.
Q. Do you have any recollection now - and if you don't tell us - that the communications that I've just shown to
you were matters that you would have or did in fact show Bishop Malone at the time before they were sent?
A. I have no - I have no recollection one way or the other, no.
Q. Did you have a usual practice, in your time as vicar general, in sending out correspondence under the title "Vicar General", that you would, in a sense, clear those in a fashion with the bishop?
A. Not necessarily, no.
Q. What makes you resist the notion that you had taken charge of the McAlinden laicisation process? You're entitled to resist that but I'm just seeking to explore that.
A. Yes, because I didn't see that as the task I'd been given. The task I'd been given was simply to try to get in touch with him and get him to correspond, you know, to cooperate.
Q. And that's a task that had been given to you by Bishop Malone?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall now having particular discussions with Bishop Malone on that topic; not the exact words but the substance?
A. No, I can't recall, no. I don't say that that did not happen, but I can't recall.
Q. If you weren't the person who was taking charge, there was someone, was there, who had overall management of the steps being taken to laicise McAlinden?
A. I would presume that was the bishop, yes.
Q. It wouldn't be anyone other than the bishop?
A. I doubt it. It could have been but I doubt it.
Q. In the letter that's at tab 383, you address that letter to McAlinden at an address in Tipperary?
A. Yes.
Q. Could I just ask you to flick back in time to tab 277 of the bundle. I will give you a chance to read it. You will see there's a handwritten letter from McAlinden to Bishop Malone dated 27 February 1996 ?
A. Yes.
Q. You will see that there is some commentary from McAlinden and then there's a reference to:
[That he] ... would like to advise that any correspondence could be sent there [to him] to the following temporary address.
A. Yes.
Q. And there is an address given there that is the address at Tipperary?
A. Yes.
Q. You will see that that's the same address that you've used in your letter of 16 May 1996?
A. Yes.
Q. And McAlinden answered the letter by saying:

I have already arranged with Father Pat to collect any mail.
A. Yes.
Q. Does looking at that letter now give you any degree of confidence that you would have had to look at this letter at least for the purpose of knowing the particular address to send mail to McAlinden?
A. Not necessarily. The address may well have been in the office.
Q. When you say "in the office", it would be in a file relating to McAlinden matters?
A. It could be. It could simply be in a list of addresses, contacts points, yes.
Q. You can see there that, as at February 1996, he's indicating that this is a temporary address to be used for the moment?
A. Yes.
Q. So it wasn't seemingly part of any permanent list of addresses of priests that might be --
A. No.
Q. -- applying at that time. Doing the best for the

Commissioner now, do you think it's likely that you would have looked at this letter at least for the purpose of getting this address prior to communicating with McAlinden in your letter of May?
A. Not necessarily so because Pat Hallinan's address was known to us and if it was known that McAlinden was with Pat Hallinan, we'd simply pick up his address.
Q. But for you to know that McAlinden was with

Pat Hallinan, one immediate way of knowing that would be to have looked at the correspondence relating to McAlinden in this letter?
A. That's one way, yes.
Q. There are only two ways, aren't there, that you could have looked at the letter, or someone has told you?
A. Or?
Q. Or - three ways, yes.
A. McAlinden - whenever McAlinden visited Ireland, he used Pat Hallinan's address.
Q. Do you have any recollection of that being the case at all or are you just surmising that as a potential third possibility?
A. I think it's more than a potential third possibility because I think - if I recall, he was known to use that address. It could well have been that, that that's the address he used when he was in Ireland; that's how you'd get in touch with him.
Q. When you refer to that being a potential address for McAlinden in Ireland, is that something that you recall McAlinden telling you?
A. No. No.
Q. If that's not the case, are you able to say who might have told you that?
A. No.
Q. Or who in fact told you that?
A. No, I don't - I can't, no.
Q. Doing the best you can, you have no recollection of that in fact being the case?
A. What being the case, I'm sorry?
Q. Of you being told by anyone that McAlinden had a temporary address at Tipperary in Ireland?
A. I can't recall, no.
Q. When you created the letter of 16 May 1996 to McAlinden and you'd sent it and you can see from what you're looking at here that we've got what appears to be a photocopy that includes your signature?
A. Yes.
Q. That's a document that has been obtained from the records of the diocese?
A. Yes.
Q. Similarly, if you look at the next page, there's another copy of a letter at least --
A. Yes.
Q. -- which has been obtained from the records of the diocese here?
A. Yes.
Q. When you were vicar general was it your practice to have a file relating to particular topics so that you could put copies of correspondence relating to McAlinden into that file, are you able to say?
A. No, a copy of the correspondence would go in McAlinden's file.
Q. And McAlinden's file would be a file that was one of the bishop's files?
A. Yes.
Q. Do we take it that as vicar general, for the particular purposes you needed to, that you had access to the bishop's files in this case relating to McAlinden?
A. No, not necessarily. I certainly don't recall any sort of access to the file generally. If there was any access - this is a guess - it would have been given to me by the bishop, but I don't have any immediate recall of that, no.
Q. When you say it would have been given to you by the bishop, it was files relating to a particular priest, that is to say, McAlinden?
A. The bishop would have had the files on the priests.
Q. Yes.
A. I have no recollection of ever referring to those directly. I would have asked him to put in a letter that I'd written, but $I$ do not recall ever seeing the file myself.
Q. This is at the time of the early years of Bishop Malone?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall Bishop Malone having files on particular priests in the bishop's office?
A. I presume so, yes.
Q. When you say you "presume so", have you got a recollection of having seen those?
A. I have seen the filing cabinet there with - simply with priest's written name on it - with the name "priest" on the drawer, but I don't - you know, that's as close as it's got.
Q. From time to time, as vicar general, when you had to deal with matters relating to particular priests, was it the case that Bishop Malone would give you access to a particular file on a priest to deal with that matter?
A. I have no recall of that ever happening.
Q. When you say you have no recall of that ever happening, do you say that it never happened?
A. I think I would say it never happened, yes.
Q. For you to be in a position to send this communication of 16 May 1996, may we take it that you had to have some background knowledge as to what was happening, where you entered the process of the correspondence with McAlinden?
A. Right. Yes.
Q. You're indicating "yes"?
A. Yes.
Q. Do we take it that you would have taken steps to ensure that you were informed as to what the position was when you wrote to McAlinden?
A. In a general sense, yes; yes.
Q. Because you wanted to make sure that when you were writing to McAlinden, particularly on a matter as serious
as laicisation, that you were accurately setting out the position of the diocese up until that point in time?
A. Not necessarily. This process had been started before I came - got involved.
Q. Accepting that, on 16 May 1996 you're sending out a letter under the title "Vicar General of the Diocese"?
A. Yes.
Q. It is addressed to a very, very serious topic of laicisation?
A. Yes.
Q. You knew the context, the background to that process of laicisation was that this gentleman, McAlinden, had been accused of sexually abusing children?
A. Yes.
Q. The combination of those two matters meant that it was clearly a most serious topic that you were addressing? A. Yes.
Q. Surely it was the case that you would have taken steps to make sure that the correspondence that you were dispatching accurately recorded the position at that point in time of the diocese?
A. Insofar as I'm simply asking him to provide us with a canon lawyer so that we can proceed with the case.
Q. You're doing a little bit more than that, aren't you? You're indicating that, "The Bishop has also decided to continue with the case begun by Bishop Leo for your laicisation"?
A. Yes.
Q. In that letter you're making clear, aren't you, as you understood the position, which was accurate, that a process against McAlinden had been started in the days of Bishop Clarke?
A. Yes.
Q. Also, if you turn to the document at tab 284 , which is written on the same day, in the third paragraph down there you're indicating to the Chancellor of the Diocese of Dublin the position of the diocese that, "We are applying to have Denis dispensed from priesthood..."?
A. Yes.
Q. And you're relaying the position taken by the previous bishop?
A. Yes.
Q. And the previous vicar general?
A. Yes.
Q. And I think you've indicated to the Commissioner that from Monsignor Hart you didn't receive any handover of any sort?
A. No.
Q. You didn't have any communications with him in relation to the McAlinden process?
A. No.
Q. As far as you can recall?
A. As far as I can recall, no.
Q. Isn't it likely, highly likely to have been the case that to put yourself in a position to make the statements that you do in those letters and to make sure that they're accurate, that you would have had to look at the file relating to McAlinden that was in the bishop's office -A. No.
Q. -- that dealt with these very matters?
A. Not necessary to look at the file, no.
Q. It is inconceivable that you would have sent this correspondence out without having taken that careful step, isn't it? I'm putting that to you as a proposition.
A. If the bishop had asked me to get in touch with him because the process of laicisation was being pursued, that would be sufficient for me to get in touch.
Q. All right.
A. I don't see it as I would have to demand proof that this has to happen.
Q. No, I'm not saying that you have to demand proof.
A. Right.
Q. This letter here of 16 May to the Diocese of Dublin is clearly indicating, isn't it, in quite proper fashion, quite an understanding of the process up until that point
in time?
A. Right. Yes.

* Q. For you to have been able to put together a letter in that fashion, you had to have had an understanding yourself as to what the position was?
* A. Yes.

MR GYLES: I object. What the letter says is that the bishop had asked him to do something. There has been a series of questions about that and there is a premise in the question that this letter contains information which could not have been made available in a direct instruction.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Kell?
MR KELL: Commissioner, I am clearly entitled to explore with this witness the sources of information that he had to enter into a process where there were communications between the diocese and McAlinden relating to the abuse of children and to see where his source of knowledge came from and to explore that in terms of the documents that were available.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, very well. In tab 284 it certainly looks as though the address and the way the address is formulated and repeated comes from the letter by McAlinden himself.

MR KELL: Yes.
THE COMMISSIONER: Un1ike the other letter which has it in a slightly different formula, but anyway, yes, I'll permit you to ask that question, $\mathrm{Mr} \mathrm{Kell}$.

MR KELL: Thank you. Father, again, I'm not being critical, we're just seeking to explore and then putting the proposition to you that you would have taken the steps to carefully inform yourself - I'm sorry, could the question be read back, Commissioner, before I ask any more?

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Kell.
(Question and answer marked * at page 1252 lines 16 to 19 read)

MR KELL: Q. Again, father, I'm not intending to be
critical, what's being suggested to you is that you would have taken the quite proper and careful steps of making sure that you were informed as to the position of this very serious process that was being undertaken against McAlinden?
A. Yes.
Q. And to do so it is likely, in fact, highly likely that you would have looked at the McAlinden file that included the correspondence relating to this very process?
A. Not necessarily.
Q. You seem to be resisting that proposition?
A. Because I did not see the file.
Q. You've got a recollection now, do you, as to the sources of information that you had resort to for the purpose of preparing this letter?
A. The source of information was the bishop.
Q. By referring to the bishop you're referring to an oral conversation, are you, with Bishop Malone?
A. More than likely, yes.
Q. When you say "more than likely" --
A. I don't have a copy of any letter that he wrote to me saying, "Please do this".
Q. You're sitting there in the vicar general's office in the chancery building; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And Bishop Malone is just down the hallway, is he?
A. Upstairs.
Q. Upstairs?
A. Yes.
Q. It is a matter of a few seconds walk to get to his office?
A. Yes.
Q. In his office you're aware, aren't you, that he has got files that relate to particular priests?
A. Yes.
Q. You were given the task of assisting Bishop Malone in
corresponding in relation to this very important matter dealing with McAlinden?
A. Yes .
Q. As vicar general you were in some respects the second in charge of the diocese, subject to the qualifications that you've indicated previously?
A. Yes.
Q. For the purpose of your task you needed to get information, didn't you, one way or another, from Bishop Malone as to where the process of laicisation was up to?
A. Yes.
Q. The most easily accessible means by which you could do that was to walk up the stairs to Bishop Malone's office and ask for the files relating to McAlinden?
A. That's one way of doing it, yes.
Q. Sitting here, as you are now, you can't tell the Commissioner, can you, that you didn't in fact take that step, in the sense that your memory of these matters is not sufficiently detailed that you have an actual recollection of preparing this letter without taking that particular step?

MR GYLES: He has given this evidence twice and he said that he did not access the bishop's files. He has already given that evidence twice, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
Q. Do you maintain that evidence, Father Burston, that you didn't look at the bishop's files?
A. I have no recollection ever of looking at the bishop's files, no.

MR KELL: I see the time, Commissioner, so would that be a convenient time?

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. I will adjourn the public hearings until 10 o'clock tomorrow.

MR HUNT: Subject to this, that I intended at the conclusion of Father Saunders' evidence to tender the documents behind tab 414 and 416 , which were the documents
that my learned friend Mr Gyles SC asked Father Saunders about.

THE COMMISSIONER: Separate exhibits, Mr Hunt?
MR HUNT: Yes, please.
THE COMMISSIONER: The material behind tab 414, which is the - in fact, that is already marked as a public exhibit.

MR HUNT: Yes, it is. It is already marked in a different fashion, but I now seek that it be tendered publicly in addition to its other marking.

THE COMMISSIONER: I understand, Mr Hunt. Thank you. The file note by Bishop Malone of 27 April 2004 will be admitted and marked exhibit 116.

EXHIBIT \#116 FILE NOTE BY BISHOP MALONE DATED 27/4/2004 (TAB 414)

THE COMMISSIONER: The faxed message from Bishop Malone to Mr Michael McDonald, together with the form headed "Child Protection Information Details. Ombudsman Act 1974", will be admitted and marked exhibit 117.

EXHIBIT \#117 FAXED MESSAGE FROM BISHOP MALONE TO MR MICHAEL MCDONALD, TOGETHER WITH FORM HEADED "CHILD PROTECTION INFORMATION DETAILS. OMBUDSMAN ACT 1974" (TAB 416)
(Transcript suppressed from page 1255, line 31 to page 1256, 1ine 23)

MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, I rise to raise one important matter that has been notified to me by Mr Gyles. It has been observed by counsel at the Bar table that this particular witness was subjected to verbal harassment in the precincts of the court outside the courtroom. It is of huge concern to those that assist you that any witness would be treated that way by members of the public. Commissioner, it appears to me a matter that would be appropriate for you to raise as a matter of general conduct, that witnesses who take the trouble to appear before this Commission ought not be subjected to that kind of treatment.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Ms Lonergan, and thank you, Mr Gyles, for raising it.
Q. Father Burston, I apologise that you have been subjected to rudeness and disrespect in the confines of this courthouse.
A. Thank you, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Ladies and gentlemen, it is unacceptable for any witness who attends this inquiry to be
subject to disrespectful comments or any other unfortunate behaviour and it will not be tolerated and if I'm able to find out who is responsible, further action might be expected to ensue. It is not the first time I've had to raise this matter, but it is most inappropriate that any witness, in particular, a priest who has given his life to the service of the Catholic Church, should be treated like this in these types of proceedings.

No findings have yet been made by this inquiry and it is unhelpful in the extreme for people to prejudge. As I think I've said before, when members of juries are sworn in they are specifically warned not to prejudge because prejudgment is a part of prejudice. It is essential that everyone is not intimidated from coming in and giving their evidence without any form of harassment and it is essential that we all keep an open mind about matters that concern this inquiry.

There are always two sides to stories and few very things in this life are black and white. I would ask everyone to observe respectful conduct towards everyone who come to give evidence, particularly people who have to go through the very difficult, very confronting, very intimidating thing of giving evidence. It is a difficult thing to give evidence. That is why victims of crime often are permitted to give evidence in closed courts.

Father Burston doesn't have that advantage. It is a difficult thing to do and everyone should be assisting him, and all of the other witnesses who come to give their evidence, to do so fully and frankly and without fear of any of that type of conduct.

I will adjourn until tomorrow at 10 o'clock.
AT 4.10PM THE COMMISSION WAS ADJOURNED TO THURSDAY, 18 JULY 2013 AT 10AM
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