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MR KELL: Commissioner, I have two relatively minor transcript corrections that have been drawn to my attention. Could I deal with those first. At yesterday's transcript, at page 1233, 1 ine 24 , there is a merging of the question and answer. After the first sentence there should be the answer: "It is hard to give a clear answers on that", et cetera.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MR KELL: Second1y, at page 1244, at line 29 , there was a question asked to Father Burston relating to putting himself in a position to correspond with McAlinden et cetera and in fact taking steps to look at what had been the previous correspondence dealing with McAlinden "on this topic", rather than "and this topic".

THE COMMISSIONER: That change can be made, thank you Mr Kell.

Before we commence, Father Burston, may I apologise once again that some people, who apparently didn't hear my admonition, subjected you to bullying and boorish behaviour outside the court, if the news was any indication, I apologise for that, and for anyone who missed it, that sort of behaviour won't be tolerated. There is a way to have your say in this inquiry and everyone with something to say is urged to come and say it or make a submission to the inquiry to say so and not to take it out on individual witnesses such as Father Burston.
<WILLIAM JOHN BURSTON, sworn:
[10.15am]

## <EXAMINATION BY MR KELL CONTINUING:

MR GYLES: Section 23, if that's necessary, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Gyles.
MR KELL: Q. Father, I wonder if you could reach for volume 4 of the tender bundle. Would you turn to tab 283. You will see that this is a letter that was drawn to your attention yesterday, on 16 May, where you wrote to McAlinden?
A. Yes .
Q. Care of Reverend Hallinan?
A. Yes.
Q. You will see you have an address on that letter that is - I won't try the Gaelic - Gort Mhuire, Ballinamult, at County Tipperary in a particular style?
A. Yes.
Q. If you go to the next page, this is tab 284. On the same day you've written to the chancellor of the diocese of Dublin?
A. Yes.
Q. You'11 see in the second paragraph there that you have indicated that, as we saw yesterday, there's a priest McAlinden who you're having difficulties with?
A. Yes .
Q. Then you indicate:
... who has given his contact address as [care of] Father Patrick Hallinan.

You'11 see that you've styled the address of McAlinden in quite different terms there; instead of "Gort", you have "G1en Mhuire"?
A. Yes.
Q. And then you continue on after the Ballinamult and before County Tipperary, you've included Clonmel, C-L-O-N-M-E-L. Could I ask you to turn back in the bundle to tab 277, which for practitioners is exhibit 107. That's the handwritten letter that you saw that I took you to yesterday of 27 February 1996 from McAlinden to Bishop Malone?
A. Yes .
Q. That's a letter of some three months or so before your writing in May to McAlinden?
A. Yes.
Q. If you go halfway down there, you will see that he has provided the following temporary address for Father Hallinan.
A. Yes.
Q. You'll see it is styled as Glen Mhuire?
A. Yes.
Q. And Clonmel is included as well?
A. Yes.
Q. Does that indicate to you that - if you keep your finger on the letter at tab 277 and you flick through to the letter at 284 to Reverend Stinson at the diocese of Dublin - when you were writing this letter in May 1996 to the diocese of Dublin, you had the letter from McAlinden with the particular address there, including the Glen Mhuire, necessarily before you. Does that give you a degree of confidence that you had that letter from McAlinden before you at that time?
A. No. No, it doesn't.
Q. You can see you have a different style of address for the preceding letter that I've taken you to?
A. Yes.
Q. I want to suggest to you that what it indicates as likely being the case is that, at the time you wrote your second letter of 16 May 1996, you had before you at least from the bishop's files the document, the handwritten document from McAlinden of February of that year?
A. It doesn't - when I wrote, sorry?
Q. What I'm suggesting to you is that at the time you wrote your second letter of 16 May 1996 --
A. The second one, yes.
Q. -- it is likely that you had before you the handwritten letter of 27 February from McAlinden where he had styled the address of Father Hallinan in the terms that you had used not in your first letter at tab 283, but in your second letter at 284. Do you accept that proposition? A. No.
Q. Why do you not accept it?
A. Because Pat Hallinan's address would have been in other files in the office anyway. It wasn't the only location for it.
Q. At the time that you're suggesting that you're writing about Father Hallinan on 16 May 1996, you can see that, on the same day, you've got two different addresses. You can see that from the documents?
A. Not two different addresses.
Q. You've styled the addresses in two different terms? A. Yes.
Q. That suggests, doesn't it, that you've got those addresses from different sources?
A. I don't know. I cannot recall where I got them from, but they would have been in the office. They would have been available.
Q. One immediate place where it would be available would be, and the logical place it would be, the most recent correspondence from McAlinden to which you were responding by this letter?
A. That's one possibility.
Q. It is one possibility? It is more than that. It is a strong and likely possibility, isn't it, Father Burston?
A. If there's a list of addresses in the office, it could well have been taken from that list.
Q. When you say "the office", you're talking about the vicar general's office, are you.
A. No, I'm talking about the bishop's office and the typist - the secretary who wrote the note.
Q. The bishop's office is the office that we spoke about yesterday that was a couple of seconds away from your office just upstairs?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you suggesting to the Commissioner that you've gone to the bishop's office to find out information relating to your correspondence to McAlinden?

MR GYLES: I object. He didn't say that.
MR KELL: I'm putting it to him.
THE COMMISSIONER: It was available in the bishop's office whether or not Father Burston went there. Is that what you mean?

MR GYLES: That's right. He spoke of the same issue yesterday. He spoke of a list of addresses. He talked about that yesterday. He hasn't given evidence that he walked up to the bishop's office, up the stairs, to get
that address.
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Kell, would you put the other possibilities.

MR KELL: Yes, al1 right.
Q. Father, it is correct, isn't it, that, as you sit there in the witness box, you do not have a recollection in your mind of getting this address for Father Hallinan from a particular list in the bishop's office?
A. No. No.
Q. I think you've accepted that one possibility is that you've got this address from the bishop's files relating to McAlinden, or at least you've seen that McAlinden letter of February 1996 where he recounts that address?
A. That's a possibility, but it's only one --
Q. You accept that a possibility?
A. Yes.
Q. You gave some evidence yesterday to the effect that you think that Father McAlinden was the first priest of the diocese - you can put that to one side for the moment that you became aware of who raised concerns in relation to proximity to children, about children. That was your evidence yesterday, wasn't it?
A. I think it was, yes. I'm not perfectly sure.

MR GYLES: What's the reference to that?
MR KELL: Sorry, I'11 withdraw that.
Q. Yesterday you gave evidence to the effect that, in terms of your experience within the diocese, the first priest that you believe you heard any concerns about in relation to the risk they posed to children was Father McAlinden?
A. That was my recollection, but I can't be any more precise than that.
Q. You also gave evidence that you do not recall when you first became aware of reports regarding McAlinden and risks in terms of sexual abuse of children?
A. Yes, I think I - that's true.
Q. You also gave evidence to the effect that you do not recall the source of such reports or concerns relating to McAlinden?
A. Yes .
Q. You also gave evidence that you do not recall the nature of the reports that you received regarding McAlinden and the risks he posed to children?
A. Yes.
Q. You understand that it might be regarded as inconceivable that you would not recall the circumstances when you first became aware of McAlinden posing risks to children?
A. I'm sorry?

MR GYLES: What was the question? As to whether or not this witness believes something is inconceivable in the mind of another person is of no probative value to you, Commissioner.

MR KELL: I'11 withdraw that.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR KELL: Q. I suggest to you, Father Burston, the first time that you heard that a priest of your diocese was alleged to have been involved in the sexual abuse of children would be a striking and memorable occasion; do you agree with that?
A. Probably, yes.
Q. Your evidence to this Commission is that you just don't recall when that happened?
A. That's true.
Q. Is it the case that you perceive yourself as having some problems with your memory?
A. Yes.
Q. To your understanding, does this problem impact on your ability to accurately recall past events?
A. Yes.
Q. Relating to McAlinden?
A. Past events, full stop.
Q. It impacts on your ability to accurately recall past events?
A. Yes .
Q. Including as relating to McAlinden?
A. Including that, yes.
Q. You're saying that you're doing the best you can to assist this Commission, but that we should or the Commissioner should take into account in assessing your evidence your inability to accurately recall past events; is that the case?
A. Yes.
Q. Taking into account the problems that you say that you have with your memory, is your evidence that you think you did not have access to documents from the bishop's file relating to McAlinden; is that the case?
A. Sorry?

MR GYLES: I object to the question.
MR KELL: I will withdraw it.
MR GYLES: The question of access and what that means --
MR KELL: I'11 withdraw that question.
Q. Father, is it your evidence that you do not recall obtaining documents to review from Bishop Malone's file on McAlinden in 1996?
A. I do not recall that, no.
Q. But you accept, consistent with your problems identified with your memory, that that may well have occurred; do you accept that possibility?
A. Unlikely.
Q. You also accept the possibility, don't you, that you were provided with documents from the McAlinden file by the bishop? You were given documents from that file to look at for the purpose of your correspondence with McAlinden?
A. I have no memory of that at all. No recall.
Q. Can I ask, do you recall any conversations with Monsignor Hart relating to McAlinden?
A. I cannot immediately, no.
Q. Is it your belief that you didn't have any conversations with Monsignor Hart relating to McAlinden and the laicisation process?
A. I cannot recall whether I did or not. At the time I wrote that letter Monsignor Hart wasn't in the diocese, he was on leave, so I would not have had immediate access to him.
Q. Other than Bishop Malone, do you recall any conversations with any church officials, any other church official from the diocese, relating to McAlinden --
A. No.
Q. -- and the risks he posed?
A. No.
Q. But you believe you had conversations with Bishop Malone in 1996 regarding McAlinden?
A. Yes.
Q. They included the conversations that gave you, as it were, the riding instruction for you to correspond with McAlinden about laicisation?
A. Yes.
Q. Could you pull out volume 3 of the folders. I just want to explore with you --
A. Sorry?
Q. Volume 3 of the folders. I want to explore with you whether you're able to assist the Commissioner with some of the information, doing the best that you can with your recall, that Bishop Malone may have given you relating to McAlinden. Could I ask you to tab 265. For the practitioners, that's exhibit 74. I will give you a chance to read that. You can see that's a letter dated 2 November 1995 from coadjutor Bishop Malone to McAlinden. I'll give you an opportunity to read that quickly.
A. Yes.
Q. Sitting there in the witness box today and doing the best you can, do you recall having seen that letter before? A. No.
Q. You will see in the third paragraph of that letter Bishop Malone writes to McAlinden and refers to the
"gravity of the allegations against you"?
A. Yes.
Q. Which was obviously a reference to allegations of
child sexual abuse. Do you understand that to be the case?
A. I presume it to be the case, yes.
Q. He refers also to the evidence supporting those
allegations?
A. Yes .
Q. Do you see that reference there?
A. Yes.
Q. In the discussions that you had with Bishop Malone in
1996, did Bishop Malone tell you - do you recall whether
Bishop Malone told you information about the gravity of the
allegations against McAlinden?
A. I presume he would have, but I don't recall
immediately the conversation, no.
Q. Similarly, did Bishop Malone speak to you about the evidence supporting those allegations in his discussions with you in 1996?
A. I don't recall that at all, no.
Q. Could I ask you to turn back to tab 262. You will see that's a letter dated 19 October 1995 from Bishop Clarke to McAlinden?
A. Yes .

MR KELL: For practitioners, that's exhibit 67.
Q. I'11 give you a quick opportunity to read that, please.
A. Yes.
Q. You've had a chance to look at that?
A. Yes.
Q. Can I ask you, doing the best you can today, do you recall having seen this letter before?
A. No.
Q. You will see in the second paragraph that

Bishop Clarke wrote of an admission that McAlinden had made to Father Lucas?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recal1 Bishop Malone in 1996 giving you information about that topic?
A. No.
Q. That there had been an admission made?
A. No, I do not recall, no.
Q. Have you heard that from any other source?
A. No, I don't think so.
Q. You will see on the second page of the letter, the second paragraph down, that the bishop of the diocese had told McAlinden that he had it on very good authority that some people were threatening seriously to take this whole matter to the police?
A. Yes.
Q. Again, was that something that Bishop Malone had told you in 1996 in his discussions with you?
A. I don't recall that, no.
Q. Can I ask you to jump back to tab 250 and that's exhibit 73. You will see there a letter dated 2 June 1995 from Monsignor Hart to the rector and parish priest at the San Pablo diocese in the Philippines?
A. Yes.
Q. Could I ask you to read that, please.
A. Yes.
Q. You will see in the second paragraph there that Monsignor Hart refers to having had consultation with Bishop Malone and that he wished - he drew the attention of the reverend of the San Pablo diocese that he wished to advise:
... we do require, for the benefit of those
who have lodged their complaints against ... McAlinden, a letter indicating that your Diocese has removed his faculties and that he will return to England.
A. Yes.
Q. I think you've given evidence that you don't recall
any discussions with Monsignor Hart?
A. Certainly not.
Q. Relating to McAlinden?
A. No.
Q. In your discussions that you had with Bishop Malone in 1996 relating to the McAlinden matter, do you recall Bishop Malone telling you that there had been correspondence with the San Pablo diocese about McAlinden? A. I don't recall that, no.
Q. And that was correspondence on the benefit of persons that lodged complaints about McAlinden? You don't remember that?
A. No. No.
Q. You'll see in the third paragraph that there's reference to failing this procedure - that is to say, failing the obtaining of the letter from the San Pablo diocese that McAlinden's faculties had been removed in the Philippines, failing this procedure - those who have lodged complaints intend to consider instituting criminal charges? A. Yes.
Q. And compensation charges against the church?
A. Yes.
Q. In your discussions with Bishop Malone in 1996, do you recall the bishop telling you that there were persons who had made complaints about McAlinden that were threatening to institute criminal charges in relation to the matter, in certain circumstances?
A. I do not recall that, no.
Q. You can put that folder down. Do you recall having conversations with Bishop Malone in 1996 on the topic of reporting McAlinden to the NSW Police?
A. No, I do not, no.
Q. If it was suggested to you that you did have conversations with Bishop Malone in 1996 on that topic that is to say, reporting McAlinden to the NSW Police - you would be surprised by that, would you?
A. No, I don't think so.
Q. Your evidence is you don't recall having that
conversation, but you accept that it may well have occurred?
A. Lots of things may well have occurred, but I simply do not recall that.
Q. Perhaps you're able to assist the Commissioner in a different way. By 1996 you had been incardinated to the diocese for over 20 years?
A. Yes, 31, 32 or something.
Q. You'd held various positions in the diocese?
A. Yes.
Q. Including a number of years as a diocesan consultor?
A. Yes.
Q. To a number of bishops, or at least two bishops?
A. Yes.
Q. As at 1996, you held the office of vicar general?
A. Yes.
Q. So, effectively, subject to the qualifications you've indicated, second in charge within the diocese?
A. Yes .
Q. You were familiar with the ethos and culture of the diocese?
A. I'm not sure when you say "ethos and culture".
Q. You'd spent, as you indicated, over 30 years within the institution of the diocese of Maitland-Newcastle?
A. Yes .
Q. And you've indicated that you held various positions in the diocese?
A. Yes .
Q. You knew the workings of the diocese very well?
A. I wouldn't say very well.
Q. As at mid-1996, you had been in the position of vicar general since January of that year?
A. Yes.
Q. You've seen those letters that I've just taken you to which refer to there being a number of things: first,
grave allegations having been made against McAlinden? A. Yes .
Q. And you saw that there was reference in correspondence from Bishop Malone that there was evidence supporting those allegations?
A. I'm sorry, I'm not - your question is not clear.
Q. Let me pause. I'm just trying to ascertain whether you're able to assist the Commissioner as to the approach that was taken in 1996. In the letters I've just shown you, you saw that there was reference to grave allegations having been made against McAlinden?
A. Yes.
Q. You saw there was reference in a letter from the bishop that there was evidence supporting those allegations?
A. Yes.
Q. You saw also that there was reference to an admission having been made by McAlinden?
A. Yes.
Q. You saw similarly that there were people that were threatening seriously to take the matter to the police?
A. Yes .
Q. You saw that reference?
A. Yes.
Q. You saw reference to those who had complained about McAlinden considering instituting criminal charges?
A. Yes.
Q. That is to say, involving the police?
A. Yes.
Q. Having regard to those five matters, are you able to assist the Commissioner as to why, to your knowledge, in 1996 no steps were taken to notify NSW Police about McAlinden?

MR GYLES: I object this. The witness has been taken to five documents that are not his documents and are not documents that were received by him.

THE COMMISSIONER: Or seen at the time, necessarily.
MR GYLES: Or seen at the time by him. He has been shown them now. He has been asked to give an explanation as to why the diocese in general is said not to have acted and he is simply not in a position to address that question.

THE COMMISSIONER: Perhaps, Mr Ke11, you could ask Father Burston if he knows the reason from what he knew then, thank you.

MR KELL: Certainly.
Q. To your understanding, Father Burston, no report was made to NSW Police regarding McAlinden in 1996 ?
A. That's my understanding, yes.
Q. Are you able to assist the Commissioner, having regard to the background and context you are aware of, as to why no report was made in 1996 about McAlinden?
A. My understanding is the victims did not wish to go to the police.
Q. That's your understanding as at 1996, is it?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that based on something that Bishop Malone told you?
A. I presume so, yes.
Q. Are you able to point to any particular contemporaneous record or document at the time that refers to victims not wanting to have the matter taken to the police?
A. No.
Q. Is it the case that your belief or understanding is based on what you believe to have been a discussion with Bishop Malone in 1996?
A. Yes.
Q. And you're not able to assist the Commissioner as to the terms of that conversation, are you?
A. No.
Q. You've got no recollection in the form of an "I said/He said" type basis about that?
A. No.
Q. I'11 ask you to pick up volume 4 of the tender bundle again and jump to tab 281.
A. Tab 281, yes.
Q. Behind tab 281, if you go to page 604, you will see that's a media release dated 24 April 1996 ?
A. Yes.
Q. It refers to charges of sexual abuse having been laid against Father Vincent Ryan?
A. Yes .
Q. If you go to the bottom of that media release, you see it says:

For further information or clarification
please contact:
Father William Burston (Vicar General).
A. Yes.
Q. Or the communications officer?
A. Yes.
Q. I'm going to ask you about the second paragraph. Would you have a quick look at that media release.
A. Yes.
Q. To put this in context, it is a document, again, at the time at which you were vicar general?
A. Yes.
Q. It refers to Ryan having been withdrawn from active ministry on 11 October 1995 ?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall that as the date on which Ryan was arrested on child sex offences?
A. I presume it is, yes.
Q. Are you able to recall the circumstances in 1995 when you became aware of allegations relating to a police investigation relating to Ryan?
A. Sorry?
Q. I am sorry; I asked that badly. Are you able to recall whether it was before 11 October 1995 that you became aware there was a police investigation relating to Ryan?
A. I don't think I - no. I was not aware of any police investigation until the day he was arrested.
Q. Do we take it from the fact that you are indicated on the bottom of the document as the person to contact for information or clarification, that you had some involvement in the preparation of the document, the media release?
A. I'm not sure.
Q. You don't recall it?
A. I don't recall that, no.
Q. You can see in the second paragraph there, it says:

In accordance with normal Church procedure, Father Ryan was immediately withdrawn from active ministry on 11 October 1995 ...
A. Yes.
Q. And then:
... the proper procedure of our legal
system is taking its course.
As the person identified on the document as able to provide clarification at least at 1996. Are you able to assist as to what was contemplated or what you understand to be contemplated by the reference "in accordance with normal church procedure"? What's the normal church procedure that's referred to there?
A. I cannot clarify that immediately, no. My presumption was that if somebody has been charged with a serious offence, the church law would say he is to be stood aside, stood down. That's an assumption that I'm making now.
Q. You don't take that as an assumption that until someone's arrested on a charge, no steps should be taken beforehand?
A. In this situation, I don't think anyone knew until he was arrested.
Q. In your time as vicar general at the diocese, did you
become aware that in the 1970s the Maitland Clergy Central Fund had paid for a one-way ticket for McAlinden to travel to New Guinea? Do you have any knowledge about that matter?
A. No, I don't.
Q. Is that something that you've not heard about?
A. I had not heard about then, no.
Q. Have you also heard, at any stage at your time with the diocese, of McAlinden being provided with a one-way ticket to England?
A. No.
Q. In 1993?
A. No.
Q. You'd agree that it would be fairly unusual for the diocese, if that were the case, to pay for a one-way airline ticket for one of its parish priests?
A. It would be, yes.
Q. I wonder if you could pick up volume 4 again and can I ask you to go to tab 304.
A. Yes.

MR KELL: Commissioner that's exhibit 93.
Q. You will see there is a letter that you wrote on 10 August 1999 to Mr John Davoren of the Professional Standards Office?
A. Yes.
Q. Could I ask you to read that letter?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you know Mr Davoren at this time as at August 1999?
A. Yes.
Q. The Professional Standards body was an arm of the Catholic Church based in Sydney?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall whether your 1etter, as at August 1999, was made at the request of Bishop Malone or sent at the request of Bishop Malone?
A. I don't recall that, no.
Q. What was your purpose in sending this letter to Professional Standards in August 1999?
A. I can't recall what the purpose was, other than what is stated there.
Q. You don't recall any discussion at all with Bishop Malone in 1999 relating to the topic of reporting the matter to police?
A. No.
Q. As at August 1999, what was your understanding, if you can recall, as to the purpose of the Professional Standards Office?
A. I think part of their procedure - part of their function was to look into the ways in which these matters could be handled in the best way possible and John Davoren, I think, was the secretary or whatever, the convener of that resource group.
Q. You can see that there's reference in that letter to two persons who were identified as being victims of McAlinden; that is, [AL] and [AK]?
A. Yes.
Q. I think you've got a pseudonym list in front of you.
A. Yes.
Q. Would you have a check of that.
A. Yes.
Q. You indicate in the second paragraph of the letter:

This information has come to us from [AL] and [AK] ...
A. Yes.
Q. And that [AL] and [AK] don't wish to be involved in any civil action in this regard.
A. Yes.
Q. What did you mean by your reference to "civil action"?
A. Taking the matter to the police.
Q. You didn't, yourself, interview [AL] or [AK]?
A. No.
Q. Are you able to assist the Commissioner as to the basis on which you were able to include in that letter a statement to the effect that [AL] and [AK] did not wish to be involved in any civil action?
A. My presumption is that I would have been given that information from the bishop.
Q. You're not able to identify any other potential source from which that information came to you, other than Bishop Malone at that time?
A. I can't - no, I cannot, no.
Q. In the third paragraph you make reference to.
... this is a matter where "intelligence" could well be given to the police.
A. Yes.
Q. What did you mean by the expression "intelligence"?
A. My understanding was that the police could be informed that there were issues here but that the victims did not wish to come forward, so that they would have it as background information.
Q. In the next paragraph, you include reference to a suspicion that McAlinden would be back in Australia in August of that year - that is, 1999 - and would be residing somewhere in the Bunbury region of Western Australia? A. Yes.
Q. Are you able to assist now as to where you got that information from?
A. No, I cannot, I'm sorry.
Q. Also that he was presently in England celebrating his golden jubilee?
A. Yes.
Q. You were aware from the terms of your letter that his faculties had been removed since 1993?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall where you got that information from?
A. No, I don't recall it, no.
Q. You must have known, as at 10 August 1999, that McAlinden was suspected of coming back to Australia in late August and residing thereafter in Bunbury or you wouldn't have included that in the letter. That's the case, isn't it, Father Burston?
A. Yes, I would have, yes.
Q. Could I ask you to jump to the next tab, which is tab 305. Before I do that, are you able to assist the Commissioner in any way as to what had changed between 1996 and 1999 which caused you, in 1999, to write to the Professional Standards Office with information relating to McAlinden?
A. I cannot recall what the change was, I'm sorry.
Q. Other than that you believe that you had a discussion with - you believe you would have had a discussion with Bishop Malone in August 1999 about the topic of writing to Professional Standards; is that the case?
A. Probably, yes.
Q. In tab 305, you will see there is a letter dated 10 August 1999 from you to the Bishop of Nottingham?
A. Yes.

MR KELL: This is exhibit 94, Commissioner.
Q. You indicate that McAlinden is presently in Skegness?
A. Yes.
Q. And, again, that his faculties have been withdrawn since February 1993?
A. Yes.
Q. And:

Denis is not an easy man to deal with.
Are you able to assist as to what you intended by that reference?
A. Just that he was not an easy man to deal with.

I don't --
Q. In the sense of not an easy man to track down or were you making a reference to his personality? What were you intending by that statement?
A. That "You would find him hard to deal with". I can't - I can't - I can't see what the purpose of the question is. I'm not --
Q. You were conveying information to the Bishop of Nottingham that Denis was not an easy man to deal with? A. Right.
Q. Are you able to assist in what respects you were intending to suggest that Denis was not an easy man to deal with? What were the characteristics you were intending to draw to the attention of the Bishop of Nottingham?
A. He would be elusive, he would be hard to get hold of, you know. I think - I can't think of the reason why that statement is there other than that it was a fact that well, what was behind from stating that fact, I cannot recall.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Father, may I interrupt. We didn't know Denis McAlinden in his lifetime, but was he an unpleasant fellow in general, leaving aside everything we now know about his paedophilia?
A. He could be, and the fact that already trying to get him - to pin him down had proved difficult. So I'd say to the bishop that this is not a - I suppose the insinuation was that it won't be a matter of simply ringing him up and that he would immediately cooperate.
Q. If the Bishop of Nottingham had rung you up on the telephone and said, "What do you mean by this, Father Burston" --
A. Yes, yes.
Q. -- what would you have said to him then?
A. I would have said, "He's somewhat elusive and he's somewhat - you know, he can somewhat fly off the handle easily. He can get very upset quickly", things like that.
Q. A bad-tempered man?
A. Yes. Yes, yes.
Q. Thank you, Father Burston.
A. Thank you, Commissioner.

MR KELL: Q. Your expression "not an easy man to deal with" was intended to include some of those characteristics that you've just described, that he was a bad-tempered man
and difficult to deal with?
A. Yes.
Q. In that same paragraph you refer to:

My canonical adviser suggested to me that I put in writing what I've already said on the phone ...
A. Yes.
Q. Who was your canonical adviser that you're referring to?
A. I can't recall that, no. No, I can't, sorry.
Q. As at 1999, who were the persons within the Maitland-Newcastle diocese who were able to provide canon law advice to you?
A. There were a number of them, but I don't know which one - you know, not only in this diocese but also in Sydney there were canon lawyers whom I had known, so I can't be more precise than that.
Q. You make reference to "what I have already said on the phone to Monsignor Peter O'Dowd"?
A. Yes.
Q. Who was Monsignor O'Dowd?
A. The vicar general of the diocese of Nottingham.
Q. Where you make reference to McAlinden celebrating his golden jubilee of priesthood, what's that a particular reference to? Is a golden jubilee a reference to an active expression of exercise of priesthood faculties by McAlinden or is it simply an anniversary date?
A. It is a special anniversary date.
Q. What's incorporated by that expression? When a priest obtains their golden jubilee, do certain things happen?
A. Not necessarily, but I think he was with family and celebrating. I'm not quite --
Q. But you sort of indicate there.
.... McAlinden is presently in Skegness celebrating his Golden Jubilee of Priesthood. This is despite the fact that
his faculties have been withdrawn since February 1993.
A. Yes.
Q. If McAlinden's faculties have been withdrawn, he remains an incardinated priest?
A. Yes.
Q. It is simply that, at least within the diocese, he's not able to publicly perform his ministry in the sense of celebrating mass?
A. Yes.
Q. The fact that McAlinden was in Skegness in August 1999 celebrating an anniversary, does that entail that he was in some way exercising faculties contrary to the withdrawal that had happened in 1993?
A. It does entail that, yes.
Q. How does it entail that?
A. I presume he would have been celebrating mass publicly. That was my presumption.
Q. That's your concern that motivated you in writing this letter?
A. Yes.
Q. Could I ask you to go to tab 306.
A. Right. Yes.
Q. You will see that you've written on 10 August 1999 to McAlinden at a Skegness address?
A. Yes.
Q. You indicate:

I am writing to let you know that proceedings are under way in the canonical forum about matters that you are well aware of.
A. Yes.
Q. What was your reference in 1999 to "the canonical forum"?
A. That there was a procedure to have him stood down from
priesthood, have him defrocked.
Q. In 1996 you were writing to McAlinden about laicisation?
A. Yes.
Q. And this is three years later?
A. Later, yes.
Q. Was this a continuation of something that you'd been involved in in 1996 or is this a new --
A. This is an attempt to restart it or to keep it going, yes.
Q. Is it an attempt to co-opt McAlinden into a laicisation?
A. Yes .
Q. $\quad 0 r$ is it something different?
A. No, it is to get him to cooperate in the laicisation process.
Q. And yet, this had been going on since at least 1996 according to the correspondence?
A. Yes .
Q. Did you form the view at any time in 1996 or later that the attempt to laicise McAlinden was futile?
A. I don't know that I formed that view, no.
Q. In that letter of 10 August 1999 you will see that you've signed it "Rev W Burston, Vicar General"?
A. Yes.
Q. Underneath that there is the initials in capitals "WB"?
A. Yes.
Q. Then "/mp"?
A. Yes.
Q. The "WB" is obviously a reference to William Burston, can we take it?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you able to assist as to what the letters "m1" signify?
A. The typist.
Q. Who was that?
A. I presume Maree Lawrie.
Q. Maree Lawrie?
A. Yes.
Q. How do you spell that, L-A-U-R-I-E?
A. L-A-W-R-I-E, I think. I'm open to correction on that.
Q. You will see down the bottom of the letter underneath that there's in small type a file:

Acbc - professional standards/McA1inden, D - WB's letter.
A. Yes.
Q. Are you able to assist as to what that refers to?
A. No.
Q. You will see, just jumping back on the proceeding page there's a similar reference to "Acbc", et cetera, at the bottom of that letter?
A. Yes.
Q. Does that indicate to you that that is a reference to a filing system within the diocese on the computer as to this correspondence?
A. I presume so, yes.
Q. But you don't have any other particular knowledge about this?
A. No.
Q. The letters were typed for you, were they?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you hand-write them at the time or did you use a dictaphone?
A. I don't know.
Q. You don't recall?
A. I don't recal1, no. I certainly did not use a
dictaphone. I've not used the same for many years.
Q. What was your usual practice as at 1999 in terms of preparing letters?
A. Writing them or typing them roughly and getting the secretary to type them correctly.
Q. Writing them by hand and giving them to the secretary was one?
A. That's one - yes.
Q. When you say "typing", you had your own computer at the time?
A. Yes.
Q. You'd do a rough draft, would you, and let the secretary finalise the correspondence?
A. Yes.
Q. As vicar general, did you have your own secretary or did you share a secretary with the bishop?
A. No, I shared a secretary with the bishop.
Q. As at 1999, that was Maree Lawrie?
A. That was one of them, yes.
Q. There were a number of secretaries at that time that you shared?
A. I think so, yes.
Q. Do you recall the names of any of the others?
A. The only other one was Elizabeth Doyle.
Q. Could I ask you to jump to tab 308. You will see that there's a letter there that you appear to have received from the Professional Standards Office?
A. Yes.
Q. From Mr Davoren?
A. Yes.
Q. Saying:

Thank you for your letter ... regarding Rev Denis McAlinden.

And indicating in the second paragraph: We seem to have missed each other by a day
or so. I will pass the matter on to the
police and send you a copy of the formal
communication.
A. Yes.
Q. :

I will speak to you when you get back.
A. Yes.
Q. Pausing there, do you recall conversations that you had with Mr Davoren in about August 1999 relating to the topic of McAlinden and reporting to the police?
A. No, I don't.
Q. If you jump to the next tab, you will see that there is a document that appears to be a notification headed "Dissemination to NSW Police Service Child Protection Enforcement Agency"?
A. Yes .
Q. There's some information that's included regarding McAlinden. You will see on the bottom it is dated, under "Notifying person", 24 August 1999?
A. Yes .
Q. And the name of the notifying person is indicated to be John Davoren on behalf of Bishop Michael Malone?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have any recollection of receiving in 1999 this notification from Mr Davoren?
A. No, I don't.
Q. Do you recall any discussions that you had in about 1999 with NSW Police relating to McAlinden?
A. No.
Q. Could I just ask you to jump to tab 313. You will see there a letter dated 8 October 1999. This is exhibit 99, Commissioner.
A. Yes.
Q. It is from a Detective Senior Mark Constable Watters of the Lower Hunter Local Area Command addressed to the
bishop's chancery. Could you read that letter?
A. Yes.
Q. You will see that that letter records that a victim of McAlinden, [AE], had reported on that date, having been sexually abused by McAlinden in 1953 to 1954 ?
A. Yes.
Q. And that police were requesting a copy of a letter that may have been sent to [AE]'s parents by the bishop back in the 1950s?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall whether this letter was brought to your attention in October 1999 as vicar general?
A. No, I don't think it was. I do not recall it.
Q. Are you able to assist the Commissioner as to your expectation as at 1999 as to where within the chancery a letter addressed to "bishop's chancery" dealing with a subject matter such as this would be directed?
A. I presume to the bishop.
Q. To the bishop?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall discussing the subject matter of the letter in any way with Bishop Malone in $1999 ?$
A. No, I do not.
Q. Do you recall making any inquiries in 1999 to try and locate a copy of the letter from 1953?
A. No.

MR GYLES: It is not "the letter"; it is "a letter". This question assumes there is a letter. There is a real question about that given the evidence.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, there is, of course, but did Mr Kell's question offend that?

MR GYLES: A series of questions has proceed on the basis there is a letter. My point is --

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Kell, would you just say, "make a search for a letter if it existed".

MR KELL: Yes.
Q. Do you recall being asked to take any steps in 1999 to search for a letter from the 1950s, from the bishop back then, relating to McAlinden?
A. No.
Q. That would be a particularly unusual request, I take it?
A. It would be, yes.
Q. The letter also asks for details of the current whereabouts of McAlinden. Do you recall providing any information to NSW Police in 1999 regarding the whereabouts or location of McAlinden?
A. I do not recall it, no.
Q. You don't recall being asked by anyone within the diocese for your knowledge regarding where McAlinden might be at that time, to provide it on?
A. I do not recall that, no.
Q. Do you have any recollection of any other person within the diocese in 1999 being tasked with the job of assisting police in relation to the whereabouts of McAlinden?
A. No, I don't.
Q. I wonder if you would put that to one side for a moment. I want to ask you some questions relating to Father James Fletcher. Is it the position, Father Burston, that he - that is to say, Fletcher - had been a friend of yours?
A. Yes.
Q. You had worked together in your early times in the 1970s with Father Fletcher?
A. Briefly at Waratah, yes.
Q. You were assistant priest at Waratah?
A. Yes.
Q. And Fletcher was the parish priest?
A. No.
Q. No. What role did he have at the time that you were at Waratah?
A. I was assistant priest. He was hospital chaplain.
Q. Did you meet him first when you were at Maitland or at Waratah?
A. I probably met him when I was at Maitland, yes.
Q. And that was in 1971?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you able to assist the Commissioner with the first time when it was that you heard of concerns relating to Father James Fletcher and the sexual abuse of children? A. No, I can't recall immediately when I first heard, no.

MR KELL: Commissioner, $I$ wonder if it might be convenient to have an early morning tea break.

THE COMMISSIONER: All right; morning tea it is. Thank you.

SHORT ADJOURNMENT
MR KELL: Q. Father, this morning you gave some evidence that you regarded yourself as having memory problems?
A. Yes .
Q. Are you seeing any medical doctor about those memory problems?
A. No.
Q. Have you previously seen any medical practitioner about those memory problems?
A. No. I presume them to be the result of 10 anaesthetics in the last eight years.
Q. Why do you say that you believe you've got memory problems from --
A. That's been my experience.
Q. It is not a matter that you're seeing any medical practitioner about?
A. No.
Q. It is not a matter about which you are able to provide any medical evidence --

MR GYLES: Commissioner, is it being said this witness
should be obtaining medical treatment for a memory condition?

THE COMMISSIONER: No, I don't think that had been said yes, yet, Mr Gyles. It is a query at this stage.

MR GYLES: It seems the possible relevance of the question is --

THE COMMISSIONER: No doubt it's directed towards ascertaining whether there is medical evidence to support a contention that there is some memory loss. If there's not, well, there's not.

MR GYLES: But the anterior question was: why would he obtain it? Father Burston has said he has had 10 general anaesthetics in the last eight years and he feels it has affected his memory. That's relevant evidence --

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MR GYLES: -- whether or not he has sought medical advice about that.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, there may have been no need to seek it.

MR GYLES: What is the purpose of --
THE COMMISSIONER: No doubt Father Burston will tell us about whether or not he has and, if he's asked, why not.

MR GYLES: Thank you.
MR KELL: Thank you, Commissioner.
Q. Father Burston, you indicated that you had nine general anaesthetics and you --

THE COMMISSIONER: Ten, I think it was.
THE WITNESS: I said 10.
MR KELL: Q. And you suggest that, as a consequence of that, you've got memory problems. Why do you say that? A. Because that's my experience.
Q. That's your experience, is it, that since you've had those, you've had a continual deterioration of memory? Is that the position?
A. Yes.
Q. Your memory today has been quite precise on some aspects, hasn't it, Father Burston?
A. Yes.
Q. You were able to remember - for example, when I asked you about whether there had been any handover from Monsignor Hart to you as vicar general in 1995-96, you were quite precise in remembering, weren't you, that Monsignor Hart was on leave at a particular point in time? A. Yes.
Q. You had no difficulty in remembering, in that situation, that there was no person who was able to give you information on McAlinden; that is, in the form of Monsignor Hart?
A. Yes.
Q. When you've been asked questions as to your knowledge about McAlinden from documents and discussions that you've had with church officials about McAlinden, you've proffered an answer to the Commissioner on numerous occasions of "I don't recall"?
A. Yes.
Q. Haven't you?
A. Yes.
Q. It is the position, isn't it, that you've just been selective in your evidence today in terms of what you're willing to recall and able to recall; that's the case, isn't it?
A. No.
Q. In fact, you are able to recall much more about McAlinden than you've indicated to the Commission; that's the position, isn't it?
A. No.

* Q. In fact, you have a recollection, don't you, of earlier reports being brought to your attention regarding McAlinden than you've suggested to the Commission today? You've got a recollection about those matters?
* A. No.

MR GYLES: I object. How can that possibly be put in that way?

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Kell is just suggesting that that may be the case.

MR GYLES: If it's put that way, it is different.
MR KELL: I'm putting it as a proposition that can be accepted or rejected. It was put in the form of a question to this witness, given what appears to be open to be a submission that his recollection about matters is highty selective.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Continue.
MR KELL: I don't want it to be suggested at any later time that that matter hasn't been squarely put to this witness.

THE COMMISSIONER: And that Father Burston has been given a chance to answer such a suggestion.
Q. Father, please feel free to do so.
A. Thank you.

MR KELL: Thank you, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Did you want the question read back?
MR KELL: Yes. I thought he had just got the answer to the question in before the objection.
(Question and answer marked * read)
MR KELL: I understand it was put as a question in the form of a proposition.

THE COMMISSIONER: Not a statement; it was a question.
MR KELL: Yes, and he has rejected that.
Q. Father, could I ask you to turn to volume 5 of the bundle. I will get you to identify two documents. Would you go to tab 386?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that a statement that you provided to NSW Police on 20 May 2003 relating to the Fletcher matter?
A. Yes.
Q. You've had an opportunity to read that in the last day or so?
A. Yes.
Q. Are the contents of that statement accurate?
A. Yes.
Q. Also, if you can go to tab 409, there's a supplementary statement that you provided to NSW Police, dated 8 September 2003?
A. Yes.

MR KELL: These were both marked as exhibit 54, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, thank you, Mr Kell.
MR KELL: Q. You've had the opportunity recently to read that statement again?
A. Yes.
Q. Are the contents of that shorter supplementary statement also correct?
A. Yes.
Q. If you go back to the first statement at tab 386, you indicate in paragraph 6 of the statement you provided to the police.
... the first time I became aware of the allegations involving Jim Fletcher from [AH] was following a '60 Minutes' program on 2 June 2002.
A. Yes.
Q. Was that the first occasion - that is to say, the 60 Minutes program on 2 June 2002 - where anyone spoke to you about concerns relating to Father Fletcher and the victim known as [AH]?
A. I think so. I'm not sure.
Q. When you say you think so, you're searching your recollection at the moment, are you?
A. Yes.
Q. You may have encountered that earlier than on about 2 June 2002?
A. I may have, but I - yes, it doesn't come to mind immediately.
Q. What you've indicated to police in your statement then was that the first time you became aware of the allegations was following that program on 2 June 2002?
A. Yes.
Q. Putting to one side victim [AH], did you become aware of any concerns relating to Father Fletcher and his behaviour with boys that might be inappropriate at any time in the 1990s?
A. I don't think so, no.
Q. Do you recall any discussion with Bishop Malone in about 1996 relating to a suspicion that Fletcher had been inappropriately behaving with boys?
A. Not an inappropriately behaving suspicion, no.

I don't recall that, no.
Q. Do you recal1 any reference to a report from Patrick Roohan to the bishop in about 1996 relating to Fletcher's behaviour?
A. I don't recall it, no.
Q. Do we take it that if that report had been made to you in 1996, it is something that you would recall, or you're not able to say having regard to the difficulties you -A. I'm not able to say at the moment, no. It is likely to be something I would recall, yes, but I can't say.
Q. You indicated that you knew Father Fletcher and were friends with him in the 1970s when you were at Waratah?
A. Yes.
Q. And he was at Waratah as well?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you able to assist us as to whether you have any recollection of Father Fletcher having been moved rather
abruptly to Gateshead in the 1970s, at very short notice, from Maitland?
A. I can remember him being moved, but that's all, yes.
Q. Are you able to assist us as to whether you remember there being any controversy in terms of that move to Gateshead at the time?
A. I can't recall immediately, no.
Q. Do you recall any suggestion at that time of there being a concern or suspicion about Fletcher having behaved inappropriately with boys?
A. I don't recall that, no.
Q. You provided your statement to the police in May 2003?
A. Yes.
Q. You will recall that was shortly after Father Fletcher was charged in relation to victim [AH]?
A. I don't know whether he was charged at that point.

I'm not sure.
Q. I think you indicated that you heard about the allegations relating to [AH], in your statement, on about 2 June following the 60 Minutes program?
A. Yes.
Q. And you, later that day, travelled to see Fletcher with Father Harrigan?
A. The next day.
Q. The next day. And that was to visit at Branxton?
A. Yes.
Q. You had a discussion with Father Fletcher?
A. Yes.
Q. And he'd indicated to you that, following the

60 Minutes program, he'd received a phone call from a young person?
A. Yes.
Q. And he was very abusive to him?
A. Yes.
Q. You had asked Fletcher whether he had any idea who the caller was?
A. Yes.
Q. And he said to you that it sounded like [AH]?
A. Yes.
Q. You explored that with Father Fletcher by asking whether he might say something like this?
A. Asking him why he might say something like this?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. According to you Father Fletcher said, "I don't know." Was it the case that Bishop Malone had asked you to attend at Branxton on that day to see Fletcher; that is to say, the next day following the 60 Minutes program in June 2002? A. I don't think so. I don't think so.
Q. How did you become aware of the allegations? Did you watch the 60 Minutes program?
A. No.
Q. Did you receive a call from Fletcher following the program?
A. I'm not sure whether it was Fletcher or Harrigan, but I certainly received a call, yes.
Q. What was your purpose in going to see Fletcher the next day?
A. To see why he wanted to see me, what was it all about.
Q. The call that you received, I think you said you're not sure whether it was from Father Harrigan or Fletcher? A. Yes.
Q. If you look at paragraph 6 of your statement, you indicate that you believed that you received a message off Des Harrigan to contact him?
A. Oh, yes, yes, yes.
Q. What did Father Harrigan say to you when you spoke with him?
A. I can't recall, no. Probably something to the effect that Jim was upset, but I don't know what the content of the conversation was.
Q. Again, is this a matter where you're having difficulty
with your recollection about certain events?
A. Well, I'm obviously having difficulty about the recollection, but I --
Q. You received --

MR GYLES: Let him finish.
MR KELL: Q. I am sorry; I didn't mean to cut you off. A. I don't know - I don't remember that - I don't know that I would have remembered the content of the conversation anyway, except that Fletcher was - would like to see me.
Q. Were you told in that conversation by Father Harrigan that someone had accused Fletcher of sexually abusing him?
A. I don't think so, but I'm not sure. I don't think so.
Q. You don't think so, but you're not sure?
A. Yes.
Q. That would be a fairly striking matter if it was said to you, wouldn't it?
A. Yes, it would, yes.
Q. And that would be something would you recall?
A. Yes, I think so, yes.
Q. When was the first time in June 2002 that you were told that Father Fletcher had been accused of sexually abusing a young boy?
A. It would have been the next day, a day or two after the program.
Q. When you say "it would have been", are you able to draw upon a recollection of someone telling you that now? A. No.
Q. You're not able to assist the Commissioner as to whether it was Father Fletcher who told you or Father Harrigan?
A. I'm not, no.
Q. And you travelled to Branxton and you spoke with Father Fletcher?
A. Yes.
Q. Was part of your purpose in visiting him to provide pastoral support, was it?
A. I would say that, yes.
Q. Did you continue with that role in the period after June 2002?
A. I did.
Q. How often did you meet and speak with Father Fletcher?
A. I can't recall the frequency.
Q. I want you to assume for present purposes that the matter relating to victim [AH] was reported to police on 4 June 2002?
A. Right.
Q. That is two days after the 60 Minutes program. Is that something of which you have knowledge at the moment? A. It's part of the statement that I made.
Q. Is it your recollection that Father Fletcher continued in his position as parish priest at Branxton for a number of months after that?
A. I presume so, but I'm not sure of that, no.
Q. Do you recall that Father Fletcher was charged in about May 2003? Excuse me, Commissioner --

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Father, would you answer Mr Kell before he speaks to senior counsel?
A. Sorry?
Q. Do you recall Mr Kell l s question?

MR KELL: Q. Do you recall Father Fletcher being charged by police in about May 2003?
A. I don't recall that, no.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. While Mr Kell is otherwise engaged, Father Burston, may I ask you to help me with something. When you spoke to Father Fletcher in this period after it was known that there was a complaint of child sexual abuse against him and when he was charged, did he maintain that he was innocent of these allegations to you?
A. He maintained his innocence all along, yes, Commissioner.
Q. Did he - and to you personally?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. Did you discuss the details of it with him when you had these pastoral visits with him?
A. There was very little opportunity to do that. He showed me the brief of evidence from two - rather the result of two interviews, and whenever I would say to him "This is - this could be believed", he changed the subject. So it wasn't something that $I$ could discuss with him.
Q. He deceived you on something that you realised at the time, I think, did he not?
A. Yes.
Q. I refer to your statement of 8 September 2003.
A. Oh, yes, yes.
Q. In paragraph 4, that's the last tab there?
A. Oh, right. Oh, yes.
Q. Do you recall that you noted in that statement that James Fletcher insisted to you that [AH] never stayed overnight with him at the presbytery?
A. Yes.
Q. And you corrected him and said, "I don't think it's true, Jim. I remember that you told me". When we're talking about that now, do you remember that conversation with him?
A. I certainly - yes, I do, not in detail, but certain1y remember, as I've stated there, that $I$ put it to him that he had told me before that [AH] had stayed - was it [AH]? Yes.
Q. Did that give you some disquiet about whether he was being truthful to you in his --
A. Yes, it did, yes.
Q. I take it, Father Burston, that you accepted the verdict of the court when ultimately James Fletcher was convicted of these offences?
A. Yes, I did, yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: I'm sorry to interrupt, Mr Kell. Thank you, Father Burston.

MR KELL: Thank you, Commissioner.
Q. Was there a time leading up to the verdict of the court where you formed the view that Fletcher was likely to be guilty of the offences charged?
A. I can't say that. My - I was still confused until
after the verdict.
Q. When you say you were still confused, you were uncertain?
A. Uncertain, if you like, yes.
Q. Is it fair to say that from the time that Fletcher was charged up until the verdict, there was a continuing sense of unease on your part as to the innocence of Fletcher?

MR GYLES: Commissioner, I object on the grounds of relevance. Where does this go, whatever his view about --

THE COMMISSIONER: It would be of assistance to me, Mr Gyles.

MR GYLES: If it would, then I don't object, Commissioner.
MR KELL: And it is relevant, Commissioner, if I might say so.
Q. I wonder if you could answer that question.
A. Yes, there was unease about whether he was guilty or not, yes.
Q. And that's unease on the part of you?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you have an increasing acceptance from the period of June 2002 up until the verdict of the jury in December regarding the likely innocence or otherwise of Fletcher? Was there a particular event that caused you to more seriously doubt the innocence of Fletcher?
A. The verdict.
Q. But before the verdict, was there another event?
A. No, not that I can - I don't think so, yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: May I ask something arising from that, Mr Kell. I do apologise.
Q. Father, this was a priest you first met in 1971?
A. Yes.
Q. So you'd known him quite well for 20 -odd years?
A. Yes
Q. You were friends with him or --
A. Yes.
Q. -- quite good friends, anyway; is that overstating it?
A. Friends anyway, yes, and I suppose at times we were good friends, yes.
Q. When you first heard of these allegations, they must have come as a huge shock to you?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you remember that point, first hearing about it and from whom?
A. Well, the first hearing about it was after the program.
Q. Yes. Who was it who told you?
A. James Fletcher himself said, "These are - this guy's making an allegation", and I don't - I don't recall when I would have had any further information about that until sorry.
Q. Did you give him to believe that you accepted his denial as part of your pastoral care of him?
A. Certainly until I saw the two - the brief of evidence that he was given and then, as I said, whenever I'd say to him, "This could be believed" without wishing to say, "Hey, this is true", he changed the subject, so I began to wonder then.
Q. And especially then when you caught him out in that lie to you about the boy staying in the presbytery?
A. The boy staying there, yes.
Q. Just returning to McAlinden, a priest you knew as well, that's the first priest you had heard of certainly who had been accused of sexual abuse of children, wasn't it?
A. Yes, I'm not sure of the chronology of that and Vincent Ryan, in my hearing of him, but yes.
Q. Wouldn't such terrible news, a terrible thing, be seared upon your brain forever, hearing that such an allegation had been made about a priest that you knew?
A. I don't know that I can answer that clearly. If it was somebody closer to me like McAlinden, for example sorry, like James Fletcher, yes; but McAlinden, I don't know that it would have been as such a searing event, as you say.
Q. Because McAlinden was not very --
A. A difficult customer and not very friendly - not very close to me, yes.
Q. Did he have any friends - McAlinden - in the priesthood in the diocese?
A. That I'm not sure. One certainly that he would stay with in Ireland was Patrick Hallinan.
Q. But not many?
A. Others I don't - I don't know.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Father Burston. I'm sorry, Mr Kell.

MR KELL: No, thank you, Commissioner.
Q. Was there a time when you became aware, in about April 2004, that there was a further Fletcher victim who had come forward and had provided evidence to the police?
A. I'm not sure of the dating of that, but I certainly saw the brief of evidence. That, I think, may be the first time that I was aware.
Q. The brief of evidence to which you're referring had statements, did it, from persons who or a person who complained of sexual abuse by Fletcher other than [AH]? A. Yes.
Q. And that was part of the reasons why, was it, that you started to doubt the innocence of Fletcher?
A. Yes .
Q. I think you indicated to the Commissioner, when the Commissioner asked you about whether events might be seared on your brain because of the first time you heard accusations against McAlinden, and you said that there might be some issue relating to whether Ryan predated

McAlinden?
A. Yes .
Q. But the position would be different in respect of Fletcher because he'd been a friend of yours?
A. Yes.
Q. Do we take it from those answers that the first time you had any reports made to you by Fletcher or Bishop Malone relating to improper conduct by Fletcher with boys was when you heard that Fletcher - when Fletcher had told you about the accusations in June 2002; is that the case?
A. I think that's the case, yes.
Q. And so that's seared in your brain now because, according to you, that's the first time that you became aware of an accusation that Fletcher had behaved inappropriately with boys, is it?
A. Yes.
Q. Following the 60 Minutes program in 2002, you indicated that you had seen Father Fletcher?
A. Yes .
Q. And that there was a pastoral element to your contact with him?
A. Yes.
Q. You continued with that contact in the coming months?
A. Yes.
Q. How regularly did you see him?
A. I can't answer that.
Q. Was it a weekly --
A. I can't answer it, I'm sorry.
Q. You can't answer it?
A. I don't know.
Q. You're answering me very quickly. Are you able to just consider that, whether it was - was it a daily call? A. It certainly wasn't a daily call but I cannot answer how regularly it was, no.
Q. And that's because you've got no recollection about
the matter?
A. Because it would have been infrequent. It wouldn't have been a scheduled once a week or once a month meeting.
Q. By "infrequent", you'd see him sometimes twice a month perhaps and then weekly the next month, is that what you're indicating.
A. It could be, yes.
Q. You gave some evidence that it wasn't as clear to you as to when you first became aware of allegations relating to McAlinden?
A. Yes .
Q. In contrast to the position with Fletcher?
A. Yes.
Q. But McAlinden was a priest of the diocese?
A. Yes.
Q. As you search your memory now, it was either, wasn't it - the candidate for the first time you heard about a priest of the diocese having sexually abused boys was either McAlinden or Vince Ryan, wasn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. One or the other?
A. Yes.
Q. There were something like 30 priests of the diocese at any particular point in time?
A. There would have been more.
Q. There would be more?
A. Yes.
Q. Something like 50?

MR GYLES: Is this question directed to the situation in --

THE COMMISSIONER: It did change over the years. It reduced --

MR KELL: I will withdraw that.
Q. There was a cohort of priests of the diocese in all
the time that you were incardinated?
A. Yes.
Q. In the early 1970s you had been a priest, an assistant priest at various parishes?
A. Yes.
Q. And then at some point in time - and I think you gave evidence today that you became aware of allegations about Vince Ryan when he was arrested?
A. Yes .
Q. Was that what your evidence was?
A. Yes.
Q. Back in October 1995?
A. Yes.
Q. At some point in time you became aware that McAlinden had been accused of abusing boys sexually?
A. No.
Q. Al1 right. I'11 withdraw that. At some point in time you became aware that McAlinden was sexually abusing children?
A. Yes.
Q. That would have been striking news to you, wouldn't it, that a priest of this diocese was abusing children?
A. Yes.
Q. It didn't matter whether he was a friend of yours or not, did it? He was one of the priests of the diocese.
A. Yes.
Q. And you would have been shocked?
A. Yes.
Q. And it would have been a momentous occasion, I suggest to you?
A. I'm sorry, I can't place when it was though.
Q. It was a striking occasion, wasn't it?
A. I do not recall it, I'm sorry.
Q. You're answering that very quick1y.

MR GYLES: I object. This is the second time that's been said. First of all, I challenge it, I object to that comment on the basis that it was not answered quickly, number one, and number two, what is wrong with answering a question quickly?

THE COMMISSIONER: Particularly if it has come a few times in a row.

MR GYLES: He has been asked a series of questions, including by you, Commissioner, and my learned friend has now given two different adjectives to him. There is a question of degree here, particularly when the criticism is made unfairly.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Gyles. Could you ask your next question, please, Mr Kell ?

MR KELL: Yes. Thank you.
Q. Father, it was a momentous occasion when you first heard that McAlinden had sexually abused children?

MR GYLES: This very question has been asked and answered and it has then been followed by a following question of the same character. I think we understand this point.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
Q. It was a momentous occasion, father, but it seems to be the case that you have no recollection of it?
A. I do not have a recollection.
Q. But would you accept it would have been momentous?
A. It would, yes, but I have no recollection of when it occurred.
Q. Did you know that Father McAlinden's predilection was with little girls, when you came to know of it?
A. That's when I - yes, when I finally came to know it, yes.
Q. Who told you that?
A. That I cannot recall.

THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Yes, sorry, carry on.

MR KELL: Q. Without putting a time on it, do you remember where you were when you were told that?
A. No.
Q. When you heard that?
A. No, I don't.
Q. You don't?
A. No.
Q. I just want to return to Father Fletcher. At a period of time you were providing pastoral support to Father Fletcher?
A. Yes.
Q. He continued to remain as the parish priest at Branxton?
A. I'm not sure of the dating of that and when he moved from there: I can't recall.
Q. Do you remember he was charged in May 2003?
A. Yes.
Q. Your statement indicates that the allegation that was made to him from [AH] was in June 2002?
A. Yes.
Q. The following day, or two days later, you learned that [AH] had been to the police?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. From that point in time you knew that there was a police investigation relating to Fletcher?
A. Yes .
Q. And he continued to be the parish priest at Branxton?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you have discussions with Bishop Malone in 2002 relating to Fletcher's role as a parish priest at Branxton?
A. I don't recall any.
Q. You don't recall there being any?
A. No.
Q. Do you recall Bishop Malone consulting with you as to
whether Fletcher should be stood down from his role at Branxton?
A. I don't recall that, no.
Q. You've got no recollection about that?
A. No.
Q. You're answering again question my question very quick1y.

MR GYLES: I object.
MR KELL: That's a comment, not a question.
MR GYLES: I object. That is an unfair question. I dispute that the question was answered quickly, in any event, and it is unhelpful in your role, Commissioner. You can make an assessment of this witness without comments like that.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. It wasn't the quickest answer I've ever heard, Mr Kell.

MR KELL: Thank you.
Q. You have given evidence earlier today that you know who John Davoren is?
A. Yes.
Q. In 2003 and 2002 he was a director of the PSO?
A. Yes.
Q. The Professional Standards Office?
A. Yes.
Q. He was effectively the conduit for providing information from the church to NSW Police in certain circumstances, as you understood the position?

MR BARAN: I object to the width of the question, Commissioner. "In certain circumstances", in the context of this inquiry, is a very wide assertion.

THE COMMISSIONER: It is rather broad.
MR KELL: I withdraw that. It is not intended to be controversial.
Q. You knew in 2003 that John Davoren worked within an arm of the Catholic Church?
A. Yes .
Q. And that he had contacts with the NSW Police Force?
A. As far as I knew, yes.
Q. You understood that he could be in a position to provide information to NSW Police?
A. Yes .
Q. And you'd utilised that back in $1999 ?$
A. Yes.
Q. In February 2004 did you have a conversation with Mr Davoren in relation to Fletcher?
A. I don't recall a conversation.
Q. You don't recall?
A. No.
Q. In February 2003, I want to suggest to you, you had a conversation --

MR BARAN: I am sorry, 2003 or 2004? You just said 2004.
MR KELL: Q. I am sorry, if I said 2004 it should be 2003. On 24 February 2003 you had a conversation with Mr Davoren of the PSO?
A. Right.
Q. And he had made a suggestion to you that Fletcher should be stood down from his position as a parish priest at Branxton?
A. I don't recall that conversation but that could well have taken place.
Q. You said to Mr Davoren that [AH] had been demonstrating bizarre behaviour for some years and that you thought it was likely that the current matter was just another sign of his psychological disturbance. Do you recall saying that?
A. I don't recall that, no; I do not, no.
Q. Do you deny saying that?
A. I would deny some of the implications there, yes.
Q. Do you deny holding that view as at February 2003?
A. I would not have used the words "psychological disturbance".
Q. You're not answering my question. Do you deny holding the view at February 2003 that [AH] had been demonstrating behaviour, bizarre behaviour for some years?
A. I don't know that I used the word "bizarre".
Q. No, I'm asking you a different question. Did you hold the view --

MR GYLES: With all due respect, he answered the question. He was asked whether he had a recollection of those matters and his response was, "I don't know whether I would use the word 'bizarre' to describe his state of mind." That was an answer to the question.

THE COMMISSIONER: I recall you asking about a psychological disturbance, Mr Kell.

MR KELL: Yes.
Q. Father, what I have asked you is do you recall holding the view in 2003 that [AH] had been demonstrating bizarre behaviours for some years?
A. I can't recall putting it that way to anybody but --
Q. That's a different question. I'm asking you whether you held that view at February 2003?
A. I don't know. I cannot answer that one.
Q. You can't answer whether you held that view?
A. Yes, I can't answer that clearly, no.
Q. You wouldn't have suggested that to Mr Davoren unless you had held that view, would you?
A. Probably, yes, that's true, yes.
Q. You're agreeing with me that you wouldn't have said that to Mr Davoren unless you held that view?
A. No, I may not have used the phraseology that's quoted there.
Q. No, I'm asking you a different question. You wouldn't have said to Mr Davoren that [AH] had been demonstrating
bizarre behaviour for some years unless you held that view, would you?
A. Yes, that's - yes.
Q. Similarly, you thought it was likely that the current matter involving Fletcher and [AH] was just another sign of his psychological disturbance; that's what you said to Mr Davoren?
A. Yes, okay, I said it, yes.
Q. And you're agreeing that you did say that?

MR GYLES: These questions are all proceeding on an assumption that Mr Davoren has recorded these things.

THE COMMISSIONER: Correctly.
MR GYLES: To be fair to the witness, as I apprehend his evidence, it is that he cannot recall the conversation and he is being asked whether he would, assuming those things are correct, have held that view if they had been said --

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MR GYLES: -- and accepting it.
MR KELL: I will withdraw the question in that form.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Kell. You know how to meet Mr Gyles's objection.

MR KELL: Yes.
Q. In February 2003 you did hold the view, didn't you, that the current matter involving [AH] was just another sign of [AH]'s psychological disturbance? You held that view, didn't you?
A. Yes.
Q. You told Mr Davoren that you told him that?
A. I presume I did, yes.
Q. You also said to Mr Davoren that there was no other complaint of this or any other kind that had ever been received against Fletcher?
A. Yes.
Q. You're agreeing with me that you said that to --
A. I presume I did. You're reporting a conversation that I can't recall.
Q. Do you remember saying that to Mr Davoren?
A. No, I don't.
Q. Do you remember that being the view that you held in February 2003?
A. Yes.
Q. You do?
A. Yes.
Q. That you held the view that there had been no other complaint of this or any other kind against Fletcher?
A. Yes.
Q. And you wouldn't have said that to Mr Davoren unless you held that view, would you?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you hold the view in February 2003 that the diocese still did not have sufficient information about [AH]'s complaint to justify standing Fletcher down?
A. Yes.
Q. You did hold that view in February 2003?
A. I think so, yes.
Q. You said that to Mr Davoren in a conversation on 24 February 2003?
A. Yes.
Q. And you're agreeing with me that you did say that?
A. I'm agreeing with you that that is a recording of a conversation that I do not recall easily.
Q. But it was the view that you held as at February 2003, wasn't it?
A. Yes.

MR KELL: Is that a convenient time, Commissioner?
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. It's 1 o'clock already.
LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT

## UPON RESUMPTION

MR KELL: Q. Father, you'd worked for many years as a director of Centacare?
A. Yes.
Q. During that time you'd provided psychological services?
A. Yes.
Q. Part of that work that you did involved dealing with families who had been affected by sexual abuse?
A. I don't recall working with families who were affected by it, no.
Q. In your time at Centacare, were some of the persons that you consulted with victims of sexual abuse, not by priests but victims of sexual abuse?
A. Yes.
Q. They were?
A. Yes.
Q. You provided counselling services to those persons?
A. Yes.
Q. And helped to arrange services on a long-term basis for those victims?
A. If appropriate, yes.
Q. Part of your experience with victims of sexual abuse has been that the abuse itself can have consequences on their behaviour?
A. Yes.
Q. It can lead to, in some cases, what might be regarded as antisocial behaviour?
A. Yes.
Q. I might turn to another topic. In 2012, you were interviewed by police in relation to the Strike Force Lantle investigation?
A. Yes.
Q. After some administrative arrangements, there was a time set in place where you attended for an interview? A. Yes.
Q. That was a voluntary interview?
A. Yes.
Q. You endeavoured, did you, to provide accurate and complete answers to the questions that were asked of you in that interview?
A. Yes.
Q. Is there any respect in which you believe that you may not have cooperated in any way with the Lantle investigation?
A. No respect, no. I cooperated completely.

MR KELL: Thank you. Commissioner, those are the questions that $I$ had for Father Burston in chief in the public part of the examination. There are a couple of matters that need to be dealt with in camera for reasons that are extraneous to Father Burston.

It is a matter for you, but one manner which we propose to deal with this is that we do the public cross-examination now of Father Burston and then, at the end of the day, we perhaps do the short in-camera hearings that need to be done, if that is convenient.

THE COMMISSIONER: Very well. May I ask a question, and I'm sorry, Mr Kell, and, Father Burston, for butting in probably unwelcomingly at all times.
Q. When Mr Kell asked you that question about your experience for many years at Centacare and its predecessor and your experience with victims of sexual assault leaving aside clergy, of course, but just generally victims of sexual assault - and realising that often the effects are manifested in, I think you said, antisocial behaviour, or agreed with Mr Kell antisocial behaviour, but there could be other psychological disturbances; would that be correct?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. When you heard about the allegations by [AH] and some of the acting out that he had been apparently doing, did that, for you as a social worker, psychologist, raise any alarm bells, indeed especially as you knew his loving parents and so on, that there may have been some sexual assault of that boy?
A. Certainly some trauma. I don't know that

I immediately jumped to the conclusion it was sexual abuse, but certainly some trauma, yes.
Q. Yes. Did that sway you a little when you were considering James Fletcher's denials to you of having abused the boy?
A. It didn't change my view that certainly there had been some trauma. I was puzzled as to whether it was Fletcher.
Q. As far as you were concerned, would it be true to say that whatever behavioural - or misbehaviours he was performing and doing may have been consistent with someone who had been sexually abused?
A. Oh, yes, yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Father Burston. Mr Kell, have you completed what you wanted to cover with Father Burston in public?

MR KELL: I have, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Is it appropriate to move on to other counsel?

MR KELL: Yes.

## <EXAMINATION BY MR BARAN:

MR BARAN: Q. Very briefly, sir, you were asked some questions by my learned friend assisting the Commission regarding the letter that you had sent to the Professional Standards Office, which I'11 just turn up, which is behind tab 304. That is in volume 4.
A. Yes.
Q. Firstly, the document appears to be addressed to the Professional Standards Resource Group?
A. Yes.
Q. As far as you were aware at the time, was either that body or a body known as the Professional Standards Office the relevant body that was dealing with complaints in respects of matters such as child sexual assault?
A. Yes.
Q. Just move over then, please, to a few more pages,
which is over at tab 308. You were taken to this particular document, which is a letter written by Mr Davoren from the Professional Standards Office, appearing to respond to your letter which had been addressed to the Professional Standards Group?
A. The Resource Group. Yes.
Q. In between that time, did you learn that another person, who is under the pseudonym of [AE], had made certain complaints of child sexual assault? Have a look at the pseudonym list if you want to.
A. [AE]. I don't think I was. I'm not sure.
Q. If you go behind tab 310, you will see statement of complaint by [AE].
A. Yes.
Q. Then behind tab 311, you will see there appears to be, by at least 8 October 1999, a police report that appears to be accepted and created regarding --
A. Sorry?
Q. Tab 311. Do you see at the top there it is a police report and a summary, if you go to the next page, at page 771 involving [AE]?
A. Oh, right, yes.
Q. Do you recall, sir, having any discussions with either Mr Davoren or anyone on behalf of the Professional
Standards Office that another victim had come forward and the police were, as it were, on the case?
A. I don't have any recollection of that, no.
Q. Do you recall as well by 1 December 1999, or shortly thereafter, being informed by the Professional Standards Office that a warrant for the arrest of McAlinden had been issued?
A. I don't recall that, no. No.
Q. It appears that the communications between yourself and Mr Davoren appear to go cold at that particular time. A. Right.
Q. I'm wondering if you could tell the Commission what your recollection is as to why it appears that there's no more contact?
A. No, I can't, and I don't recall any reason why.
Q. Is it a possibility - and it is a possibility only that you became aware of another victim coming forward and making complaints to police and police taking action, hence, suspending any further inquiries regarding the Professional Standards Office?
A. I don't recall that, but that would have been the procedure.

MR BARAN: Thank you.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Mr Cohen?
MR COHEN: I think, having regard to my experience yesterday, I have no questions, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Cohen. Mr Harben.

## <EXAMINATION BY MR HARBEN:

MR HARBEN: Q. Father, you were appointed vicar general for five years from 1 January 1996; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Is it also the case that you were appointed as an assistant vicar general on 1 August 2001 until 31 December 2005?
A. Yes .
Q. In that latter period, there were in fact two vicars general in the diocese?
A. Yes.
Q. We've heard evidence from you and others about the position of vicar general and what assistance they were asked for and were able to give the bishop, so can I take it that in the second period there was a doubling of efforts in that regard to give assistance to the bishop? A. Not necessarily.
Q. There were two of you to go to for discussion and advice on certain matters?
A. Yes .
Q. Did you know whether that type of arrangement existed in any other diocese?
A. It is common in many dioceses.
Q. It wasn't common in Newcastle-Maitland prior to that time?
A. Yes, it was. I can't give you the dates, but it had been, yes.
Q. Was that the situation when you were appointed in January of 1996?
A. No.
Q. Prior to your appointment, there was only one vicar general?
A. Yes.
Q. Following your appointment in January 1996, there was only one vicar general?
A. Yes.
Q. I think you also said in evidence that the Council of Priests under Bishop Malone were automatically members of the consultors?
A. Yes.
Q. That was a different arrangement that had existed previously; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Did that, in effect, widen the circle of advice that was available to the bishop?
A. Possibly, not necessarily.
Q. The priests who were members of the Council of Priests had previously not always been consultors?
A. But the previous consultors had been members of the Council of Priests.
Q. What was the difference then under Bishop Malone making it automatic that the Council of Priests became consultors, as you said in your evidence?
A. Meaning that he only had one body to refer to. It was more an administrative - well, he saw it. I think, as an administrative - making it more administratively easy.
Q. By that do you mean in terms of the administration, it is not just administration, is it; it affects all of the operations of the diocese in terms of advice?
A. In terms of the advice which the bishop seeks?
Q. Yes. His ability to seek advice from a wider group of people?
A. If all the members of the Council of Priests - all the consultors are also members of the Council of Priests, but there are other priests on it.
Q. And that would be the case?
A. That was the case under Bishop Malone. Under Bishop Malone they became that one group. Previously they were two separate groups, but mainly the same people except for the extras on the Council of Priests.
Q. Thank you. That was something that Bishop Malone instituted during his time as bishop?
A. Yes.
Q. By the way, this diocese, you would agree that it was a busy diocese?
A. Well, I presume so, yes.
Q. You were busy in your role as vicar general?
A. At times, yes.
Q. Those around you, you could see were busy?
A. Yes.
Q. You were asked to recall on a number of occasions whether you had spoken to anybody about anything to do with [AH] prior to June of 2002, and I think not only in your police statement but on a number of occasions, you said you couldn't recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. I want to suggest to you that, in December of 2000, Bishop Malone spoke to you about something that had been told to him by [BI].

MR KELL: Commissioner, I don't want to interrupt my friend, but I might just talk to Mr Harben across for a minute.
(Mr Kell and Mr Harben confer)
MR KELL: Thank you, Commissioner.
MR HARBEN: Q. In 2002, following the 60 Minutes
program, you learnt of a phone call that had been made to Father Fletcher?
A. Yes.
Q. Some days later?
A. Sorry?
Q. Some days later or a day or so later?
A. A day or so later, yes.
Q. You think that that knowledge possibly came to you via Father Fletcher or Father Harrigan?
A. Yes.
Q. You went up to see Father Fletcher?
A. Yes.
Q. I think in your second statement to the police, you give a version of speaking to [BI] after you had spoken to Fletcher?
A. I may have. I can't recall the statement.
Q. In any event, you have said in your statement that you understood that Bishop Malone and Vicar General Saunders had been up to see Father Fletcher?
A. Right.
Q. You knew that - sorry, do you recall that now?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. You didn't go with them on that journey, did you?
A. No.
Q. It would be untrue to say that when you returned from such a journey with those two people, it was at that time you saw [BI] to report what had been said. That would be untrue, wouldn't it?
A. Yes.

MR HARBEN: Thank you, Commissioner.
MR BARAN: Commissioner, could I raise one issue? It is a matter that I did not put to this particular witness because I didn't get instructions. I've just received those instructions via the miracle of technology. Can I raise one issue with the witness, if I may?

THE COMMISSIONER: Of course.

## <EXAMINATION BY MR BARAN:

MR BARAN: Q. Sir, could you please go to volume 5 of the bundle. It is tab 375.
A. Yes.
Q. Do you see, sir, that appears to be an email from Mr Davoren to certain other persons?
A. Yes.
Q. There is a series of events which are summarised there in the email?
A. Yes.
Q. Can I bring you down, if I may, to the last two paragraphs, namely, paragraphs 6 and 7 ?
A. Yes.
Q. You will see there that there is a summary and it refers to "a senior priest"?
A. Yes.
Q. Can I walk you through it, if I may:

Later again on 24 February --
This is 2003 --
... I spoke to a senior priest and official of the Diocese of Maitland Newcastle with the idea of recommending that Fletcher be stood down at least until the investigation was completed.

You were asked some questions about that particular conversation by our learned friend assisting the Commission. Do you remember that?
A. Yes.
Q. I want to put to you that the senior priest referred to in that document was you?
A. I should imagine so, yes.
Q. You will see it goes on there:

The man $I$ contacted has a long experience in working with people with problems --

You?
A. Yes.
Q. :
... and was for many years director of Centacare Newcastle.

Again, no question it was you?
A. Yes.

MR BARAN: Thank you.
MR CAVANAGH: Nothing arising.
THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Skinner?
MR SKINNER: No questions.
MS McLAUGHLIN: No questions.
THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Gyles? I'm sorry, Ms Gerace?
MR GERACE: I have some questions, if that's appropriate.
Could I proceed before Mr Gyles?
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
<EXAMINATION BY MS GERACE:
MR GERACE: Q. Father, you have a degree involving psychology. That was study involving how many years?
A. Five.
Q. And then an additional masters?
A. Sorry, the masters was at the end of the five years.
Q. So it was three years plus the two to get both?
A. Yes.
Q. As part of your obtaining your masters, both your undergraduate degree and your masters, did your study include the study of the nature of trauma?
A. I should think so, yes.
Q. As part of your studies in obtaining your masters, did it involve a study of aberrations of the mind or mental illness?
A. Yes, there were some aspects of it, yes.
Q. Would that also have included some study or looking at the nature of aberrant sexual behaviour?
A. Yes, very little is my recollection, yes.
Q. But some?
A. Yes.
Q. In your work as the director of the - was it called Centacare at the time?
A. Yes, most of the time.
Q. Most of the time - that was for 20 years, approximately; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. As a director, were you one of the directors or were there many?
A. No, I was the boss, the director.
Q. You were the boss?
A. Yes.
Q. When you were asked yesterday about whether you did administrative or counselling work, you did both?
A. Yes.
Q. You were responsible for running the centre?
A. Yes.
Q. As well as providing direct one-on-one counselling?
A. Yes.
Q. What was the split relatively between your role as the administrator and counselling?
A. It's hard to quantify.

MR GYLES: Commissioner, I have an objection to this. My learned friend has asked some questions. We're here dealing with four police investigations. True it is that Father Burston has this experience. The question is what assistance can it be in respect of the matters that you are
considering?
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Gyles. I expect that we are about to have that revealed by Ms Gerace.

MS GERACE: Thank you.
Q. As part of your role in running that centre, there were a number of persons involved in providing counselling services?
A. Yes.
Q. You oversaw the provision of those services?
A. Yes.
Q. And whether it was you or others, the issue of providing counselling to victims of abuse was one of the services provided by Centacare?
A. Yes.
Q. It also provided services in the nature of counselling in relation to marriage difficulties or relationship difficulties; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Did it also deal with fostering services?
A. Yes.
Q. So that it was involved in the assessment of applicants for fostering children who may have been removed from homes where there was abuse?
A. Yes .
Q. Or given up for adoption, or is that run separately?
A. That was run - that was separately, yes.
Q. In your role as the director of Centacare, were you involved in the formulation of policies that guided your service in how it responded to issues of abuse of children within a home?

MR GYLES: I maintain my objection. My learned friend has been given more latitude and again we don't seem to be anywhere near the matters that you are appropriately considering, Commissioner,

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Gyles. I think we're
getting closer.
MS GERACE: Yes. Sometimes we need to go broader to come down to the specifics.
Q. One of the things that you needed to do as the director of Centacare was ensure that there were policies in place to guide those providing the services to guide them in how they responded to issues of abuse within a home where it involved children?
A. Yes.
Q. One of the things that you gave consideration to in that role as the director was where, if at all, it obliged your counsellors and other persons providing those services, to take the matters further where they became aware of abuse of children within a home?
A. That was rare because the first port of call for children in difficulties within the home was the department.
Q. Yes?
A. And they would usually refer the children into our care. But we didn't have the direct involvement in the first instance.
Q. Yes, I understand that, but it was one of the things, as a director of Centacare, that you needed to consider when formulating your policies for what your counsellors did when it did come to their attention?
A. Yes.
Q. By the time you became a consultor, both in 1981 and also in the period 1992-1995, you were aware of the issue of child abuse as a general concern within the community? A. Yes.
Q. And also the need to consider an appropriate response where you in a professional capacity or where one in a professional capacity becomes aware of child abuse?
A. Yes .
Q. Also in your role as the director of Centacare, you were involved in formulating policies which guided the counsellors in how they responded to information that came to them about abuse of children?
A. Yes.
Q. In 1988 the church set up the Special Issues Committee; do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. The Special Issues Committee was set up to deal specifically with providing guidance to bishops about how they responded to special issues that affected the clergy and the bishops in the formulation of their role, in carrying out of their functions. You were also aware at the time when that Special Issues Committee was set up, that one of the main issues that that body was set up to address was the problem of abuse of children by clergy? A. I don't know recall that being as one of the main issues, but I'm not perfectly sure at this point.
Q. Were you aware of it being one of the issues that the Special Issues Committee was set up to examine?
A. Yes.
Q. And that it was set up to provide guidance to bishops in their responses to those issues as they arose?
A. Yes.
Q. Was it the case that the Professional Standards Group was a group set up under the auspices of the Special Issues Committee?

MR KELL: Commissioner, I wonder if I could have a word with my learned friend.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Kell.
(Mr Kell and Ms Gerace confer)
MS GERACE: Q. By 1988, you were aware, at least after the establishment of this committee, that sexual abuse by clergy was an issue for the church?
A. Yes.
Q. You were also aware in 1988 that one of the issues for the church was how it responded to information given to it about a member of the clergy having abused a child?
A. Yes.
Q. In addition to that, how it interacted with the police about that information?
A. Yes.
Q. How it dealt with complainants about that information?
A. Yes, them too, yes.
Q. You were asked some questions yesterday about the nature of a consultor, being a consultor. Is it fair to say that the role of being a consultor was to provide a general advisory service to the bishop?
A. Yes .
Q. Meetings were convened from time to time to deal with matters as they affected the parish, the meeting of consultors?
A. As they affected the diocese.
Q. As they affected the diocese?
A. Yes.
Q. They included, did they not, the allocation of priests or otherwise to various parishes?
A. Yes.
Q. Matters of leave or other things that concerned the various parishes?
A. Yes.
Q. The disciplining of priests?
A. I think that more rarely.
Q. But from time to time?
A. Could have been, yes. Yes.
Q. And also problems that may have arisen in relation to various priests?
A. Yes.
Q. So that insofar as you were a consultor, part of your role was to meet with the bishop and the other consultors to decide a course of action in relation to problems that were brought to those meetings; do you agree with that? A. Yes.
Q. Are you able to assist us in terms of your role as a consultor? Was it a paid role or is it an honorary role? A. It's certainly not a paid role.
Q. Not a paid role?
A. No.
Q. As a consultor, did you keep notes of meetings of the consultors?
A. I did not, no.
Q. Was there someone assigned to take the minutes of meetings of the consultors?
A. At times yes and at times no. Under Bishop Malone, I don't remember anyone necessarily taking notes of the meetings, no.
Q. Was it the practice that minutes of the one meeting would be adopted at a subsequent meeting of consultors? A. I can't recall exactly now, but only - obviously only those minutes that had been written up, yes.
Q. May I just ask quickly - you didn't keep notes of meetings of consultors?
A. I didn't keep personal notes, no.
Q. You didn't keep personal notes?. Can I ask you about that point: when you were the vicar general, you had an office; yes?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you maintain a diary?
A. No, not - only an appointments diary.
Q. An appointments diary?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you keep notes, as the vicar general, of meetings?
A. No.
Q. May I ask you further, going back - I am sorry,

I should have asked this earlier - when you were a consultor between 1992 and 1995, were you involved in regular correspondence, regular communication might be a better word, with Monsignor Hart about matters that had been brought to the consultors' meetings?
A. We would talk about it, but not a formal
communication, as far as I recall.
Q. But you would talk to him about --
A. It may be, yes.
Q. May I ask you briefly - you gave some evidence earlier today about having had 10 general anaesthetics. Would you mind indicating what period, over what years?
A. From 2004 to 2012.
Q. 2004 to 2012 .
A. Yes.
Q. When, in your view, do you say that your memory started to be affected?
A. Certainly after the second one, because it was a longer anaesthetic.
Q. So, even on your own evidence, your memory was not affected as of the period prior to 2004?
A. Apart from ageing, no, it wasn't.
Q. You were asked yesterday about how long you were a consultor when you were first appointed in 1981. I think your answer was that without checking records, you couldn't be sure. What records were you were referring to that would need to be checked?
A. Well, the appointment - the list, you know, I saw, and maybe the - I don't know. There are - I'd have to - yes, I'm not sure of that. There would be some, I'm sure, in the bishop's office that would have the meetings and who was there, but that's - but I can't recall immediately.
Q. There weren't any specific records that you were referring to?
A. There may be even in my own appointments diary, you know, sort of the time when they petered out, but I can't give the actual dates.
Q. But you don't have any issue with the dates as they are recorded on the documents that you were shown yesterday --
A. No.
Q. -- about what you did at various times in your appointments?
A. No, I don't have an issue.
Q. Are you also aware that, in or about 1992-1993, 1et's say 1993, that a Royal Commission was underway looking at the issue of paedophilia?
A. Yes.
Q. Were you also aware that it was a very big issue for the Catholic Church as a number of its clergy were having to give evidence before that Royal Commission?
A. Yes.
Q. As at 1993, you were aware then that one of the issues that was being examined was the church's response to information that came to it about abuse by members of the clergy?
A. Yes.
Q. Were you also aware, as at 1993, that one of the issues was what the church should do when it got information about a clergy member having abused a child and whether or not it should go to the police?
A. Yes.
Q. Were you also aware in 1993 that quite often the view that was taken was that if the victims didn't wish to go to the police, the church did not go to the police?

MR GYLES: I object. A view taken by whom?
MS GERACE: I'11 withdraw it.
MR SAIDI: I don't want to interrupt my friend, but I think the Royal Commission was later than 1992-93. I think it was more 1995, 1996, 1997.

THE COMMISSIONER: That's my recollection also, Mr Saidi.
MS GERACE: Q. You gave some evidence earlier today that in relation to --

MR GYLES: Before my learned friend moves on, in connection with those questions that have just been put, I'm grateful to Mr Saidi for raising this issue. What we have had is a series of questions which have been dated by reference to the Royal Commission on the premise that it was --

THE COMMISSIONER: It wasn't very many. It was the last two or maybe three.

MR GYLES: I appreciate that. A11 I'm saying --

MS GERACE: I'm happy to correct the record. I understand that. I did not intend to mislead --

MR GYLES: I'm not for a moment criticising my learned friend, but just so the record shows that there have been affirmative answers given and, as to the timing of the knowledge, it was not as to the date, but to the Royal Commission.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, that's on the record.
MS GERACE: Q. Father, I'm sorry about those dates. Can I say this: as at 1996, at least, evidence was being given before the Royal Commission by some of the clergy. Were you aware of that?
A. I wasn't specifically aware of that, no.
Q. Were you aware that Father Lucas gave evidence before the Royal Commission?
A. I may well have known, but I don't --

MR GYLES: I object. The question is what is the probative value in terms of the issues you are dealing with, Commissioner, in this wide-ranging cross-examination which, at the moment, with all due respect to my learned friend, hasn't been brought to any point? As far as Father Lucas is concerned, Father Lucas is on the witness list. To the extent there's relevant evidence to be given, you'11 hear from him.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Gyles.
MS GERACE: Can I indicate that the point of the cross-examination may not be immediately apparent, but one of the questions that's being looked at it is the extent to wit church did various things, whether it hindered or obstructed or otherwise. One of the things that has been examined in great detail is the responses of the various church officials to the information that came before it, both in respect of McAlinden and Fletcher.

Establishing what this witness knew about the issues of abuse, the questions about when it was necessary to go to the police or not, is very relevant to assessing both the response of the church and the credibility of the witness in terms of what any witness says they either did
or didn't think about or did or didn't know. So the cross-examination that's been undertaken today is very relevant to those issues.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Ms Gerace, and I've been with you until Father Lucas has been brought in and --

MS GERACE: I'11 move on and put it more generally.
THE COMMISSIONER: I don't know that anybody could hold Father Burston responsible or even --

MS GERACE: I had not intended to, but the point was that the Royal Commission looked at various issues and made findings. The issue was a very big one for the church. I'11 go more directly rather than to the specifics of Father Lucas.
Q. In terms of the Royal Commission, Father Burston, you are aware that one of the issues that the Royal Commission was looking at - this is by way of backtracking just to bring us back to the topic - was the issue of church response to information about sexual abuse by clergy to the police?
A. Yes.
Q. The particular question of whether a matter should be taken to the police once the church knew about allegations of abuse was something that would you have been alive to from at least the second year or so into your period as vicar general of the diocese?
A. I should think so, yes.
Q. Can we take it that, from 1997 onwards, you were alive to having to turn your mind to whether or not information that came to you as the vicar general should be recorded to the police when it concerned child sexual abuse? Do you agree with that?
A. Yes.
Q. You were taken to a document earlier today. Father, could I ask you, please. To have a look at document tab 304, which is in volume 4.
A. Yes.
Q. This is your document to John Davoren. We've already established that?
A. Yes.
Q. We're talking in the third paragraph:

However, I think this is a matter where "intelligence" could well be given to the police.
A. Yes.
Q. I want to ask you about that paragraph. Where you refer there to "intelligence" being given to the police, is it in fact the case you were suggesting that general information could be provided to the police about McAlinden and his risks of offending?
A. I'm not sure. My recollection is that the information, the intelligence there, would be about the two victims who themselves, at this point, in my understanding, did not wish to be involved.
Q. The point being there that, notwithstanding at this stage your understanding was that the victims did not wish to go to the police, you were advocating to John Davoren that intelligence be given to the police?
A. Yes.
Q. The reason being, I'm suggesting to you, that a view had been formed that McAlinden was a risk to children?
A. I'm not - it could well have been, but I don't see that as involved there.
Q. Then going on to this point, the position you're advocating here was that information of whatever nature could be provided to the police, first, not withstanding that the victims did not wish the matter to go to the police - yes?
A. Yes.
Q. Secondly, because you, in your role as vicar general, had formed a view that information should be provided to the police?
A. Yes.
Q. And, third, I'm suggesting because you had formed a view, either on your own or in consultation, that Father McAlinden was a risk in terms of further offending against children?
A. That could well have been, yes. I don't recall that as behind me at the time, yes.
Q. The point I wish to put to you now, Father Burston, is this: if at any time the church had formed a view that Father McAlinden, after having his faculties stripped, continued to pose a risk in terms of reoffending, intelligence could have been given to the police notwithstanding the victims did not wish to make complaints to the police. Do you agree with that?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. Whilst it was done in 1999, it could have been done the year before, in 1998; do you agree with that? A. Yes.
Q. And it could have been done as early as 1995 , couldn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. To suggest that the reason why the church did not go to the police was because the victims did not wish to make complaints to the police is not the full story, is it?

MR BARAN: I object to the question on this basis: the question is based on a premise that's inconsistent with the Towards Healing document, and I think it is clause 37 of Towards Healing. That's behind tab 328 , page 819. The particular clause is 37.1 and 37.2. Based on the fact that that would appear to be the protocol or a protocol, the question is unfair.

THE COMMISSIONER: There is a difference, isn't there, Mr Baran, between informing police in a general even anonymised way and dragging the victim down to the police and saying "You must tell the police what you have told us"?

MR BARAN: Quite so. But the question proceeds upon the basis that this particular witness could have disclosed matters to the police notwithstanding the complainants did not wish to do so. That would be inconsistent with this particular protocol.

THE COMMISSIONER: Not if it was done in a general intelligence-giving fashion.

MR BARAN: I think that need to be clarified.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Baran.
MR HARBEN: Commissioner, could I add to the objection?
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Harben.
MR HARBEN: The questions should only be framed on the basis of an acceptance of an assumption that the witness answers could have been to. It was put to him the reason the intelligence report was made was because - I'm paraphrasing - a view had been formed that Father McAlinden was a risk of further offending against children and that that was the reason that that report was made at that time. This follow-up question can only be put on the basis that it is on that assumption or on the basis of that proposition. If there's another reason --

THE COMMISSIONER: I rather took it from Ms Gerace's questions that the same conditions applied to each --

MS GERACE: Yes.
MR HARBEN: If that's clear.
MS GERACE: That is the basis on which the questions were put. I put that proposition in relation to 1999 and then took it back --

THE COMMISSIONER: All else being equal, except for the year.

MS GERACE: Precisely. I've lost my train of thought, not intentionally.

THE COMMISSIONER: It may not be your intention.
MS GERACE: No, it was not my intention, certainly.
Q. You're clear that was the basis upon which I put the question - once a view had been formed of further offending by McAlinden and general intelligence, that was the basis upon which it was put to you, Father Burston. May I take you then to the correspondence. I wish to go to the correspondence when you became involved in the laicisation procedure against Father McAlinden. I think your evidence
was this morning you became involved in 1996 once you became vicar general; is that correct?
A. Yes .
Q. In the years prior to becoming vicar general, however, you were a consultor?
A. Yes.
Q. You met with the other consultors when they met, through those years?
A. Yes .
Q. And you ceased being a consultor when you became the vicar general; is that correct?
A. No.
Q. No?
A. You're automatically a consultor if you are the vicar general.
Q. You're automatically; I see. So you continued to be a consultor?
A. Yes.
Q. In the period 1992 to the end of 1995, just prior to your appointment as vicar general, is it fair to say, even though you can't remember when precisely, you did become aware that Bishop Clarke had stripped Father McAlinden of his faculties?
A. I'm not sure. I don't - I certainly don't recall his telling us that, but I would have - if that was the case, I would have become aware then, but nothing stands out in my mind.
Q. Is it the case today the only thing you can recall is that you were aware of those matters once you became vicar general in 1996?
A. I think certainly, yes.
Q. But you don't dispute you may have been aware of those matters from your role as a consultor?
A. Yes .
Q. I want to take you to your correspondence in 1996. Would you have a look, firstly, at document 306. That is in, I think, volume $4 . \mathrm{No}$, tab 305 we'11 start with, if you don't mind, father.
A. Bundle?
Q. Bundle 4, and tab 283, I'm sorry.
A. Same bundle?
Q. I have difficulty with numbers. Yes, it is the same bundle. Tab 283? It is your letter to Father McAlinden? A. Yes.
Q. Father, can I suggest that at the time you wrote this letter in May of 1996, you were aware of the following matters, so you're - I want to be clear about the period. You're now a vicar general. You have accepted that you were aware at this stage that Father McAlinden had been stripped of his faculties, yes?
A. Yes.
Q. That the reason he had his faculties removed was because of concern of having abused children - yes?
A. Yes.
Q. And that that abuse concerned sexual abuse of children?
A. Yes.

* Q. And that it had been necessary for Bishop Clarke to proceed to laicisation because previous attempts to pull Father McAlinden into line had failed?

MR GYLES: I object. We know that the reason for this process was consistent with the wishes of [AL] and [AK]. The presumption in the question is not made out on the evidence.

MS GERACE: That's not true.
MR GYLES: It is said that the laicisation process is because of a failure in a previous process.

THE COMMISSIONER: A failure to pull him into line, I think was the expression.

MR GYLES: But we know that the genesis of this process was, at least in part, to accord with the wishes of [AL] and [AK], who did not want to go to the police.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, but they wanted it to be a
successful shutting down of McAlinden.
MR GYLES: Quite. That is what gave rise to this process, or at least in part gave rise to this process.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Ms Gerace is putting to --
MS GERACE: It is not in doubt, on the evidence, that Bishop Clarke had - without wishing to give evidence in front of Father Burston, the proposition I put was unobjectionable and Father Burston could have rejected it or otherwise had he not agreed with it, but it was only in part.

The other part that was quite clearly established in the material is this: Bishop Clarke had imposed a restriction on Father McAlinden which he was not adhering to. There is no doubt on the material that that was in fact the case. He had left the country and, instead of retiring, had moved to Manila and had been operating as a priest in breach of the restrictions placed upon him by his bishop.

THE COMMISSIONER: For whatever reason.
MS GERACE: Yes, for whatever reason.
THE COMMISSIONER: Continue, Ms Gerace.
MS GERACE: Could the question be read back, please.
(Question marked * on page 1336 1ines 30-32 read)
MS GERACE: Q. Father, did you understand that question? Would you like me to repeat it?
A. Yes.
Q. I'm putting to you that, at the time you wrote this correspondence, you were aware that it had been necessary for Bishop Clarke to proceed to attempt to laicise Father McAlinden because his previous attempts to place restrictions on what Father McAlinden had done had failed? A. Yes.
Q. It became apparent to you in 1996, whether information was either provided to you by the bishop or as a result of your inquiries in Ireland through this correspondence and
the subsequent correspondence, that Father McAlinden was being a bit evasive in that process?
A. Yes.
Q. I think you gave some evidence earlier today that when you wrote that he could be a difficult man to deal with, part of what you were referring to was the fact that it was unlikely he was going to participate willingly in this process?
A. Yes.
Q. And that was an opinion you held in 1996 ?
A. Yes.
Q. Might I suggest it was also something that may have been discussed between you and your bishop in 1996 ?
A. Yes, I should think so, yes.
Q. And that in fact your correspondence to Ireland in 1996 further confirmed the view, didn't it, that you held, that Father McAlinden did not intend to participate willingly in this laicisation procedure?
A. Yes.
Q. Father, it is fair to say, isn't it, that in terms of what your knowledge was in 1996, you were aware then that there had been complaints made against Father McAlinden; is that accurate?
A. Yes .
Q. You've already said that. Were you aware in 1996 that admissions had been obtained by Father Lucas about that conduct?

MR SKINNER: I object to that.
THE COMMISSIONER: Can we put it this way, Mr Skinner: that, records existed that suggested that admissions had been obtained.

MS GERACE: I'm happy with that.
MR SKINNER: Yes.
MS GERACE: Q. Did you understand the reframing of that? It's a treacherous path.
A. I was not aware that there were records of that, no.
Q. In 1996, you were aware of two complainants on your own evidence; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. You were not aware of any other complainants?
A. No.
Q. Were you ever made aware of a complaint by [AJ] about having been abused?
A. I don't think so, no.
Q. Father, were you ever asked to make inquiries of the complainants that you were aware of in terms of their continuing attitude about what they should do about Father McAlinden?
A. No, I'm not.
Q. Were you ever asked by the bishop to look at Father McAlinden's records?
A. I don't think so, no.
Q. Or to make inquiries about what else or other information may have existed about Father McAlinden and his offending against children?
A. No.
Q. The proposition I wish to put to you, father, is this: as at 1996, you had an opinion that Father McAlinden was unlikely to cooperate in the laicisation procedure?
A. Yes.
Q. You've already accepted that. You also said that most likely that was a view that was discussed with your bishop? A. Yes.
Q. I don't know if you're able to assist now and whether, you know whether you discussed that with Monsignor Hart at any stage in 1996?
A. I would doubt that because, at this time in 1996, Monsignor Hart was on leave, on long service leave.
Q. Do you know whether you discussed that view with Father Lucas?
A. No, I'm pretty sure I didn't.

* Q. In 1996, having that view that Father McAlinden was
unlikely to willingly cooperate in laicisation, and having evidence of his attempt to distance himself or avoid correspondence, a genuine concern must have been held by you that there was a risk of Father McAlinden continuing to offend?

MR GYLES: I object. The premise of this question is that, in 1996, Father McAlinden at that point was not corresponding. My learned friend has put to this witness that in 1996 - Commissioner, you will recall at 305, in 1999, there was a reference to McAlinden not being an easy man to deal with and some evidence was given about that as being a matter that occurred in 1996. The position in 996 was - and what is indicated by the document of 16 May 1996 - that this was Father Burston's first involvement in the McAlinden matter. It is not an accurate premise to put the question that, at this point, he had been avoiding correspondence in relation to the laicisation, when in fact there had been correspondence from him.

MS GERACE: Could I stop my friend there, and I don't like to ordinarily interject in the submissions, but the witness has given his own evidence of the views of Father McAlinden's response to correspondence. If some other view of that correspondence wishes to be put by the church, it can be put at another time. I'm talking about this witness and his view of Father McAlinden's response to this matter. He has given very clear evidence of the opinion that he formed. It is appropriate that I --

THE COMMISSIONER: That he had the opinion in 1996 that laicisation was unlikely to be successful.

MR GYLES: I appreciate that. I apologise if my understanding of the question is wrong, but I had understood the question was put on the basis of a factual premise, not his understanding, that, as at May 1996, there had been a lack of cooperation in terms of responding to correspondence on the part of McAlinden which is not made out on the evidence.

THE COMMISSIONER: For some reason, Mr Gyles, Father Burston did form the view in 1996 that he thought laicisation was unlikely to be successful and it may have been because of the considered and long-held view that McAlinden was not an easy man to deal with.

MR GYLES: I don't take issue with that possibility. I'm objecting to a question which is put on the basis of a factual premise which I say is not made out on the evidence and therefore is not an admissible question. It is an objectionable question.

THE COMMISSIONER: I will have another look at the question, Mr Gyles, if I may.
(Question marked * on page read)
THE COMMISSIONER: I see your point, Mr Gyles.
MS GERACE: I'11 rephrase the question.
Q. In 1996, having formed a view that Father McAlinden was unlikely to participate in the process of laicisation you've already given that evidence - you've also said that, in your opinion, you had formed a view that Father McAlinden was both difficult and distancing himself from the process - yes?
A. Yes.
Q. Am I correct in understanding that you gave evidence that you formed the view that he was seeking to avoid or not engage in this process of laicisation - yes?
A. Yes.
Q. You had some information in 1996 that Father McAlinden was not going to - that the process of laicisation was being undertaken because he was not adhering to restrictions placed upon him by his bishop, Bishop Clarke. A. Yes.
Q. At that stage - Yes? I think you're saying "Yes" as I ask these questions.
A. Yes.
Q. The transcription may not be picking that up. At that stage, you must have had some concern that Father McAlinden was at risk of reoffending and $I$ mean specifically in terms of further offending by way of sexual abuse?
A. I don't know. He was miles away in Western Australia at some point, so, you know, I hadn't formed the clear view that people were at risk, I must say, yes, but that's possible.
Q. But it's possible, isn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. And had the matter been given consideration, it would have been a view, at least a potential that he was indeed at risk of further reoffending?
A. Yes.
Q. That is a matter, is it not, father, that you should have turned your mind to in 1996 in your role as vicar general?
A. I was not carrying the case. I was simply carrying out various parts of it. I don't see it necessarily as something I would have had to turn my mind to.
Q. Yes. You weren't carrying the case but you did understand that your responsibility to report offending is an individual one, is it not?
A. This is in 1996?
Q. Yes. Insofar as there is an obligation or concern, it is individual as well, isn't it?

MR GYLES: What obligation is my learned friend talking about, to be fair to this witness?

MS GERACE: I'11 change it and rephrase it.
Q. Father, you may not have been carrying the case but you were involved in the case?
A. Yes.
Q. You were involved in working with the bishop in undertaking this process - yes?
A. Yes.
Q. The role of the vicar general is to stand in the mind of the bishop as well, isn't it? Does that accurately describe the vicar general as --
A. "Standing in the mind of the bishop" wouldn't be a description $I$ would give it.
Q. How do you describe the role of the vicar general?
A. To do what the bishop asks - mostly to do what the bishop asks him to do and to stand in his place if need be.
Q. If need be when he's not present?
A. Yes.
Q. To that extent you have, do you not, the same powers as the bishop when the bishop is not present in the diocese?
A. Not completely but mostly, yes.
Q. For the most part you are able to continue a process started by the bishop where he is not in the diocese; is that accurate?
A. If he wishes it to be proceeded, yes.
Q. Yes, and at this stage, the bishop did wish for this to be proceeded, didn't he?
A. As far as I know, yes.
Q. So that you were working with the bishop in this process?
A. Yes.
Q. It is distinct from the delegation of writing a letter to your secretary or someone else within the diocese, isn't it?
A. Not completely.
Q. You weren't just the bishop's scribe in this process, were you?
A. I was the bishop's agent in some part of it.
Q. You were acting as the bishop's agent in the process as he directed you to be?
A. Yes.
Q. And in the tasks that you undertook?
A. Yes.
Q. You could stand in his position where he was not in the diocese?
A. If he wished that.
Q. Yes - yes?
A. If he wished that.
Q. Would you have done all that your bishop asked you to do?
A. I presume so. I'm not aware of not doing it.
Q. Were you aware of any discussion with your bishop in 1996 about whether or not an approach should be made to the police about the problem of Father McAlinden?
A. I'm not aware and have no memory of that discussion, if it took place.
Q. Are you able to say that no discussion took place about that matter in 1996?
A. I think that might be a bit much to say. Certain1y, I don't - it did not take place, but I don't recall anything happening, no.
Q. I don't know that I really you understand the answer, so if you could just explain it to me?
A. The answer is I could not definitely say it did not happen because I have no recollection of its happening.
Q. When you say "no recollection", you're saying, "I can recall discussions about McAlinden in 1996 and I do not believe we had a discussion about going to the police, but I couldn't be sure"?
A. Yes .
Q. May I ask you about in 1996 and through to the end of your period as vicar general whether you formed a view or otherwise that in your discussions did - I'm sorry, I'11 withdraw that. I'11 set it up in a slightly different way. Father, just prior to your appointment as vicar general, Father Vincent Ryan was arrested on charges of sexually abusing boys?
A. Yes.
Q. In early 1996, you were dealing with this issue of Father McAlinden in terms of his abuse of girls?
A. Yes.
Q. At least at the beginning of your period as vicar general, there were two separate incidents involving sexual abuse by clergy as far as we know, within your diocese? A. Yes.
Q. May I suggest the following: first, as a general proposition, this issue of sexual abuse by clergy was a topic of general discussion between yourself and the bishop in 1996?
A. Well --

MR GYLES: How can my friend put that?
MR HARBEN: Is that confined to these two clergy who have been named? My learned friend has put a proposition.
I assume the proposition is for the purpose of the question, so when the question then uses the term discussion about the clergy, in fairness to the witness, I assume that the question means about those clergy.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I would have assumed that too.
MS GERACE: Yes.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Ms Gerace.
MS GERACE: Q. That the issue of responding to and dealing with the problems of Vincent Ryan and McAlinden were matters of discussion between you and your bishop? A. I presume they were, but I have no immediate memory of that.
Q. Are you able to assist us in understanding in relation to Father McAlinden was it the view in 1996 that if the problem could be dealt with within the church, without involving the police, that would be a preferable course so as to avoid scandal on the church?

MR GYLES: I object. The view of whom?
THE COMMISSIONER: The view of whom?
MS GERACE: Well the view of either yourself or the bishop.

MR GYLES: How can the witness give evidence of the view of - -

THE COMMISSIONER: The bishop may have conveyed it to him.
MR GYLES: Well, that would be an unobjectionable question.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Thank you. Ms Gerace.
MS GERACE: Q. Was it your view, Father Burston, if the matter could be dealt with within in the church without involving the police, that would be preferable so as to
avoid scandal on the church?
A. I don't see that as being part of my thought. My thought was that the victims would not go to the police and this was the best way to deal with the situation. I didn't see it as a matter of scandal. That didn't - I don't think that entered my mind.
Q. Did Bishop Malone ever convey that view to you?
A. I don't recall his doing so.
Q. In terms of this being the best way forward, when did you come to the view that the laicisation procedure was no longer the best way forward, or if you came to that view?
A. I don't know.

MR KELL: Commissioner, I think there were two questions in a sense put to the witness and he said, "I don't know." I think my friend should indicate which one he was answering and make clear whether it was --

THE COMMISSIONER: I thought it was just one question; when did Father Burston come to view that laicisation was not the --

MR KELL: And if he formed a view. I'm not sure if the witness was answering he did not know when he formed a view or if he did not know if he did form a view. Could that be made clear.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Kell.
MS GERACE: Q. Did you at some stage form the view that laicisation was not the best way to proceed?
A. I'm not sure. I don't think so.
Q. You don't know that either. Can I suggest the following additional matter that I've not put to you, Father Burston: in 1996 one of the victims had, either at that stage or some time prior, come forward with concerns about Father McAlinden continuing to be a priest and indicating that they may go to the police if the church did not act further to restrain Father McAlinden. Did you hear that?
A. I don't think so, but I'm not sure.
Q. But you're not sure, so you're just not sure now whether you'd ever heard that?
A. I don't think I had. But, as I say,, I cannot be perfectly sure.
Q. You were asked earlier today about what changed between 1996 and 1999 that caused you to write to the Professional Standards Office and you indicated an answer along the lines that you couldn't recall, but you probably had had some discussion or otherwise. Can I suggest that part of the reason that prompted the report to the police in 1999 was that the Royal Commission had released its report in May 1997 and the issue of reporting information held by the church to the police had become a very live issue for the church?
A. I'm sorry, but I don't recall that, no.
Q. Father, as the vicar general, if you had a concern about any matter affecting the diocese, would you be able to take your concern to Bishop Malone?
A. Yes.
Q. Had you had concern about what to do in any particular situation, would Bishop Malone have put at your service resources in order to assist you to come to a decision, say obtaining legal advice?
A. I presume so, yes.
Q. At no time did Bishop Malone direct you or otherwise to not investigate a matter of concern to you?
A. I don't think so. No, I don't - no.
Q. You were asked some questions yesterday about the filing of your correspondence with Father McAlinden. Do you recall that being asked yesterday about what you did with correspondence after it was drafted?
A. Yes.
Q. I will take you to it. Would you excuse me for one moment while I find the reference. In 1996, can you tell us, please, whether you had access to the personal file of Father McAlinden, should you wish to have accessed it?
A. Sorry, that's a hypothetical question?
Q. Yes.
A. We11, I probably would have, but - yes.
Q. There was no restriction placed upon you as far as you are aware in terms of accessing Father McAlinden's personal
file?
A. I wouldn't put it as open as that. I think I would need to make a case why I would need to see it.
Q. Would you need to go to Bishop Malone?
A. Yes.

MR GYLES: This topic has already been covered in some detail by Mr Kell. The day is moving on.

MS GERACE: Sorry, I didn't understand the objection. Is that because the day is moving on, I should not ask the question?

MR GYLES: The objection is that this topic has already been covered and we don't need it to be covered again.

THE COMMISSIONER: And we've got an answer, thank you Mr Gyles.

MR KELL: While my friend is pausing, can I take the opportunity to tender one document that the witness was taken to earlier, which is at tab 375. My friend Mr Baran asked some questions and took the witness to the email of John Davoren on Wednesday, 19 March 2003. I will tender that document, please.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Ke11. The document at tab 375, which is an email from John Davoren to Michael McDonald of the CCER of 19 March 2003 will be admitted and marked exhibit 118.

## EXHIBIT \#118 EMAIL FROM JOHN DAVOREN TO MICHAEL McDONALD OF THE CCER DATED 19/3/2003 (TAB 375)

MR KELL: Thank you. I might also indicate there has been a request by the media for copies of certain exhibits, which are exhibits 115, the appointments history document of Father Burston, and exhibit 116 and exhibit 117. Could practitioners let those assisting know later today if there's any objection to the release of any of those documents.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, thank you, Mr Kell.
MS GERACE: Q. Father, in 1996, were you aware of any policy within the church that guided you in the way in
which you responded to information that came to you about sexual abuse by clergy?
A. I can't think of a general policy then, no.
Q. In your time, between 1996 and 2001, were you aware of any policy that you used to guide you in terms of your response to information that came to you about sexual abuse by clergy?
A. There was a document generated - gradually developed which became known, I think, as the Towards Healing document in which the policy was set out.
Q. That was the only document that you used?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you have recourse to that? Are you telling us that you did use that yourself in terms of guiding you? A. Yes.
Q. In the decisions that you made?
A. Yes.

MS GERACE: No further questions, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Mr Gyles?
<EXAMINATION BY MR GYLES:
MR GYLES: Q. You were asked a number of questions about the laicisation process. My learned friend Ms Gerace was asking you about your role in it and you described it in various ways to the effect that you would do what you were asked to do in respect of that process. Do you recall those answers?
A. Yes.
Q. At one stage you described yourself as the agent of the bishop in respect of that process in some respects? A. Yes.
Q. You were asked some questions generally as to the role of the vicar general being able to step into the shoes of the bishop if he left the diocese; do you recall that?
A. Yes .
Q. I think what you told the Commissioner was that where the bishop left the diocese and where he requested you to
act in a particular way on his behalf, the vicar general was authorised, in effect, to do that?
A. Yes.
Q. So far as the laicisation process is concerned, do you have any recollection of the bishop ever asking you to take over that process in a way which would involve you stepping into his shoes and having responsibility for it?
A. No, I don't.
Q. Do you ever recall in respect of the laicisation process the bishop leaving the diocese in a way in which you would consider you became responsible for this process?
A. Sorry?
Q. Do you understand the question?
A. Could I have the question again?
Q. I don't want to confuse you. In terms of the circumstances in which the vicar general could, where authorised or where asked to, deal with matters when the bishop left the diocese - you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. In respect of the laicisation process, did you ever consider that the bishop relevantly left the diocese in a way in which that process was - that the responsibility for that process was passed across to you?
A. No, I didn't.
Q. You were asked some questions about whether there had been a discussion in 1996 between you and Bishop Malone as to whether or not matters relating to McAlinden, ie, [AL] and $[A K]$, should have been reported to the police. Do you recall that?
A. I recall the question.
Q. Do you recall the question?
A. Yes.
Q. Your answer was you had no recollection of there having been that discussion?
A. Yes .
Q. In the ordinary course of events, if that discussion had taken place, can we take it you would have provided input, if requested by the bishop, with respect to that
issue?
A. Yes.
Q. And again it would have been a matter for him to make a decision as to what to do in that respect?
A. Yes .
Q. You have referred, both in respect of questions by my learned friend Mr Kell and Ms Gerace, to the difficulties that you feel you've experienced with your memory?
A. Yes.
Q. I think you told Ms Gerace that the first of the general anaesthetics which you attribute to, at least in a temporal sense, your loss of memory is being in about 1984 - sorry, 1994? In the timeline, that is - I'm sorry 2004?
A. 2004 .
Q. I'm very grateful to my learned junior for that. In terms of the sequence, in 2003, you had provided a statement to the police in respect of the Fletcher prosecution, hadn't you?
A. Yes.
Q. You said that you had your first general anaesthetic shortly after that, in 2004?
A. 2004, yes.
Q. You then distinguished between that and the second operation that you had?
A. Yes.
Q. I think your words were that with the second operation you were under a general anaesthetic for a longer period; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. After that second operation, did you feel that on a day-to-day basis your memory wasn't as good as it had been before that operation?
A. Yes.
Q. You gave evidence that you've had a number of operations after that?
A. Yes.
Q. When was the last of those operations?
A. Last year. 2012.
Q. Is it the fact that between 2004 and 2012 you have you've had something in the order of 10 operations?
A. Ten, yes.
Q. And you've attributed, in respect of the early operations, the second operation as being one which, to your mind, had a significant effect on your capacity to recall events prior to that?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you tell us in terms of the subsequent operations that you've had and the general anaesthetics which have been necessary as part of those operations, have you felt that each time you've had those operations and woken up and recovered, it has also affected your memory?
A. It has, yes.
Q. Is it the case that that is something that is a characteristic of your mind, that you are accepting of; that is not something you've gone and sought treatment about?
A. I've seen it as a natural part of what's happened, yes. I haven't sought treatment, no.
Q. You haven't seen a need on a day-to-day basis to seek specific treatment about it; is that the case?
A. No, that's the case, yes.
Q. But despite that, despite you not having treatment, by way your way of thinking or to your mind, it has had a significant and substantial effect on your capacity to recall events going back --

MR KELL: Commissioner. I object.
THE COMMISSIONER: What's the objection, Mr Kell?
MR KELL: I think my friend has taken the issue of Father Burston's memory and the operations as far as it can be taken. The inferences that can be drawn from the evidence are a matter ultimately for you, Commissioner having regard to the totality of Father Burston's evidence including --

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Kell, even if Father Burston went to a doctor and the doctor finally came to a view that he had diminished memory, it would probably be mainly based on father's self report, in any event. It is relevant for me to know what he believes has been his memory diminution since the operations and I'll permit Mr Gyles to continue. I'm sure you're nearly finished.

MR GYLES: It is my last question.
Q. To your mind, that has had a substantial effect on your capacity to recall events going back obviously over the period over which you've been asked questions today. Yes.
Q. In any event, you're a 77 or 78 -year-old man at the moment?
A. Yes.
Q. I think your qualifications about your memory even in 2003 was that that was obviously subject to general ageing?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have volume 4 there?
A. Yes.
Q. Could you go, please, to the document at tab 283.
A. Yes.
Q. Fatherm do you feel as though you're able to continue at the moment?
A. Yes.
Q. Thank you. You've been taken to this document. It is the document of 16 May 1996. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. It is the letter that you wrote to McAlinden care of Pat Hallinan?
A. Yes.
Q. As I recall your evidence given yesterday, I thought you said, and correct me if I am wrong, that there was probably an address list around which would have had Pat Hallinan's address on it?
A. Yes.
Q. Why would the diocese, independent of McAlinden, have Pat Hallinan's address?
A. He is a former priest of the diocese who had retired and lived in Ireland. He'd gone back home.
Q. I see. If one, whether it was you or whether it was a person typing this letter, wanted to send a letter to Pat Hallinan, there may well be, independent of Denis McAlinden's file, a list of addresses of former priests which was kept as a convenient way in which to be able to locate their addresses where the diocese needed to make contact with them; is that the case?
A. Yes.
Q. Pat Hallinan was one of those who would have fallen into that category?
A. Yes.
Q. We see a letter here that's typed and which is signed by you?
A. Yes.
Q. Was it your practice to type letters like this yourself or would it be done for you, or did it depend - or can't you say?
A. Both would have happened. I sometimes typed them myself, sometimes got someone else to do it.
Q. Let's say it was you typing this letter and the letter which follows on from it, you'll see, which is the letter I'm sorry. There is the letter at 283 and then another letter that you wrote to Monsignor Stinson in Dublin on the same day?
A. Yes.
Q. So it is possible that you typed both of those letters or it is possible they were typed for you?
A. Both are possible.
Q. Let's just say it was you typing those letters?
A. Yes.
Q. You would agree with me, would you, in the light of the answer you've just given, it is entirely possible that, to the extent that you were the one who went and located the address for Pat Hallinan, that might have been on a piece of paper and you wouldn't have had to have resource
to the bishop's file concerning McAlinden to be able to produce that letter; that's the case, isn't it?
A. That's the case, yes.
Q. Indeed, if it was a letter which was prepared or typed by someone else and they had gone to find Pat Hallinan's address, they may have been able to access a similar sort of document?
A. Yes.
Q. Without having recourse to the McAlinden file in the bishop's office?
A. Yes.

MR GYLES: The position with my cross-examination is that I expect it might take me another 15 minutes to go through the matters I want to deal with. I'm happy to deal with that now if it is convenient, or I can deal with it tomorrow if it is convenient. It is a matter for counsel assisting and you, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Kell, what do you suggest?
MR KELL: There are some commitments that we have, Commissioner. I wonder whether Father Burston could be asked to come back tomorrow. At this stage, the continuation of the public cross-examination and re-examination would commence at 11 o'clock in the morning.

THE COMMISSIONER: Because of other commitments?
MR KELL: Because of certain commitments we have in the morning. I'll speak to practitioners about certain matters we can deal with perhaps before then.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. It is appropriate to rise now until the resumption of public hearings at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

AT 4PM THE COMMISSION WAS ADJOURNED
TO FRIDAY, 19 JULY 2013 AT 11AM
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