1	Wednesday, 10 July 2019	1	Q. In terms of the evidence we are going to hear from you,
2	(10.00 am)	2	I am going to ask you a little bit about your upbringing
3	THE CHAIR: Good morning, everyone, and welcome to Day 8 of	3	and then the abuse that you suffered from a member of
4	this public hearing. Ms McNeill?	4	the church, and then we will talk a little bit about the
5	MS McNEILL: Thank you, chair. Our first witness is	5	response that you have received from the church over the
6	Reverend Matthew Ineson. Can the witness please be	6	years, in particular your experiences of the Clergy
7	sworn?	7	Discipline Measure, and then, finally, more broadly,
8	REVEREND MATTHEW INESON (affirmed)	8	about areas of change within the church that you think
9	Examination by MS McNEILL	9	would assist.
10	MS McNEILL: Good morning. Can I confirm, then, you are	10	A. Okay.
11	Reverend Matthew Ineson?	11	Q. All right?
12	A. I am.	12	A. Yes.
13	Q. We have met outside, and you'd prefer me to call you	13	Q. By way of background, is it right that you come from
14	Mr Ineson for your evidence today?	14	a very religious family?
15	A. That's fine.	15	A. Yes.
16	Q. You have provided two witness statements for this	16	Q. And that, as a child, a lot of your childhood was spent
17	inquiry?	17	in church and church activities, such as altar serving,
18	A. Yes.	18	choir, et cetera?
19	Q. If at any point during your evidence you need to be	19	A. That's absolutely right. Taken to the church as a baby
20	reminded of what's said in those witness statements,	20	and grew up in the church and was involved in all church
21	I will bring them up on the screen for you, and we will	21	activities. Yes.
22	look at them together?	22	Q. You're quite softly spoken.
23	A. Okay.	23	A. Am I, sorry? I apologise.
24	Q. So don't hesitate to indicate; okay?	24	Q. Not a problem. Just keep your voice up nice and loud,
25	A. Okay.	25	so everybody can hear you.
	Page 1		Page 2
1	You yourself were ordained in the year 2000?	1	the recommendation was to go and stay with
1 2	You, yourself, were ordained in the year 2000?  A. Yes.	1 2	the recommendation was to go and stay with  Trevor Devanamanikkam, and be came and nicked me un from
2	A. Yes.	2	Trevor Devanamanikkam, and he came and picked me up from
	A. Yes.  Q. And you were a curate in Hartlepool for three years	2 3	Trevor Devanamanikkam, and he came and picked me up from the vicarage in his car.
2 3 4	<ul><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. And you were a curate in Hartlepool for three years</li><li>A. Yes.</li></ul>	2 3 4	Trevor Devanamanikkam, and he came and picked me up from the vicarage in his car.  Q. How old were you when you went to say with
2 3	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you were a curate in Hartlepool for three years</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q before becoming a vicar in Rotherham for over</li> </ul>	2 3	Trevor Devanamanikkam, and he came and picked me up from the vicarage in his car.  Q. How old were you when you went to say with Trevor Devanamanikkam?
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you were a curate in Hartlepool for three years</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q before becoming a vicar in Rotherham for over ten years?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	Trevor Devanamanikkam, and he came and picked me up from the vicarage in his car.  Q. How old were you when you went to say with Trevor Devanamanikkam?  A. I was just 16.
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you were a curate in Hartlepool for three years</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q before becoming a vicar in Rotherham for over ten years?</li> <li>A. That's correct, ten years.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	Trevor Devanamanikkam, and he came and picked me up from the vicarage in his car.  Q. How old were you when you went to say with Trevor Devanamanikkam?  A. I was just 16.  Q. Just 16?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you were a curate in Hartlepool for three years</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q before becoming a vicar in Rotherham for over ten years?</li> <li>A. That's correct, ten years.</li> <li>Q. You have reported that you were abused by the Reverend</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Trevor Devanamanikkam, and he came and picked me up from the vicarage in his car.  Q. How old were you when you went to say with Trevor Devanamanikkam?  A. I was just 16.  Q. Just 16?  A. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you were a curate in Hartlepool for three years</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q before becoming a vicar in Rotherham for over ten years?</li> <li>A. That's correct, ten years.</li> <li>Q. You have reported that you were abused by the Reverend Trevor Devanamanikkam?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Trevor Devanamanikkam, and he came and picked me up from the vicarage in his car.  Q. How old were you when you went to say with Trevor Devanamanikkam?  A. I was just 16.  Q. Just 16?  A. Yes.  Q. You have reported that he abused you whilst you were
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you were a curate in Hartlepool for three years</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q before becoming a vicar in Rotherham for over ten years?</li> <li>A. That's correct, ten years.</li> <li>Q. You have reported that you were abused by the Reverend Trevor Devanamanikkam?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Trevor Devanamanikkam, and he came and picked me up from the vicarage in his car.  Q. How old were you when you went to say with Trevor Devanamanikkam?  A. I was just 16.  Q. Just 16?  A. Yes.  Q. You have reported that he abused you whilst you were staying with him?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you were a curate in Hartlepool for three years</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q before becoming a vicar in Rotherham for over ten years?</li> <li>A. That's correct, ten years.</li> <li>Q. You have reported that you were abused by the Reverend Trevor Devanamanikkam?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Can you tell us how you met the Reverend</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Trevor Devanamanikkam, and he came and picked me up from the vicarage in his car.  Q. How old were you when you went to say with Trevor Devanamanikkam?  A. I was just 16.  Q. Just 16?  A. Yes.  Q. You have reported that he abused you whilst you were staying with him?  A. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you were a curate in Hartlepool for three years</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q before becoming a vicar in Rotherham for over ten years?</li> <li>A. That's correct, ten years.</li> <li>Q. You have reported that you were abused by the Reverend Trevor Devanamanikkam?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Can you tell us how you met the Reverend Trevor Devanamanikkam?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Trevor Devanamanikkam, and he came and picked me up from the vicarage in his car.  Q. How old were you when you went to say with Trevor Devanamanikkam?  A. I was just 16.  Q. Just 16?  A. Yes.  Q. You have reported that he abused you whilst you were staying with him?  A. Yes.  Q. Can you tell us as much as you're comfortable about the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you were a curate in Hartlepool for three years</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q before becoming a vicar in Rotherham for over ten years?</li> <li>A. That's correct, ten years.</li> <li>Q. You have reported that you were abused by the Reverend Trevor Devanamanikkam?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Can you tell us how you met the Reverend Trevor Devanamanikkam?</li> <li>A. Yes. There was a family breakdown. My mum had left and</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Trevor Devanamanikkam, and he came and picked me up from the vicarage in his car.  Q. How old were you when you went to say with Trevor Devanamanikkam?  A. I was just 16.  Q. Just 16?  A. Yes.  Q. You have reported that he abused you whilst you were staying with him?  A. Yes.  Q. Can you tell us as much as you're comfortable about the abuse that you suffered from Trevor Devanamanikkam?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you were a curate in Hartlepool for three years</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q before becoming a vicar in Rotherham for over ten years?</li> <li>A. That's correct, ten years.</li> <li>Q. You have reported that you were abused by the Reverend Trevor Devanamanikkam?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Can you tell us how you met the Reverend Trevor Devanamanikkam?</li> <li>A. Yes. There was a family breakdown. My mum had left and gone. She actually left the country. And I was in the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Trevor Devanamanikkam, and he came and picked me up from the vicarage in his car.  Q. How old were you when you went to say with Trevor Devanamanikkam?  A. I was just 16.  Q. Just 16?  A. Yes.  Q. You have reported that he abused you whilst you were staying with him?  A. Yes.  Q. Can you tell us as much as you're comfortable about the abuse that you suffered from Trevor Devanamanikkam?  A. The first night I stayed at the vicarage, I was put in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you were a curate in Hartlepool for three years</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q before becoming a vicar in Rotherham for over ten years?</li> <li>A. That's correct, ten years.</li> <li>Q. You have reported that you were abused by the Reverend Trevor Devanamanikkam?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Can you tell us how you met the Reverend Trevor Devanamanikkam?</li> <li>A. Yes. There was a family breakdown. My mum had left and gone. She actually left the country. And I was in the care of my grandparents. And there was just a complete</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Trevor Devanamanikkam, and he came and picked me up from the vicarage in his car.  Q. How old were you when you went to say with Trevor Devanamanikkam?  A. I was just 16.  Q. Just 16?  A. Yes.  Q. You have reported that he abused you whilst you were staying with him?  A. Yes.  Q. Can you tell us as much as you're comfortable about the abuse that you suffered from Trevor Devanamanikkam?  A. The first night I stayed at the vicarage, I was put in the box room, the tiny little room which overlooked the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you were a curate in Hartlepool for three years</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q before becoming a vicar in Rotherham for over ten years?</li> <li>A. That's correct, ten years.</li> <li>Q. You have reported that you were abused by the Reverend Trevor Devanamanikkam?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Can you tell us how you met the Reverend Trevor Devanamanikkam?</li> <li>A. Yes. There was a family breakdown. My mum had left and gone. She actually left the country. And I was in the care of my grandparents. And there was just a complete family breakdown. I was a teenager, my gran was a lot</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Trevor Devanamanikkam, and he came and picked me up from the vicarage in his car.  Q. How old were you when you went to say with Trevor Devanamanikkam?  A. I was just 16.  Q. Just 16?  A. Yes.  Q. You have reported that he abused you whilst you were staying with him?  A. Yes.  Q. Can you tell us as much as you're comfortable about the abuse that you suffered from Trevor Devanamanikkam?  A. The first night I stayed at the vicarage, I was put in the box room, the tiny little room which overlooked the church. Then, after a couple of nights, he came and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you were a curate in Hartlepool for three years</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q before becoming a vicar in Rotherham for over ten years?</li> <li>A. That's correct, ten years.</li> <li>Q. You have reported that you were abused by the Reverend Trevor Devanamanikkam?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Can you tell us how you met the Reverend Trevor Devanamanikkam?</li> <li>A. Yes. There was a family breakdown. My mum had left and gone. She actually left the country. And I was in the care of my grandparents. And there was just a complete family breakdown. I was a teenager, my gran was a lot older, lots of things, and the family just fell apart,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Trevor Devanamanikkam, and he came and picked me up from the vicarage in his car.  Q. How old were you when you went to say with Trevor Devanamanikkam?  A. I was just 16.  Q. Just 16?  A. Yes.  Q. You have reported that he abused you whilst you were staying with him?  A. Yes.  Q. Can you tell us as much as you're comfortable about the abuse that you suffered from Trevor Devanamanikkam?  A. The first night I stayed at the vicarage, I was put in the box room, the tiny little room which overlooked the church. Then, after a couple of nights, he came and said to me, "You ought to move into another bedroom,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you were a curate in Hartlepool for three years</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q before becoming a vicar in Rotherham for over ten years?</li> <li>A. That's correct, ten years.</li> <li>Q. You have reported that you were abused by the Reverend Trevor Devanamanikkam?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Can you tell us how you met the Reverend Trevor Devanamanikkam?</li> <li>A. Yes. There was a family breakdown. My mum had left and gone. She actually left the country. And I was in the care of my grandparents. And there was just a complete family breakdown. I was a teenager, my gran was a lot older, lots of things, and the family just fell apart, and my nan turned to the church, as she would, to the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Trevor Devanamanikkam, and he came and picked me up from the vicarage in his car.  Q. How old were you when you went to say with Trevor Devanamanikkam?  A. I was just 16.  Q. Just 16?  A. Yes.  Q. You have reported that he abused you whilst you were staying with him?  A. Yes.  Q. Can you tell us as much as you're comfortable about the abuse that you suffered from Trevor Devanamanikkam?  A. The first night I stayed at the vicarage, I was put in the box room, the tiny little room which overlooked the church. Then, after a couple of nights, he came and said to me, "You ought to move into another bedroom, it's bigger", which sounded reasonable. And then, that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you were a curate in Hartlepool for three years</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q before becoming a vicar in Rotherham for over ten years?</li> <li>A. That's correct, ten years.</li> <li>Q. You have reported that you were abused by the Reverend Trevor Devanamanikkam?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Can you tell us how you met the Reverend Trevor Devanamanikkam?</li> <li>A. Yes. There was a family breakdown. My mum had left and gone. She actually left the country. And I was in the care of my grandparents. And there was just a complete family breakdown. I was a teenager, my gran was a lot older, lots of things, and the family just fell apart, and my nan turned to the church, as she would, to the vicar, and wanted help. And she went to see the vicar</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Trevor Devanamanikkam, and he came and picked me up from the vicarage in his car.  Q. How old were you when you went to say with Trevor Devanamanikkam?  A. I was just 16.  Q. Just 16?  A. Yes.  Q. You have reported that he abused you whilst you were staying with him?  A. Yes.  Q. Can you tell us as much as you're comfortable about the abuse that you suffered from Trevor Devanamanikkam?  A. The first night I stayed at the vicarage, I was put in the box room, the tiny little room which overlooked the church. Then, after a couple of nights, he came and said to me, "You ought to move into another bedroom, it's bigger", which sounded reasonable. And then, that night, he came into the bedroom when I'd gone to bed,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you were a curate in Hartlepool for three years</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q before becoming a vicar in Rotherham for over ten years?</li> <li>A. That's correct, ten years.</li> <li>Q. You have reported that you were abused by the Reverend Trevor Devanamanikkam?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Can you tell us how you met the Reverend Trevor Devanamanikkam?</li> <li>A. Yes. There was a family breakdown. My mum had left and gone. She actually left the country. And I was in the care of my grandparents. And there was just a complete family breakdown. I was a teenager, my gran was a lot older, lots of things, and the family just fell apart, and my nan turned to the church, as she would, to the vicar, and wanted help. And she went to see the vicar of the next door parish, who she'd known for a long</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Trevor Devanamanikkam, and he came and picked me up from the vicarage in his car.  Q. How old were you when you went to say with Trevor Devanamanikkam?  A. I was just 16.  Q. Just 16?  A. Yes.  Q. You have reported that he abused you whilst you were staying with him?  A. Yes.  Q. Can you tell us as much as you're comfortable about the abuse that you suffered from Trevor Devanamanikkam?  A. The first night I stayed at the vicarage, I was put in the box room, the tiny little room which overlooked the church. Then, after a couple of nights, he came and said to me, "You ought to move into another bedroom, it's bigger", which sounded reasonable. And then, that night, he came into the bedroom when I'd gone to bed, sat on the end of the bed he didn't even turn the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you were a curate in Hartlepool for three years</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q before becoming a vicar in Rotherham for over ten years?</li> <li>A. That's correct, ten years.</li> <li>Q. You have reported that you were abused by the Reverend Trevor Devanamanikkam?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Can you tell us how you met the Reverend Trevor Devanamanikkam?</li> <li>A. Yes. There was a family breakdown. My mum had left and gone. She actually left the country. And I was in the care of my grandparents. And there was just a complete family breakdown. I was a teenager, my gran was a lot older, lots of things, and the family just fell apart, and my nan turned to the church, as she would, to the vicar, and wanted help. And she went to see the vicar of the next door parish, who she'd known for a long time, and there was a chap there with him, and he</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Trevor Devanamanikkam, and he came and picked me up from the vicarage in his car.  Q. How old were you when you went to say with Trevor Devanamanikkam?  A. I was just 16.  Q. Just 16?  A. Yes.  Q. You have reported that he abused you whilst you were staying with him?  A. Yes.  Q. Can you tell us as much as you're comfortable about the abuse that you suffered from Trevor Devanamanikkam?  A. The first night I stayed at the vicarage, I was put in the box room, the tiny little room which overlooked the church. Then, after a couple of nights, he came and said to me, "You ought to move into another bedroom, it's bigger", which sounded reasonable. And then, that night, he came into the bedroom when I'd gone to bed, sat on the end of the bed he didn't even turn the light on. And he started to ask me things about, was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you were a curate in Hartlepool for three years</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q before becoming a vicar in Rotherham for over ten years?</li> <li>A. That's correct, ten years.</li> <li>Q. You have reported that you were abused by the Reverend Trevor Devanamanikkam?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Can you tell us how you met the Reverend Trevor Devanamanikkam?</li> <li>A. Yes. There was a family breakdown. My mum had left and gone. She actually left the country. And I was in the care of my grandparents. And there was just a complete family breakdown. I was a teenager, my gran was a lot older, lots of things, and the family just fell apart, and my nan turned to the church, as she would, to the vicar, and wanted help. And she went to see the vicar of the next door parish, who she'd known for a long time, and there was a chap there with him, and he recommended that we all needed a break from each other</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Trevor Devanamanikkam, and he came and picked me up from the vicarage in his car.  Q. How old were you when you went to say with Trevor Devanamanikkam?  A. I was just 16.  Q. Just 16?  A. Yes.  Q. You have reported that he abused you whilst you were staying with him?  A. Yes.  Q. Can you tell us as much as you're comfortable about the abuse that you suffered from Trevor Devanamanikkam?  A. The first night I stayed at the vicarage, I was put in the box room, the tiny little room which overlooked the church. Then, after a couple of nights, he came and said to me, "You ought to move into another bedroom, it's bigger", which sounded reasonable. And then, that night, he came into the bedroom when I'd gone to bed, sat on the end of the bed he didn't even turn the light on. And he started to ask me things about, was I comfortable, how was I feeling being away from home,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you were a curate in Hartlepool for three years</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q before becoming a vicar in Rotherham for over ten years?</li> <li>A. That's correct, ten years.</li> <li>Q. You have reported that you were abused by the Reverend Trevor Devanamanikkam?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Can you tell us how you met the Reverend Trevor Devanamanikkam?</li> <li>A. Yes. There was a family breakdown. My mum had left and gone. She actually left the country. And I was in the care of my grandparents. And there was just a complete family breakdown. I was a teenager, my gran was a lot older, lots of things, and the family just fell apart, and my nan turned to the church, as she would, to the vicar, and wanted help. And she went to see the vicar of the next door parish, who she'd known for a long time, and there was a chap there with him, and he recommended that we all needed a break from each other and the family was in problems, and that I he had</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Trevor Devanamanikkam, and he came and picked me up from the vicarage in his car.  Q. How old were you when you went to say with Trevor Devanamanikkam?  A. I was just 16.  Q. Just 16?  A. Yes.  Q. You have reported that he abused you whilst you were staying with him?  A. Yes.  Q. Can you tell us as much as you're comfortable about the abuse that you suffered from Trevor Devanamanikkam?  A. The first night I stayed at the vicarage, I was put in the box room, the tiny little room which overlooked the church. Then, after a couple of nights, he came and said to me, "You ought to move into another bedroom, it's bigger", which sounded reasonable. And then, that night, he came into the bedroom when I'd gone to bed, sat on the end of the bed he didn't even turn the light on. And he started to ask me things about, was I comfortable, how was I feeling being away from home, and so on, and then he put his hands under the duvet and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you were a curate in Hartlepool for three years</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q before becoming a vicar in Rotherham for over ten years?</li> <li>A. That's correct, ten years.</li> <li>Q. You have reported that you were abused by the Reverend Trevor Devanamanikkam?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Can you tell us how you met the Reverend Trevor Devanamanikkam?</li> <li>A. Yes. There was a family breakdown. My mum had left and gone. She actually left the country. And I was in the care of my grandparents. And there was just a complete family breakdown. I was a teenager, my gran was a lot older, lots of things, and the family just fell apart, and my nan turned to the church, as she would, to the vicar, and wanted help. And she went to see the vicar of the next door parish, who she'd known for a long time, and there was a chap there with him, and he recommended that we all needed a break from each other and the family was in problems, and that I he had a friend, and I should he recommended I went and</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Trevor Devanamanikkam, and he came and picked me up from the vicarage in his car.  Q. How old were you when you went to say with Trevor Devanamanikkam?  A. I was just 16.  Q. Just 16?  A. Yes.  Q. You have reported that he abused you whilst you were staying with him?  A. Yes.  Q. Can you tell us as much as you're comfortable about the abuse that you suffered from Trevor Devanamanikkam?  A. The first night I stayed at the vicarage, I was put in the box room, the tiny little room which overlooked the church. Then, after a couple of nights, he came and said to me, "You ought to move into another bedroom, it's bigger", which sounded reasonable. And then, that night, he came into the bedroom when I'd gone to bed, sat on the end of the bed he didn't even turn the light on. And he started to ask me things about, was I comfortable, how was I feeling being away from home, and so on, and then he put his hands under the duvet and started to touch me up, and he said to me, "Don't you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you were a curate in Hartlepool for three years</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q before becoming a vicar in Rotherham for over ten years?</li> <li>A. That's correct, ten years.</li> <li>Q. You have reported that you were abused by the Reverend Trevor Devanamanikkam?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Can you tell us how you met the Reverend Trevor Devanamanikkam?</li> <li>A. Yes. There was a family breakdown. My mum had left and gone. She actually left the country. And I was in the care of my grandparents. And there was just a complete family breakdown. I was a teenager, my gran was a lot older, lots of things, and the family just fell apart, and my nan turned to the church, as she would, to the vicar, and wanted help. And she went to see the vicar of the next door parish, who she'd known for a long time, and there was a chap there with him, and he recommended that we all needed a break from each other and the family was in problems, and that I he had</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Trevor Devanamanikkam, and he came and picked me up from the vicarage in his car.  Q. How old were you when you went to say with Trevor Devanamanikkam?  A. I was just 16.  Q. Just 16?  A. Yes.  Q. You have reported that he abused you whilst you were staying with him?  A. Yes.  Q. Can you tell us as much as you're comfortable about the abuse that you suffered from Trevor Devanamanikkam?  A. The first night I stayed at the vicarage, I was put in the box room, the tiny little room which overlooked the church. Then, after a couple of nights, he came and said to me, "You ought to move into another bedroom, it's bigger", which sounded reasonable. And then, that night, he came into the bedroom when I'd gone to bed, sat on the end of the bed he didn't even turn the light on. And he started to ask me things about, was I comfortable, how was I feeling being away from home, and so on, and then he put his hands under the duvet and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you were a curate in Hartlepool for three years</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q before becoming a vicar in Rotherham for over ten years?</li> <li>A. That's correct, ten years.</li> <li>Q. You have reported that you were abused by the Reverend Trevor Devanamanikkam?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Can you tell us how you met the Reverend Trevor Devanamanikkam?</li> <li>A. Yes. There was a family breakdown. My mum had left and gone. She actually left the country. And I was in the care of my grandparents. And there was just a complete family breakdown. I was a teenager, my gran was a lot older, lots of things, and the family just fell apart, and my nan turned to the church, as she would, to the vicar, and wanted help. And she went to see the vicar of the next door parish, who she'd known for a long time, and there was a chap there with him, and he recommended that we all needed a break from each other and the family was in problems, and that I he had a friend, and I should he recommended I went and</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Trevor Devanamanikkam, and he came and picked me up from the vicarage in his car.  Q. How old were you when you went to say with Trevor Devanamanikkam?  A. I was just 16.  Q. Just 16?  A. Yes.  Q. You have reported that he abused you whilst you were staying with him?  A. Yes.  Q. Can you tell us as much as you're comfortable about the abuse that you suffered from Trevor Devanamanikkam?  A. The first night I stayed at the vicarage, I was put in the box room, the tiny little room which overlooked the church. Then, after a couple of nights, he came and said to me, "You ought to move into another bedroom, it's bigger", which sounded reasonable. And then, that night, he came into the bedroom when I'd gone to bed, sat on the end of the bed he didn't even turn the light on. And he started to ask me things about, was I comfortable, how was I feeling being away from home, and so on, and then he put his hands under the duvet and started to touch me up, and he said to me, "Don't you

3

out, and he went.

1

4

5

6

7

Q

1

2

7

- 2 The next night, exactly the same thing happened 3 again, and, again, I said no, and he went.
  - And then he told me that I should have to move into his room. If I remember rightly, he told me there was some people coming to stay and there wasn't enough room for everybody to stay. Nobody ever actually turned up. And I said I didn't think that was right, but I was left with no option: "Well, if you don't, then you can't stay
- 10 here". And I didn't know where to go.
- 11 So I ended up in his bed, basically, and he -- I had 12 lain on my side to turn away from him, just to try and 13 nod off and go to sleep, and he came up behind me and 14 I could feel he had an erection, and he forced me. He 15 held me around -- sort of around my body. Because in
- 16 those days, I was really skinny and little, and he held 17 me and he had sex with me. And then he rolled over and
- 18 fell asleep, I can remember that, and I went straight to 19 the toilet to tidy myself up and it was a mess, and
- 20 there was blood there and everything else.
- 21 And then that went on. He did have a boyfriend who 22 used to come and stay most weekends, and I was left 23 alone when the boyfriend came, but that happened. And
- 24 I knew it wasn't right, but he told me that if anybody
- 25 ever found out, I would get the blame, my nan would be

- ashamed of me, and I wouldn't be able to stay there
- 2 anymore. And I thought, "Well, if I can't go home to my
  - nan, I've nowhere to go". I'd never been away from home
- 4 before, and I'd have to go, and I thought I would end up 5 on the streets. And that's why it carried on.
- Another thing he used -- there's a couple of things 6
- 7 that all stand out in my mind. He used to have in the
- window bottom of his bedroom a cane, not a school cane,
- 9 like a garden cane, and he used to say that his partner
- 10 at the time used to enjoy this, that he liked to pretend 11 he was a naughty schoolboy, and I said, "Oh, that was
- 12 done with when I was at school, they don't do that
- 13 anymore", but he never did try that with me.
- 14 The only other thing I remember, and it probably
- 15 didn't really sink in at the time, but now, looking
- back, I've found out how awful it was. If he was ever 16
- 17 out and saw a good-looking young lad or young man, he
- 18 would say, and he had a saying, "If that was daddy, I'd
- 19 never leave home".
- 20 Q. Having stayed with Reverend Devanamanikkam for a while,
- ultimately he raped you throughout that period? 21
- 22
- 23 Q. And you came -- how did you come to leave the vicarage?
- 24 A. Can I just add something in there?
- 25 Q. Sorry, of course.

A. Yeah, sorry. I had had no sexual experience at all up

Page 5

- to that point, and one day I started itching and he'd
- 3 given me crabs, and I just shaved all my hair, and he
- 4 said to me, "Have you had them as well?", and that
- 5 suggests to me he was sleeping with other people, he
- 6 must have been, because I was doing nothing, and the
- 8 But, sorry, to answer your question, how did I come
- to leave the vicarage, one day, my nan came -- I was in 10 the kitchen and my nan walked up the vicarage drive and
- 11 I did not know what reaction I was going to get, and she
- 12 came in and -- she rung the doorbell, came in, and she
- 13 was offhand with me. It was, "Hello, Matthew", and
- 14 I thought, "I'm in trouble", you know, as nans do. And
- 15 Trevor said, "I need to have a word with your nan. You
- 16 go and sit in the kitchen". So I went in the kitchen,
- 17 about five, ten minutes and then he came in and said,
- 18 "Your nan's gone" and I couldn't believe she'd gone 19 without saying goodbye, but I thought that means I'm in
- 20 trouble. And then that wasn't mentioned again. The
- 21 next morning, the Bishop of Bradford turned up at the 22
- vicarage and he asked me -- and I think -- I was young, 23 purple shirt, bishop, this is important, and he said,
- 24 "Are you Matthew?". I said yes. He said, "I need
- 25 a word with Trevor". Again, they went in the study and

Page 7

- Page 6
- a few minutes later he came out and said, "You do know
- 2 you can't stay here anymore? I need you to go and get
- your bag and I need you to go". I said, "Where am I to 3
- 4 go?", and he said, "That's not my problem". I actually
- 5 think, what he probably was thinking, I would go home,
- 6 but I just walked out the vicarage with the bishop on
- 7 one side and with Trevor Devanamanikkam on the other,
- 8 and I can remember the glass in a door -- there was an
- 9 outer door and an inner door -- shut behind me, and
- 10 that's how I came to leave.
- 11 Q. You told us during your evidence then that you found
- 12 it -- it felt to you impossible to tell anybody what was
- 13 going on and you were concerned about not being able to
- 14 go back to your grandmother's. We know, and we will
- 15 jump forward in time in a moment, that you didn't
- 16 actually disclose your abuse for some years?
- 17 A. No.
- 18 Q. To help us understand, what were the main difficulties
- 19 you felt about telling anyone what had happened to you?
- 20 A. There's an awful lot of shame there. Again -- my nan
- 21
- was my mum. You've got to understand, my mum did not
- 22 bring me up. My mum once told me that -- years later, 23 that if abortions had been legal when she was having me,
- I wouldn't be here now. She didn't want me. And my nan 24
- 25 brought me up, and my grandma, the paternal grandmother,

3

6

- 1 on weekends. The grandparents did a lot of bringing up.
- 2 Sorry, just go back and ask the question. I'm getting
- 3 distracted.
- 4 Q. The question was why you didn't feel able to disclose
- 5 your abuse for so long?
- 6 A. I was worried about upsetting them, again. All that
- 7 with my nan, "Was I in trouble?". But then, who would
- 8 believe a 16-year-old lad against a bishop and a vicar?
- 9 These were positions of authority. Who would believe me
- 10 and what would happen? And I was constantly thinking,
- 11 "Am I in trouble?". In my mind, he's put across to me
- 12 this was my doing, it was my fault all the time, and
- 13 that was why.
- 14 Q. I want to talk about when you did subsequently feel able
- 15 to disclose your abuse. When was the first time you
- 16 disclosed what had happened to you to somebody?
- 17 A. July 2012.
- 18 Q. And to whom did you disclose?
- 19 A. That was the Bishop of Doncaster.
- 20 Q. Is that Bishop Peter Burrows?
- 21 A. It is.

1

- 22 Q. Can you tell us how you disclosed to him and what his
- 23 response was?
- 24 A. I can. There was a meeting at my -- I was a vicar by
- 25 then, and there was a meeting between the parochial

- church council and the bishop over issues at the school,
- 2 the local church school, had been going on. And one of
  - those issues had been that the local --
- 4 Q. I'm just going to pause you there. We are going to try
- 5 very hard not to identify any safeguarding individuals
  - at the local school so we are going to stay relatively
- 7 vague on this point?
- 8 A. There was an issue of -- a safeguarding issue at the
- 9 school.
- 10 Q. Thank you.
- 11 A. And the meeting took place, and the bishop told us the
- 12 police had been called, the matter had been sorted, and
- 13 we didn't believe him, and so on. And after that -- and
- 14 I was cross. At a meeting, I asked him if I could have
- 15 two minutes in the vestry. And we went into the vestry,
- 16 and he kept looking at his watch the whole time, "I'm
- 17 sorry, I've got to be somewhere else, I've got to be
- 18 somewhere else", and I said, "Do you know why I am so
- 19 cross?" I said, "Because this happened to me, and I've
- 20 never told anybody", in what was then 28 years, "and 21
- I am not going to stand by. I am the vicar, I'm older. 22
- I'm not standing by and potentially letting this happen
- 23 to children on my patch", and all the time he's clock 24 watching, and, "Well, thank you for telling me", and he
- 25

Page 10

went. As he walked out the church door, I watched him

## Page 9

- walk the length of the church, I just thought, "I've
- 2 just disclosed abuse to you".
- 3 Q. When you told him, was it specifically because you
- 4 wanted him to do something and did that change? After
- 5 he walked away, did you want him to do something?
- 6 A. My initial reason for telling him, I was so angry about
- 7 what had been going on. I'm not standing by and
- 8 potentially letting this happen to me, you know; that
- 9 was the initial thing. But then, afterwards, on
- 10 reflection, thinking, "I've just disclosed to him,
- 11 surely he'll do something about that now", because
- 12 I said to him, "I was abused by a priest when I was
- 13 a youngster".
- 14 Q. We know what the policies say, but from your perspective
- 15 as a survivor, what would have been a helpful response
- 16 from him at that time?
- 17 A. I never heard from him again about it, at all.
- 18 I presumed he would have reported the priest, he would

Page 11

- 19 have arranged to investigate the priest. That's what --
- 20 the response I would have expected. I never heard
- 21 another word from him.
- 22 Q. I understand the next person within the church you
- 23 disclosed to is Steven Croft?
- 24 A. That's correct.
- 25 Q. Bishop Steven Croft?

A. Correct.

- 2 Q. Can you tell us the circumstances of that disclosure?
- 3 A. I can. That was December 2012. I was burgled at the
- 4 vicarage, again, several times in Rotherham. The police
- 5 were called and the people were caught. I rang
- 6 Church House and I got the then Archdeacon of Doncaster,
- 7 not my archdeacon, as it were, not my area, and he said
- 8 to me, "Stay there. I'm coming up", and with all due --
- I can't fault the man. He came straight up, he was
- 10 lovely, kettle was on, "I'll sort your door out", he was
- 11 lovely. Spoke to the police and everything.
- 12 Presumably, he went and spoke to Steven Croft and he
- 13 rang me the day after about the burglary. To give him
- 14 fair due, he asked me how I was and I remember saying, 15 "I feel a lot better today than I did last night, having
- 16 had a night's sleep" and he said, "The archdeacon will
- 17 sort the door out for you and everything else". I said
- 18 to him, "You and I need a chat". I said, "Did
- 19 Bishop Peter tell you about the school and about my own
- 20 disclosure to him of my own abuse?", and he used what
- 21 I call the stock Anglican answer: "I can't remember". 22
- 23 chooses. And I told him everything. I told him about

Because they can never remember anything when it

24 the school, everything that happened there, and I told 25 him that -- I said, "And I said to Bishop Peter, 'I was

1 abused by a priest", and I named Devanamanikkam, and he 1 home", because I was so angry with him, and we were 2 2 said, "I'm sorry, I've got a meeting to go to, I've got having a heated conversation, shall we say. And that 3 a meeting to go to", and couldn't get off the phone 3 was the circumstances that there I told him. 4 quick enough. So I told him on the phone. 4 Q. I understand, just for completeness, the meeting itself 5 Q. Sticking, if we can, with Bishop Steven Croft, 5 wasn't called for the purpose of discussing the 6 I understand that you told him on other occasions as 6 disclosures you had made --7 7 well; is that right? 8 A. I did, on a following conversation on the telephone 8 Q. -- but to discuss your management of a safeguarding 9 in February 2013, and the words there were, "Do you 9 issue in your professional --10 10 remember our telephone call from before Christmas?", and A. That's correct. 11 basically the same -- I got, "I can't quite remember". 11 Q. In your parish? 12 So I told him everything again, and he did nothing. 12 A. That's correct. 13 O You also disclosed to the Archdeacon of Rotherham --13 Q. So at this point, you -- and I think you have summarised 14 it in your statement -- had made disclosures to three 14 15 15 Q. -- who is now Bishop Martyn Snow? individuals in the church? 16 A. By then. 16 A. That's correct. 17 Q. In what circumstances did you disclose to him? 17 Q. By then. And, as yet, nothing had happened, as far as 18 you could see? 18 A. That was a meeting at Church House regarding an incident 19 in the parish, and I said to him, "I didn't" -- I have 19 A. Mmm. 20 20 Q. How were you feeling about the way you'd been treated by to be clear, I did not name Devanamanikkam to 21 21 Peter Burrows, and I did not name Devanamanikkam to the church at this point? 22 22 A. I couldn't believe it. I could not believe that they Martyn Snow, because I didn't get time. The meeting 23 with Martyn Snow ended up in a bit of a row and I said, 23 would, to what I knew, do nothing about the school and 24 nothing about the fact that a priest had said to 24 "I've told Peter Burrows I was abused, I've told 25 25 Steven Croft and now I'm telling you, and I'm going a bishop -- or shall I say two bishops and an Page 13 Page 14 1 archdeacon, "I was abused by a priest". I just couldn't 1 disclose following these three individuals? 2 2 believe they were doing nothing. A. There was a letter went to Steven Croft on 26 March, 3 3 Q. And had any of them, to your mind, offered you what you which I know that because it was my birthday. And that 4 would call pastoral support --4 went to him. And then I wrote -- when I'd left the 5 5 A. Not a word. parish, I wrote to Steven Croft a letter dated 1 June, 6 Q. -- or any formal counselling or anything? 6 and I wrote him that letter, "You will never know what 7 A. Not a word. Can I just add there, later -- we may come 7 it took to tell you, but you will also never know the 8 to this later on, but Steven Croft was interviewed by 8 hurt you and your suffragan have caused me by doing 9 the BBC in November 2016, I think it broadcast, and he 9 absolutely nothing about it", and I copied that letter 10 actually said I did disclose to him by dropping it into 10 to the President of Tribunals, to the Bishop of 11 a long conversation about other things, "But I provided 11 Beverley, and to the Archbishop of York. 12 him with full pastoral care and support". That was 12 Q. You use the phrase in your witness statement you had 13 three and a half years later. I have never heard from 13 made eight disclosures to five people within the church? 14 Steven Croft and he provided no evidence at all to show 14 A. That's correct. I never got a reply. Steven Croft, to 15 that he had provided me with care. He didn't. I never 15 this day, has never written and acknowledged that 16 heard a word from him. 16 letter. The only -- neither did the Bishop of Beverley. 17 Q. I know that you made disclosures subsequently to 17 The only person who did respond was the Archbishop of 18 individuals within the church. If I have got my 18 York, who wrote back and said, "Thank you for copying me 19 chronology correct, we are moving on now to reporting into the letter, which I have read. Please be assured 19 20 the allegations to the police. Is my chronology 20 of my prayers and best wishes during this testing time", 21 correct? 21 and he did nothing. 22 A. It is, but there were further disclosures --22 That letter, can I just add, we subsequently found, 23 Q. Before you went to the police? 23 because I put a subject access request into the church, 24 A. Before I went to the police. 24 and we got a copy of core group meeting minutes from the 25 Q. Then I have got the chronology wrong. To whom did you 25 National Safeguarding Team. They record, Page 15 Page 16

1	in September 2016, that that letter was a disclosure of	1	helps, I can bring up your witness statement. It was
2	abuse, so the archbishop and all the others did receive	2	the Yorkshire Police, I think, first?
3	a written disclosure of abuse as well.	3	A. I went into Rotherham Police Station and I spoke to
4	Q. We are going to come on in a little bit to talk about	4	a police officer there I don't know if I'm supposed
5	how that, in part, led to the complaints that you later	5	to name her, but it doesn't matter. She had asked
6	made during the Clergy Discipline Measure?	6	I told her what had happened, and she said to me, "Do
7	A. Yes.	7	you want to make a formal complaint?", and she said, "Or
8	Q. Before we move to your report to the police, I just want	8	do you want to take a few days to think about it?". So
9	to ask, did you ever think of or try to engage with the	9	I did. And then she we had text messages between us,
10	Diocesan Safeguarding Team, rather than with the clergy	10	and I said, "Yes, I would like to go ahead". She
11	directly, and, if not, is there a reason that you didn't	11	replied that she had sent an email to the PPU
12	choose to?	12	department, the Public Protection Unit, and I would hear
13	A. What Diocesan Safeguarding Team? I understand now, from	13	shortly. She put something about she was on leave and
14	having looked at the SCIE independent audit, the	14	did I want them to do it now or wait until she came
15	Diocesan Safeguarding Advisor worked one day a month in	15	back? I said, "No, I'm quite happy" I think it was
16	the office. The safeguarding in the Sheffield Diocese	16	until the 24th, and I never heard a word. So I was told
17	was so bad that the SCIE report actually records that	17	on text that she reported it to the PPU department and
18	-	18	I never heard a word.
19	it says "the previous DSA", not the current one the previous DSA kept handwritten notes which were so	19	I rang South Yorkshire Police three times, saying,
	•	20	"I've never heard anything", and I was promised every
20	illegible you couldn't work out what was happening from one case to the next. So there was no sound	20	time that somebody would get back to me, and they
21		22	•
22	safeguarding in the Sheffield Diocese. I thought I'd	23	didn't. Then, the following February, I got a speeding
23	told the bishops and that was enough.	24	ticket and I got one of those things asking me to go to
24	Q. You reported to the police first in 2013. What happened	25	a class, you know, for
25	when you reported to the police, first of all, and if it	23	Q. Speed awareness.
	Page 17		Page 18
1	A. Speed awareness. I suppose, like a lot of people,	1	charged. Is that right?
2	I rang up the number and said, "Do I have to go or can	2	A. That's correct. I honestly did not know what to do.
3	I just take the three points?", and they said, "You're	3	I'd told all these bishops and senior clergy, even the
4	better off going". To which I said, "It makes you	4	Archbishop of York. I'd told the police. And I got no
5	laugh, doesn't it? You can report rape and nothing	5	response. And I just did not feel believed. I thought,
6	happens. Do a 34 in a 30 and they come down on you like	6	"Nobody believes me". And, as we all do these days,
7	a tone of bricks". He said to me, "What do you mean?".	7	I was Googling and I came across a solicitors in
8	I told him what happened and that I'd reported. He	8	Dewsbury and it was said they dealt with child abuse.
9	said, "Leave it with me". Literally, within minutes,	9	And I thought, "I never even knew that". I thought,
10	I got a phone call from a sergeant at South Yorkshire	10	"I drive past there every day". That was Jordans.
11	Police and he asked me what had happened and he promised	11	I went inside, I saw a lady, she asked me all the
12	he would look into the matter and come back to me, and	12	questions and wrote down effectively a statement, and
13	I've never heard a word from him.	13	then she said to me, "When did you know you could claim
14	Then, subsequently I don't know if you got that	14	money from the church?". I said, "I'm not here for
15	letter the police did write to me and acknowledge	15	that. I want you to help me to report it to the police
16	that they failed to ask. What I was told afterwards	16	because they're not how do I report it and get them
17	from the police investigation was that the email had	17	to listen?". She said, "Oh, that's easy. You just ring
18	been sent from South Yorkshire Police to the PPU	18	101 and tell them what you want to report. They won't
19	department in West Yorkshire Police, not to their own	19	ask you to go to the police station, they will come to
20	PPU department and it seems to have got lost somewhere	20	your house". So I did. The first thing they said to me
21	in the communications.	21	was, "Can you come down to Dewsbury Police Station?",
22	Q. You then subsequently went to the police again in 2015,	22	and I stood in the entrance and the woman on the desk
23	this time to West Yorkshire Police?	23	asked me to tell her what I was reporting, and there was
24	A. Yes.	24	a lot of people in the entrance hall.
25	Q. You disclosed your abuse and Trevor Devanamanikkam was	25	I then met a police officer in a little room, told
23	2. 150 discressed your doubt and Herri Devandmannann was	23	a men met a ponet officer in a mut room, tota
	Page 19	L	Page 20
			5 (Pages 17 to 20)

1 1 him, and then he come out and went back and asked me if thing. Go independent. Somebody who is not influenced 2 I would go and make a video statement. I did that and, 2 on either side. Speak to a truly independent support 3 shortly after, DC Alison Hanson got in touch with me. 3 and counsellor". So I went to -- because I wasn't going 4 4 to go to anybody in the church. She was the investigating officer and came to see me. 5 Q. He was subsequently charged? 5 Q. We know that Trevor Devanamanikkam took his own life 6 A. He was. 6 immediately before the trial was due to -- is it the 7 7 Q. In the run-up to the scheduled trial of trial was due to start or just the appearance at the 8 Trevor Devanamanikkam, what support did you receive, if 8 magistrate's court? 9 any, from the church, either locally or nationally? 9 A. I was told he'd been summoned. Alison rang me and told 10 A. None. I have to be honest. When it started, DC Hanson 10 me that he'd been charged and that he'd been summoned to 11 told the Lead Diocesan DSA, obviously, of 11 appear at Bradford Magistrates at the beginning of June 12 12 the investigation. She told me she contacted the church and it was the day he was due to appear in the 13 and it was -- am I allowed to name? Does it matter? 13 Magistrates. He didn't turn up. I was told his 14 Q. The DSA? 14 solicitor hadn't either, and I found that strange, 15 15 because you'd think a solicitor would turn up and say, A. That's Jenny Price; yes? She told Jenny that had 16 happened and Jenny did say, "Does Matthew need any 16 "Where is my client?", and then that night -- I spoke to 17 support?". I know that. Alison came to me and said, 17 Alison and she said, "The judge has issued a warrant for 18 18 his arrest. We'll send Oxford Police to his house. And and I said, "I don't want nothing from them, Alison", 19 Because I understood that to mean a church counsellor. 19 if he's there, he will be brought back up to Bradford 20 I didn't want anybody from the church. The police 20 and put before the magistrates in the morning. If he is 21 21 recommended me to the Star Project in Bradford who not there, it might take us a few days, but we will find 22 recommended Mosaic II, which is a counselling service --22 him". I said fine. That night I was sat watching the 23 or should I say was, because it closed last week, after 23 television and the police came to the door. "Can we years. And they recommended there. And I went there. 24 come in?" Yes. "Alison has asked us to come and tell 24 25 And Alison said to me, "I think you're doing the right 25 you first", and she told me they'd found his body at Page 21 Page 22 told by DC Hanson he'd been charged. She said, "Can you 1 home and it looked at though he'd possibly taken his own 2 life. The police were good, "Do you need anything? Do 2 tell me when he's appearing in court? Do you know what 3 3 you need any support". They were very -- I said, "No, he's been charged with? Are there any investigations 4 4 no, fine". To be honest, once it had started to sink into the bishops? And do you need any support?" 5 in, I thought, "I want to be on my own. I want to sit 5 And I said, "Isn't it funny how I'm fourth on your and I've got to absorb this". list"? I said, "You've come and rung me, fishing for 6 6 7 Q. Can we, Ralph, display a page of the witness's 7 information". I said, "You should know when he's in 8 statement, please, ANG000584\_042. Paragraphs 117 and 8 court and everything else". And I says, "But I'm fourth 118, please. Is it right that following on your list. And I've told you before, I don't want 10 Trevor Devanamanikkam's death, the church issued 10 anything from the church, yeah, I don't want to" -- you 11 a statement, and we see it there in bold? 11 know. And she said, "Well, we'll see how it goes and 12 A. Mmm. 12 I'll ring you again next week to see how you are". 13 Q. "We have been alerted by the police that 13 I understand the call could have been a care call, but 14 14 Trevor Devanamanikkam has been found dead. Our thoughts what stood out to me was, I was fourth on the list of 15 and prayers are with everyone affected by this sad news 15 questions 16 and we have offered Michael ..." 16 So to say that they have offered Michael, as it says 17 The pseudonym you were using at that time: 17 there, pastoral care and support is true, but it came 18 "... pastoral care and support." 18 way down the list. They were more concerned about 19 19 finding out were there any police investigating the 20 Q. What was your view of this statement issued? 20 bishops, did I know whether there were any charges going 21 A. I think it's disgraceful. I got a phone call -- the 21 to be brought against the bishops, and so on. She 22 22 first time I got a phone call from Moira -wanted all that information before she ever asked me, 23 Q. You can name church individuals. 23 did I need any care. That's the thing that really upset 24 A. Yes, Moira Murray, the National Safeguarding Team, on 24 25 the Friday before he was due in court. So she'd been 25 Q. In terms of topics, I'm going to move on to our next Page 23 Page 24

11

14

- 1 large topic, which is the Clergy Discipline Measure, and
- 2 we are hearing, after you, from Mr Adrian Iles from the
- 3 Church of England about the internal Clergy Discipline
- 4 Measure processes from their perspective.
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. Is it right that you have made complaints under the
- 7 Clergy Discipline Measure against a number of serving
- 8 clergy?
- 9 A. That's absolutely correct.
- 10 Q. And serving senior clergy, I should say, specifically?
- 11 A. And still serving, yes. I made -- after I made my
- 12 report to the police and the police investigation was
- 13 under way. I met my solicitor, David Greenwood, and we
- 14 completed forms under the Clergy Discipline Measure to
- 15 complain about my abuser, because he is a clergyman, and
- 16 against the bishops and the archdeacon who had ignored
- 17 my disclosures of abuse.
- 18 I then spoke to DC Hanson, and she said, "I can't
- 19 stop you, but can I ask that you hold fire? I've got to
- 20 trace Devanamanikkam and speak to him. I've got to get
- 21 my investigation under way. I have told the church the
- 22 basics, that this priest is under investigation, but can
- 23 you just wait and let me get my investigation under
- 24 way?" She did, and it took a year. Then she actually 25 wrote me a cover letter on West Yorkshire Police headed
  - Page 25

- 1 paper not saying that they had asked for that. So the
- 2 actual complaints were not put in until 2016 because of
  - that delay.
- 4 So the delay had been, I wasn't believed. South
- 5 Yorkshire Police didn't act. And I didn't feel
- believed. And it was only when I found Jordans, and
- 7 then David, that we finally filed the complaints. Do
- 8 you want me to go on, then, from the response I got?
- 9 Q. I think maybe it is helpful if we take a little bit
- 10 about each of the complaints one at a time, so that
  - those who don't know as much about it as you can follow.
- 12 A. Okay.
- 13 Q. What I will do is bring up a little bit on screen.
  - Ralph, page 75 of the witness's statement. We might not
- 15 be able to get all of them in detail. So you made
- 16 a complaint against Bishop Peter Burrows. You will
- 17 remember he was the first person you disclosed to. He
- 18 was the suffragan bishop?
- 19
- 20 Q. Your complaint was that he ignored your disclosure --
- I'm looking at the second --21
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. He ignored your disclosure of child sexual abuse and has
- 24 done nothing about it except to object in writing to an
- 25 investigation into his misconduct.

## Page 26

- 1 A. He did.
- 2 Q. Can you tell us what the objection was?
- 3 A. We sent in the complaints under the Clergy Discipline
- 4 Measure, and then received a letter saying, "Sorry,
- 5 you're out of time. The Church of England has
- 6 a one-year rule for dealing with complaints against 7 clergy". So we then appealed that, which was an appeal
- 8 to the President of Tribunals of the Church of England,
- and I understand the procedure is they then write to all
- 10 the bishops concerned -- the people complained about and
- 11 ask them their opinion on the one-year rule. I remember
- 12 seeing the -- it is like a standard letter and it says,
- 13 "You are not being asked to comment upon the actual
- 14 complaints themselves, just your opinion on the one-year

Burrows, Glyn Webster -- all of them wrote back and

- 15 rule". All of the bishops -- Sentamu, Croft, Snow,
- 17 objected to the one-year rule being extended in their
- 18 case.

16

- 19 Q. I'm just going to make sure that is clear for everybody
- 20 following. The individuals, the complete list, that you
- 2.1 made complaints about were Bishop Roy Williamson, that
- 22 he failed to comply with safeguarding guidelines?
- 23 A. And he put me out on the street.
- 24 Q. That was in relation to your own parish and the freehold

Page 27

25 that you had?

- A. No, that's when he was the Bishop of Bradford at the 1
- 2 time, who discovered and --
- 3 O. Told you to leave Trevor Devanamanikkam's house?
- 4 A. Told me to leave Trevor Devanamanikkam's vicarage
- 5 without the care for me. It was like, "Go now".
- Q. Bishop Steven Croft, who we have talked about, because 6
  - you made a number of --
- 8 A. Four disclosures to Steven Croft.
- 9 Q. -- disclosures to him. Bishop Martyn Snow, who had been
  - your archdeacon --
- 11 A. One disclosure.

7

10

15

17

21

- 12 Q. -- and became the Bishop of Leicester and then the
- 13 Bishop of Oxford, I think?
- 14 A. No. Martyn Snow was Bishop of Leicester. Steven Croft
  - was Bishop of Sheffield at the time of my disclosures,
- 16 and he was then moved to Oxford in 2016.
  - O. We are going to talk about that in a moment. Bishop Peter Burrows, which we are looking at on
- 18 19
- 20 A. Who was, and still is, the Bishop of Doncaster.
- Q. And the complaint was that he ignored your disclosure of 22 child sexual abuse and there was a data breach, which we
- 23 will talk about in a second, in relation to him.
- 24 Bishop Glyn Webster, that he ignored your disclosure of
- 25 abuse and objected in writing to the investigation?

1 1 Can I add here -- I don't know if this is the right A. Yes, and in his objection, he did actually write that he 2 had received the letter. 2 place -- the church also wrote to Trevor Devanamanikkam 3 Q. The letter from you disclosing the abuse? 3 and asked his opinion about the one-year rule and 4 4 A. Yes. whether he thought it should be investigated as well, 5 Q. And Archbishop John Sentamu, and the complaint was that 5 and he didn't reply. But I got on the phone, when 6 he had ignored a written disclosure of abuse and, 6 I discovered it, to DC Hanson. I think to say that she 7 7 likewise, had objected -was not impressed is an understatement. I know that one 8 A. Yes. of her officers got in touch with the legal office at 9 Q. -- to the investigation. These were made out of time, Q Church House, Westminster, and said, basically, "Who in 10 out of the one-year time limit, for the reasons you have 10 their right minds thinks it's acceptable to write to 11 told us, and the procedure, as we know it, from the 11 a priest who is under investigation by the police for 12 Church of England would be that you can, with the leave 12 historic child sexual abuse and give him the opportunity 13 of the court, for want of a better word, make 13 to object to being investigated?", and the reply was, 14 14 a complaint out of time, but that in making the decision "That is church procedure". 15 to grant that leave, they would consult the respondent 15 Now, I am aware that the year after, that was 16 about whom the complaint was made? 16 amended, and it is the only thing, I believe now, that 17 A. That's correct, ves. 17 the one-year rule does not apply to, if you are actually 18 18 Q. And what you have emphasised is that you're concerned accused of abuse. But at the time, they consulted my 19 about the fact that each of the individuals about whom 19 rapist about asking him about whether he thought he 20 you had complained objected to the granting of leave to 20 should be investigated or not. And that hurt. That 21 make the complaint out of time? 21 really hurt. 22 A. To even bring the complaint. So they consult those 22 Q. I'm just going to go through a little bit more about the 23 23 basis of each of the complaints so that everybody can complained about to ask them whether they think they 24 24 should be complained about. It makes -- it's no great follow. One of the complaints against Bishop Burrows 25 mind, is it, to say, "They're going to object". 25 was that he had breached the Data Protection Act because Page 29 Page 30 1 he was overheard in a cafe discussing your case. Is 1 I'd waived my anonymity, it had been in the papers and 2 2 that right? on the television and that had put him under stress. So 3 A. That was -- there were several complaints. That one 3 it was all my fault. Then he went on to blame 4 came much later. It was 22 November 2017 and I got 4 Bishop Philip North for pulling out of Sheffield and 5 a phone call from a friend of mine who was an undertaker 5 that he'd been left with the diocese and he'd had no 6 in Rotherham, and he said that he and his wife were sat support from the Archbishops of Canterbury or York or 6 7 in a cafe and the Bishop of Doncaster in purple shirt the wider church and all this stress had caused him to 7 8 and full clericals were sat at the next table with 8 have a momentary lapse of judgment. somebody he didn't know, and he said, "I hate to tell Obviously, we're not happy with that, but I'm afraid 10 you, they're laughing about your abuse and talking about 10 the Archbishop of Canterbury, as is his wont, decided to 11 it, and the whole cafe is listening". I immediately 11 take no further action on the complaint, which to me 12 rang David Greenwood and David said, "Would your friend 12 says the Archbishop of Canterbury agrees you can sit in 13 be prepared to make a statement to that effect?". So 13 a cafe, talking, one of your bishops, about somebody's 14 I asked him. He did. We then reported that to the 14 sexual abuse so the whole cafe can hear, "But it's all 15 Information Commissioner who ruled that there would have 15 right because I'm not going to take any further action 16 been a breach of the Data Protection Act, and I spoke to 16 about it". A schoolteacher wouldn't have got away with 17 the lady who deals with GDPR at Church House. She told 17 that, neither would a police officer. 18 me that, yes, they had acknowledged that had been 18 Q. We are going to come to the outcome of the complaints in a breach and we filed a CDM complaint with the 19 19 just a moment. I'm going to bring up the next page of 20 Archbishop of Canterbury about that, about which he then 20 your witness statement, page 76, just to flesh out the 2.1 decided to take no further action. 21 detail about the other complaints made. 22 22 But can I just say, in his reply to that, Bishop Steven Croft was -- the complaint in relation to 23 Peter Burrows blamed everybody but himself. He actually 23 failing to act and ignoring information that you 24 blamed me and said that he'd -- his words were, "I had 24 passed -- in relation to Bishop Steven Croft, made a momentary lapse of judgment", and it was because 25 25 I understand you raised objection to his enthronement?

Page 31

1 A. We discovered -- well, I discovered and then got on the 1 ignored your written disclosure of abuse? 2 phone to David, that between the time of us applying to 2 A. Yes. the President of Tribunals for the one-year rule to be 3 3 Q. I understand -- is it right? -- that you also raised 4 extended, the president took until August to make the 4 concerns about the fact that some of your complaints had 5 decision. But we then discovered that the church were 5 been referred to Archbishop John Sentamu to consider in 6 appointing Steven Croft to be Bishop of Oxford and his role as archbishop? 6 7 7 planned to enthrone him, and Martyn Snow as A. Absolutely. They were sent, I believe, to his office 8 Bishop of Leicester, and I found it incredible that you 8 first. We raised -- because he was one of the people Q could appoint somebody to a position like that whilst 9 complained about, we said he has a conflict of 10 there was a safeguarding complaint against them. 10 interests. He cannot handle a complaint into himself or 11 Q. The Bishop Martyn Snow we have already gone through. 11 his fellow people who had also been complained about. 12 Your allegation and complaint, was that he ignored your 12 So it was sent to the Archbishop of Canterbury. And 13 disclosures of abuse and also that you felt he had lied 13 that's right. 14 on BBC TV about the offer of pastoral support? 14 Q. Finally, at the bottom of the page, and just a tiny bit 15 A. No, he lied on BBC TV about the process. 15 over the page, Bishop Glyn Webster, that he had ignored 16 Q. Okay. 16 your disclosure of abuse and had failed to conduct any 17 A. He said that he'd heard -- I made complaints against him 17 investigation? 18 and all the other bishops. A senior judge, ie, the 18 A. Yes, and that they objected to being investigated. The 19 President of Tribunals, had asked for evidence and 19 phrase I've often used is, why would they object to the 20 they'd ruled that the bishops had no case to answer. 20 one-year rule being extended? If they have nothing to 21 That was not true. They blocked it with the one-year 21 hide, why hide behind that legal technicality? It 22 22 doesn't make sense. If they can answer my complaints, 23 O. Then --23 answer them. 24 A. He lied. 24 Q. Can you tell us a little bit, please, about the outcome Q. -- below, we have Archbishop John Sentamu, that he'd 25 of these complaints before I ask you about your 25 Page 33 Page 34 1 observations on the process? Tribunals, because the interview wasn't live, it was 2 2 A. I can. We made complaints against the Bishop of Oxford pre-recorded at the request of the Church of England 3 when he went on the television in November 2016, and he 3 press office. He wasn't asked any questions. He typed 4 4 admitted, for the first time, I'd disclosed to him, but out -- he read a pre-typed-out statement and he was 5 5 he used the phrase that I had dropped it in a long accompanied by one of their comms and media people. conversation about other things and he provided me with So we went back and said, "No, that wasn't thinking on 6 6 7 7 your feet. That was premeditated". He lied and had full pastoral care. That was a lie. 8 That went back and forth and back and forth. 8 prepared that statement beforehand and the President of I think it took over a year for the Archbishop of Tribunals referred it back to the Archbishop of 10 Canterbury to deal with, and he decided to take no 10 Canterbury, who then decided to take no further action 11 11 further action, despite the fact that Steven Croft has anyway. 12 not been able to show any evidence at all he provided me 12 Q. Can we just take a look at one of the documents relating 13 with pastoral care. Because he didn't. I never heard 13 to the complaint against Bishop Martyn Snow. It's 14 from him. To me, he should be able to say, "There is 14 ANG000605\_006. It's behind tab B1 of the bundle. This 15 15 is the report on behalf of the provincial registrar to the bishop I wrote to, there is the letter saying, 16 'Could you be in contact with Matthew and offer pastoral 16 the Archbishop of Canterbury under the measure, and 17 care if he needs it?"". Nothing. 17 I want to just look at paragraph 6. What it says is 18 18 We complained about Martyn Snow and the lying on that the alleged misconduct is clearly not trivial, but 19 television. The Archbishop of Canterbury wrote back and 19 that the code at paragraph 8 states that disciplinary 20 first of all said he was going to dismiss the complaint. 20 proceedings against clergy should only be about 2.1 Then, because it was live, the bishop was having to 21 misconduct that is potentially sufficiently serious for 22 22 think on his feet and he was trying to make things referral to a Bishops' Disciplinary Tribunal 23 intelligible for the casual viewer. We contacted the 23 proceedings, it is not for the determination of 24 BBC journalist who interviewed him, who wrote 24 grievances. Did you consider your complaint to be 25 a statement, and we appealed to the President of 25 a grievance? Page 36 Page 35

1	A. No. I think he lied. He lied on television. And	1	someone told the respondent about the abuse you suffered
2	that's misconduct. And certainly I think the phrase in	2	from the Reverend Trevor Devanamanikkam and that
3	the Clergy Discipline Measure is "conduct unbecoming of	3	therefore the respondent acted in the way that you
4	a clerk in Holy Orders". He lied to the general public	4	allege he did"
5	on television. That's not a grievance. That's	5	Which is asking you to leave the house:
6	a complaint.	6	" in the knowledge there must be sufficient
7	Q. The ultimate conclusion was:	7	evidence to sustain the allegation that [he] knew"
8	"My assessment is also that the matters contained	8	Over the page is the response to that in the second
9	within the complaint are not trivial but, nevertheless,	9	bullet point, please, Ralph, on page 3:
10	do not justify further consideration being given to the	10	"The respondent denies he was aware of the abuse at
11	complaint."	11	that time. This is supported by the assistant curate
12	A. It says it all. But then, you see, to me, again and	12	and the churchwarden in their statements, who had no
13	even then, the ultimate thing, the Archbishop of	13	knowledge at the time of any abuse or any allegations
14	Canterbury takes no further action, again. That	14	against Trevor Devanamanikkam."
15	presumably means he agrees with his bishops lying on	15	Below:
16	television about such serious things.	16	"You say that the respondent visited the vicarage
17	Q. We won't be able to go through all of them, but if we	17	prior to you being required to leave and move elsewhere.
18	can look a little bit at tab B15 and the document	18	The respondent denies visiting the vicarage at this
19	ANG000603, please, Ralph B14. This is a letter sent	19	time. This is supported by the assistant curate and the
20	to you on behalf of the Archbishop of Canterbury	20	churchwarden"
21	dismissing the complaint that you made against	21	The bullet point below that:
22	Bishop Roy Williamson?	22	"It is not surprising, given the fact that you were
23	A. Yes.	23	not directly involved in the discussions which clearly
24	Q. It says at the first bullet point:	24	took place at the time, that events may not have been
25	"Your complaint is based on the assumption that	25	clear to you."
	Page 37		Page 38
1	It says:	1	meetings in the Diocese of Bradford, in which he sat
2	"The respondent denies that he knew and witnesses	2	there, about the concern about a young boy being at the
3	say that they had no knowledge of any disclosure	3	vicarage, yeah, and he'd asked the archdeacon to
4	either."	4	investigate, and he was fully aware I was there, asked
5	At the bottom:	5	for the assistant curate and the churchwardens, not
6	"I stress that, in coming to this conclusion, I am	6	knowing of the abuse they knew I was there. They
7	not addressing the abuse which you suffered from	7	wouldn't have known of the abuse because they weren't
8	Trevor Devanamanikkam, which was the subject of	8	there when the abuse happened. They weren't there at
9	a separate complaint by you and of course of	9	night-time when it was going on. But they knew I was at
10	the criminal case brought against him."	10	the vicarage.
11	These are the reasons essentially given, and there	11	And I would raise the question there, if they are so
12	is definitely a discussion about what you say and what	12	particular, if you like, why were they not asking the
13	he says. Did anybody meet with you to discuss what you	13	question, "What is this young boy doing at the
14	were saying had happened, or was it all done just on the	14	vicarage?", themselves? No, they say they weren't aware
15	papers?	15	of the abuse, but they wouldn't have been because they
16	A. No, it's all been done by correspondence, yeah. Can	16	weren't there when it was happening. But they were
17	I just answer those points?	17	certainly there when I was there.
18	Q. Please.	18	Further on, the assistant curate wrote because
19	A. My nan turned up at the vicarage and, the very morning	19	Trevor Devanamanikkam had a housekeeper that when he
20	after, the Bishop of Bradford turned up. I can only	20	left the parish, he went looking at houses with her to
21	presume and I don't know what happened there	21	try to find her proper accommodation and look after her
22	specifically that she'd gone away unhappy and got in	22	and make sure she was all right. Well, why didn't she
23	touch. Otherwise, why that possibly could have	23	do that for me? Because I was an awful lot younger than
24	happened. But in his reply to the complaint, Bishop Roy	24	the housekeeper. I was a child. And yet she allowed
25	actually wrote that there were several senior staff	25	a child to stay in a vicarage with a vicar and then
	Page 39		Page 40
	1 age 37		1 age TO

1 1 I was put out. He was there. And I will add on to that and care. He lied. No further action. Martyn Snow on 2 further on Roy Williamson also puts in his statement 2 the television, lying. Proved to be lying. No further 3 that he's never met me and didn't know me. But when 3 action from the Archbishop of Canterbury. Peter Burrows 4 4 a subject access request we also got -- the whole page in a cafe, gossiping about my abuse. He's actually is blacked out, except for one line, and it's an 5 found by the Information Commission to have breached the 6 internal thing from the National Safeguarding Team, 6 Data Protection Act. No further action. "Bishop Roy acknowledges he did meet Matthew Ineson but 7 The Archbishop of Canterbury consistently takes no said it was after the abuse and not at the time". further action and, to me, therefore, condones all these And furthermore, the most recent subject access 9 actions. Why is he not concerned that a bishop is sat request we've got, in the NST core group meeting minutes 10 10 in a cafe, gossiping. Why is he not concerned his 11 it says that, "The Archbishop of Canterbury has come 11 bishops are lying about this? Because this is serious. 12 12 It is not trivial stuff. This is abuse. into further possession of information from Bishop Roy 13 about the case, but will not release it and will not act 13 Q. Splitting them out a little bit, if we can, would it be 14 on it". And all you get in the NST minutes is, "We must 14 fair to summarise from that that you don't have faith in 15 protect this bishop. He is frail. We must look after 15 the outcomes of the Clergy Discipline Measure? 16 him". Not a word of care for me. 16 A. Absolutely. I think it's disgraceful. If I might just 17 Q. Looking, again, at the broader picture about clergy 17 share something with you, the Bishop of Bath and Wells, 18 18 the Lead Safeguarding Bishop, he did ring me one time discipline and the measure, what are your views about 19 the adequacy of the Clergy Discipline Measure and, in 19 and I was really, really, really stressed. On the 20 particular, how easy or suitable it is to be used by 20 phone, I was saying, "I don't want to talk, Peter, I'm 21 complainants, victims and survivors of abuse? 21 not interested", and he went, "Fine, fine, fine, I'll go 22 22 A. I think it's totally unsuitable. Bishop investigates away". Then, when I put the phone down, I felt guilty, 23 bishop. And they're all conflicted. It's very, very 23 so I sent him a little email and said, "I'm sorry for my 24 24 obvious. You know, we went -- if I can just briefly go outburst. I was really stressed at that time", to which 25 through, Steven Croft saying he gave me pastoral support 25 his reply was: Page 41 Page 42 put it on the wrong form. That was all I got back. But 1 "Dear Matt [I have it here], there is absolutely no 2 2 need for you to apologise. The whole process, speaking nobody explained to me from the church at all how to do 3 3 only of the last five years which you have referred to, 4 4 Q. Was there any mechanism for pastoral support to be has been shabby and shambolic." 5 And that's from the Lead Safeguarding Bishop of 5 provided to you as the complainant in a complaint 6 the Church of England. And I thank him for his comments 6 system? 7 7 A. No. Is this an appropriate time to talk about because I couldn't have put it better myself. 8 Q. That's about the faith in the outcomes. In terms of 8 counselling? the procedure, did you find it was a procedure that you, 9 Q. Please. 10 as a complainant, were able to understand and navigate? 10 A. The church had -- as I said, I'd chosen to have 11 A. No. I found it difficult. And I don't understand a lot 11 independent counselling, and the police agreed with me. 12 of the things -- writing to your abuser to ask his 12 And I went to Mosaic II for two and a half years and 13 13 opinion; writing to people who are complained about. they were excellent. Absolutely excellent. 14 14 I don't understand the one-year rule at all. I don't The church kept putting out these statements, and 15 15 they put one out saying that "The church was providing understand why there should be a one-year rule for 16 bringing complaints against clergy and certainly such 16 Matthew with full pastoral care and support". I rang 17 serious things. 17 Moira Murray from the National Safeguarding Team and I 18 Q. Did anyone from the church contact you or provide you 18 said, "I have no idea what you are even talking about. 19 That's a lie". I said, "How can you say you're any means by which to understand and navigate this? 19 20 20 providing me with full pastoral care and support. A. No. 21 Q. To explain how the processes work and explain to you --21 I don't even know what you would be offering". And she 22 22 to make sure you're putting the right documents in in said, "Well, we will pay for counselling for you", and 23 the right time and the right forms? 23 I said, "Well, pay Mosaic II, then, because they have 24 A. Not at all. There were occasions I sent in the wrong 24 been doing the job you said you would pay for". And she 25 forms, and I was told they wouldn't hear it because I'd 25 said, "Well, how much do you think is reasonable?", and Page 44 Page 43

1 1 I said, "I have no idea how much these things cost. system. I understand during the course of your complaints you raised some concerns about the role of 2 Let's say £40 an hour" -- I understand that's cheap now, 2 3 3 but it was in Yorkshire. the registrars? 4 A. I did. We discovered -- the process is that once you I said, "About £40 an hour. Seeing as I have been 4 5 going every other week for two years by then, that's 5 make a complaint to a bishop or archbishop, they pass it 6 £2,000". She said, "I think that would be reasonable. to the registrar to do the preliminary scrutinies, as 6 7 7 I'll have to pass it to the Diocese of Leeds because we've seen earlier, and they then make their view on that was where the abuse took place". So she sent it up 8 whether this is a valid complaint, whether the person Q there. Suddenly, the offer to pay was changed to, "We 9 has a valid point in making it, is an interested party, 10 will make a contribution", and badgered and badgered and 10 and their recommendations. And then they pass it back 11 badgered the Bishop of Leeds about paying for this and 11 to the bishop. But we discovered that the registrar to 12 the week before Christmas he sent Mosaic II £500, which 12 the Archbishop of Canterbury -- can I name him? --13 equated then to the equivalent of £6.47 per session. 13 O. Yes. 14 14 I objected and wrote to him and said "That's less than A. -- John Rees, was also registrar to Steven Croft in 15 15 the minimum wage. Let's be realistic. I was told my Oxford. So we raised the point there's a conflict of 16 counselling would be paid for in line with 16 interest here because you cannot investigate a complaint 17 **Ecclesiastical Insurance guidelines that counselling** 17 against your own client. So the church agreed and said, 18 should be provided". The reply I got was, "'Should' not 18 fine, and they appointed Owen Carew-Jones of the same 19 'must'. We haven't got a bottomless pit of money and no 19 solicitors' firm as John Rees -- I think he's the 20 diocese would be able to put itself in a position like 20 Rochester DSA -- registrar -- to do the complaints. We 21 that" and they refused "and there is no more money". If 21 thought, well, we'll get on with it. But quite frankly, 22 I tell you that Mosaic II closed last week due to lack 22 the complaints took that long -- they were taking of funds, and the counsellor I now go to I pay for 23 23 months, sometimes over a year, which is in breach of 24 24 myself because the church won't. the Clergy Discipline Measure, itself, time limits. 25 Q. My final question on the Clergy Discipline Measure 25 They made me stick to the one-year rule but they have Page 45 Page 46 1 never stuck to one of their own time limits. 1 ringing, Matthew, I haven't spoken to you for ages. How 2 2 I contacted Owen Carew-Jones and said, "Can you tell are you?" I said, "I'm furious, Alan". I said, "I've 3 3 just discovered that John Rees has had his hand in". me what dates you actually received the complaints from 4 4 And he said, "You know John is ordained, don't you?" the archbishop and what dates you sent your reports 5 back?" And he wouldn't. It took forever. And we 5 And I said, "No, I don't know". And I said, "Hang on 6 reported him to the Solicitors Regulation Authority and 6 a minute", so he goes online, had a look in Crockfords, 7 I got the information within 24 hours and, on the bottom 7 there's his entry and it says "Ordained deacon 1979, 8 8 curate St John's, Moor Allerton in Leeds". Then we of it, he wrote that the complaints against Bishops Snow and Croft had been delayed because the provincial 9 cross-reference that and the priest in charge at the 10 registrar was passing them to the President of Tribunals 10 parish was Trevor Devanamanikkam and he never declared 11 11 it. He'd never said a word. to see whether they could go ahead. That meant that 12 John Rees has had his hand in it all along. 12 I took that up with Moira Murray at the NST. Moira 13 13 Then I put in a subject access request when I had to to see Bishop Tim Thornton and told me that 14 14 Bishop Tim Thornton had said, "We are not doing anything again complain to the Information Commissioner to even 15 15 about it. Let Matthew do what Matthew must do". And we get that subject access request. Went through it and 16 there were 26 documents which -- where John Rees had 16 have complained to the Solicitors Regulation Authority 17 been consulted, had given his opinion, and that went 17 about John Rees and that investigation is going on at 18 18 right through, from the beginning right through, when the moment. 19 19 Q. We understand from looking at the paperwork that a core the church had said that he wouldn't have anything to do 20 20 group has been set up in relation to your case, and this with it. So I got on the phone to Owen Carew-Jones and 21 said, "This is -- he shouldn't be touching these 21 is being managed at the National Safeguarding Team 22 22 complaints". And I was told, "He's only touching the level. 23 structural parts". I said, "He shouldn't be touching 23 24 any part of them". And then I got a phone call from 24 Q. Just a very discrete question based on evidence we have 25 Bishop Alan Wilson, as a pastoral call, "I'm just 25 heard from other people: do you think that you, as the Page 48 Page 47

1 1 victim/survivor, and/or your representative, should have bottom, just before the bottom paragraph. 2 2 a role in the core group about your case? A. Yes. So I've put on there there's the DSA from Oxford. 3 3 I put "conflict of interest" because he was employed by A. Yes. I was never even told core groups were happening 4 4 at all. And then I was -- when we did discover they Steven Croft. The chaplain to the Archbishop of York, 5 were happening, I was told by Moira Murray that 5 employed by John Sentamu. The Safeguarding Advisor for 6 I couldn't see the minutes of what was being said, 6 Leicester, employed by Martyn Snow. All these people 7 7 employed by the very bishops who are being complained I wasn't allowed to know who was on the core group, there was no representation from me and, quite frankly, against. Therefore, they have a conflict of interest. Q there was no representation from Mr Devanamanikkam It seems the other people who were on there are the 10 10 either, and I think there should have been. There media people from the Church of England. They're comms. 11 should have been -- that's fair. That's fair, to me. 11 What specialist knowledge they have of safeguarding, 12 12 There was nothing. We have recently discovered through apart from trying to protect the church's reputation, 13 the subject access request of who actually is on the 13 I have no idea. But there's no representation from me 14 14 or Mr Devanamanikkam's estate. 15 Q. What is your view about the membership of that core 15 Q. Do you think that Mr Devanamanikkam should be 16 group? I think you have set it out in your second 16 represented? 17 witness statement? 17 A. Absolutely. Absolutely. I think I should and they 18 18 should. I think that was what would happen, I think, in A. I did. I've been through and I've looked in at the 19 names. They're all representatives and employees of 19 any other professional sphere, be it school or anything. 20 the very bishops complained about. So you've got the 20 Why shouldn't we be represented? 21 21 Archbishop of York's secretary, you've got Q. In relation to your case, again, we understand there is 22 22 Steven Croft's DSA, who was employed by him -going to be an internal review carried out -- an 23 Q. I will bring it up to help. 23 independent review, I should have said. Have you been 24 consulted about the way in which this review will be 24 A. Yeah, yeah, yeah. 25 Q. Ralph, ANG000648\_004. Everything down to the very 25 carried out and its terms of reference? Page 49 Page 50 1 A. The Church of England have come up with four proposed review could not go ahead while the CDMs were active?", 2 2 remits for this review. It was commissioned and she said, "John Rees". So he's -- again, he's had 3 3 in September 2017 and I was told by Moira Murray, and his hand in it all along. 4 4 she put it on an email, that the Church of England would I have had, more recently, another two or three 5 appoint the enquirer -- I said, "Well, that's hardly 5 proposals. They're trying to tell me who they say will independent, is it, if you're going to appoint the conduct the review and they have sent me a remit which, 6 6 7 person investigating yourself?" And the core group 7 to be honest, we haven't had long and I haven't had 8 would write the remit, so they're going to write the 8 a proper chance to have a look at, but my whole point remit for the investigation into themselves. And that is, it does say at the top that the whole point of 10 the reviewer would apportion no blame to anybody. 10 the review is to investigate and look at how the church 11 And I said, "Well, that's dictating the outcome 11 responded to the disclosures against 12 before anybody has even picked a pen up". And we 12 Trevor Devanamanikkam. "The church" meaning the 13 wouldn't go with that. 13 bishops, the NST, everybody. I do not understand -- and 14 14 I have then had more recent -- nothing happened. I'm not a legal man, but I do not understand how you can 15 15 Nothing happened. Moira told me that she'd been told write a remit for an enquiry into yourself. If there is 16 that the review couldn't go ahead while the complaints 16 an investigation into West Yorkshire Police, they 17 under the Clergy Discipline Measure were active. 17 wouldn't write the remit, would they? It would be 18 Q. Okay. 18 passed to another force. On that basis, I think it's 19 19 A. And after a while, she said -- she, herself, challenged wrong. We have been given no input. I'm told I can 20 that because she didn't think it was right, and she went 20 comment on their proposals, but no input, you know, as 2.1 down to the legal office in Church House and she 21 a part of the preparation. 22 Q. So you'd like a greater level of co-operation in getting questioned it and she was told there was no reason why 22 23 a review could not start while the CDMs were active, and 23 this up and running? 24 they would be noted as part of the review, and I said, 24 A. Absolutely. They're controlling the whole thing and 25 "Who told you, Moira, that we could not -- that the 25 they will manipulate the whole thing and they will say Page 52 Page 51

1 1 what they want to say. General Synod, and Justin Welby and John Sentamu were 2 I got an email vesterday from -- most of the page is 2 there. At the end of the meeting, people milling about, 3 blacked out, because I get things, if I can just show 3 John Sentamu came over to me. The whole meeting, 4 I could feel his eyes in the back of my head -- do you you, like this (indicating). 4 5 Q. You have made a number of subject access requests and 5 know what I mean? But he came up to me, and he came 6 you have received redacted responses? really in my face, too close, and he grabbed me by the 6 7 7 A. I have, and there's a comment in there from William Nye, shoulder and he held me by the shoulder, and he said to 8 and an email to the NST that says, "We must not -- be me, "One day, you and I will talk". So I said, "Well, 9 seen to have done everything right". They're working 9 I only live half an hour away. You put the kettle on, 10 the outcome out before anybody has even started, in my 10 I'll come over and we'll talk". And the look was, "Who 11 11 do you think you're speaking to?". And then he said, 12 12 "One day we will pray together". And I said, "That will Q. We have received a request under rule 10 from your 13 representative, David Greenwood, to ask you about the 13 never happen, but I will talk to you". And he said to 14 events -- the fringe event held last year at synod? 14 me -- and he was holding me the whole time, and he said, 15 15 "What do you want?" I said, "I want A. Yes. 16 16 you to apologise and I want Steven Croft and all the Q. And to ask you whether you had any contact with the 17 Archbishop John Sentamu --17 others to apologise". I said, "You ignored my 18 18 A. I did. disclosure of abuse. You left my abuser five years to 19 O. -- at that event? 19 potentially abuse again". 20 A. I did. I'd never seen John Sentamu before and, if 20 As part of the police investigations, they 21 21 discovered that Trevor Devanamanikkam was looking for I never see him again, it will be too soon, in my 22 22 opinion. It was a fringe meeting arranged so that rent boys online. 23 23 General Synod members could meet with victims of abuse. I said, "And then he's charged with very serious And there were many victims -- 40, I don't know the 24 charges against me. He then climbs in a bath and stabs 24 25 25 himself to death and then it's discovered that he had exact number, but there were many, and members of the Page 53 Page 54 Q. -- whom we have already heard, from SCIE? 1 problems himself". I said, "You were disclosed to five 2 years ago. You did nothing. So, go on, say you're 2 3 3 sorry". And he answered, "Apologies mean different O. One of the things that she said -- chair, you might 4 4 remember -- was that the victims and survivors had things to different people". And then he said to me, 5 and I didn't get this, "There is a boulder between you 5 spoken to her about the change and the practical changes 6 and I". He said, "You have put a boulder between you they would like in the church and that, largely, she had 6 7 and I". And I said to him, "The only thing in front of 7 considered those to be practical, sensible changes. So 8 you, Mr Sentamu, is the possibility you will now have to 8 my final question for you is, building on that, what answer for your actions and you don't like being practical recommendations or changes do you think would 10 answerable to anybody". And his answer was, "One day, 10 help the church to respond better to allegations of 11 we will talk", and he took his hand off my shoulder and 11 child sexual abuse? 12 walked away. 12 A. I have no desire to damage the church at all or bring 13 I went outside and I saw a lady from the NST -- I'm 13 the church down. That's not my thing. The overriding 14 14 sure it's Heather, but I'm -- I told her what happened, motive for me is to help prevent that abuse happens 15 15 "I'll make you a cup of tea. Are you all right?" When again, and I think there are people in position in the 16 I look back now, you do not, whoever you are, walk in 16 church who shouldn't be there who have repeatedly made 17 a room full of victims of abuse and physically get hold 17 mistakes, shall we say, if we're kind, about 18 of them and challenge them. But it's who he thinks he 18 safeguarding 19 is. He's arrogant. He's rude. He's a bully. 19 I think safeguarding should be totally out of 20 Q. This, I understand that you're talking about happened at 20 the hands of the Church of England. 21 the fringe event at General Synod last year? 21 Q. So managed outside of the church? 22 22 A. It did. A. Totally. You can't do your own work. You can't 23 Q. I understand that you were part of the event together 23 investigate yourself. There's too much bias there. 24 with Sheila Fish, from --24 There's too much conflict of interest. 25 A. Yes. 25 I also believe, personally, in mandatory reporting Page 55 Page 56

1 1 because I -- the church don't seem to really, in their Moira Murray told me that I would get a formal 2 2 heart, want to do that. They talk about it, but they apology from the church when the legal case against 3 3 Trevor Devanamanikkam was over. That was two years ago don't do it. I can't understand, if you discover that 4 4 abuse is possibly happening, or you receive since he died, and I have never had an apology. 5 a disclosure, you pick the phone up to the police. It's 5 I was then told by Moira I would get a formal 6 6 apology when the civil case was settled. That was as simple as that. It doesn't have to go through all 7 7 the different layers of the Church of England, and if a year next month. I have never had a formal apology. 8 I thought a little girl or boy was being abused, I would 8 Justin Welby was interviewed by a journalist student 9 pick the phone up to the police then, and that is 9 in Canterbury and the first question was, "Why hasn't 10 mandatory reporting, as far as I see. I'm simple. 10 Matthew had an apology?" He promised to chase that up. 11 Simple thinking. 11 That was last year, I think. I have never had the 12 Q. No, not at all. That concludes the questions I have for 12 13 you, unless we have missed something very key that you 13 I have never had a formal apology at all, but 14 wanted to raise that might assist the chair and panel in 14 I think there's an obvious reason for that: because they 15 their conclusions and recommendations? 15 would have to admit the bishops' failings if they 16 A. No, there is just one thing I would say. There's 16 apologised for it. I have never even had a formal 17 a couple of things. You were talking before about 17 apology for the abuse from Trevor Devanamanikkam -- the 18 apology, why would I want apology. 18 abuse by Trevor Devanamanikkam. 19 O. Yes. 19 Can I just finally say a scenario I want to share 20 A. Firstly, it is recognition. It is recognition of what 20 with you: I am a Yorkshireman, as you've probably 2.1 happened and it is recognition of the way that I have 21 gathered. David Greenwood always says, "You're straight 22 been tret. I was told, in July 2017, by Graham Tilby 22 talking", that's how it comes. I don't think the church 23 that I would -- had I had an apology? I said "No". He 23 can cope with that. That's been my experience. They said, "I can sort that out for you". That was two years 24 24 want to go around the houses and through the layers and 25 ago. I have never had it. 25 do all that. Straight talking, they can't cope with. Page 57 Page 58 1 I have even in the church been called "a common 1 They can't be trusted. 2 2 northerner" before now, at a safeguarding thing. I want And I say that as a clergyman. I am still a priest 3 3 of the Church of England and I don't believe the to say -- I really want to say thank you to David 4 4 because I wouldn't be here without David, and to people hierarchy can be trusted. Justin Welby sat in this very 5 5 like Richard who represent victims of abuse. Without room a few weeks ago, with tears in his eyes, and said 6 that support, I would still be not knowing what to do. 6 he'd learned to become ashamed of the church. I do not 7 I also want to thank my MP, who is here today. 7 understand why that is the case, because the vast 8 8 majority of the Church of England, clergy and lay, would Yeah. Her staff and her get it, and she has been totally, totally supportive, and I understand she's 9 never abuse anybody, and would report it, and they would 10 written to the Archbishop of Canterbury and asked on 10 be horrified by the abuse. It isn't the vast majority. 11 11 It is a small amount of people. And then it's the more than one occasion to meet with him to discuss my 12 case. A letter of 17 January 2018 has still not had 12 re-abuse by the bishops and the archbishops themselves, 13 13 a formal response. Over a year. and I think, if any shame wants applying, it needs to be 14 14 I want to say thank you to the many victims, and applied to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the 15 15 Archbishop of York and the House of Bishops, and not all I've met many now, who really are courageous people. 16 Some of them are here today, a lot of them will be 16 the bishops, but the vast majority of them. What 17 watching. I don't actually even want to be here today. 17 they're -- and the NST and William Nye and all that lot 18 18 at Church House. I think they are cruel, and that's the This is something I never in my life wanted to do. But 19 19 I am. But the truth is, none of us ever asked for it to 20 20 What would Jesus do in this situation? He wouldn't happen, the abuse to happen, and the re-abuse, and 21 I want to say thank you to this inquiry for all you're 21 do what they're doing. And I just think this comes down 22 22 doing, and I just hope that -- I believe the church will to -- it's the old story: abuse is about power. 23 nod at the end of this and say, "Thank you very much. 23 Devanamanikkam's power over me, he used. John Smyth did 24 the same over his victims. Peter Ball. All of them. We will take note", and they will just revert to form. 24 25 They are not going to change unless they are made to. 25 That abuse of power is used again, and again, and again

Page 59

1	by the bishops of the Church of England without they	1	I don't think these people are fit for office. Thank
2	ignore disclosures. They leave the abuser to carry on.	2	you. I'm sorry I have gone on.
3	Then, when you complain about those bishops, the	3	MS McNEILL: No, no, thank you, Mr Ineson. Chair, do you or
4	Archbishop of Canterbury just takes no further action,	4	the panel have any questions for this witness?
5	no further action, no further action. It's a complete	5	THE CHAIR: No, we have no questions.
6	cycle. That's what the problem with the Clergy	6	MS McNEILL: Thank you.
7	Discipline Measure is, because they're investigating	7	(The witness withdrew)
8	themselves, and it destroys people. It really does.	8	MS McNEILL: Chair, I wonder if this would be an appropriate
9	And why? Because bishops sit on thrones. They live	9	moment for our mid-morning break so we can start the
10	in fine houses and palaces, they wear the finest robes	10	next witness clean?
11	and garments, which cost the earth. I know, because	11	THE CHAIR: Yes, we will return at 11.35 am.
12	I've sat I sell 'em them?in them. They bully people.	12	(11.17 am)
13	Yeah? People literally kneel down and kiss the ring on	13	(A short break)
14	their finger. Who would give that up? They don't want	14	(11.36 am)
15	to, and that's why they're protecting themselves. It	15	MS SCOLDING: Good morning, chair and panel. We will now
16	really does drive people to distraction. And I say no	16	hear the evidence of Mr Adrian Iles.
17	more. I really say no more. Enough is enough. And	17	MR ADRIAN ILES (sworn)
18	I think the victims are far tougher and stronger people	18	Examination by MS SCOLDING
19	than the archbishops and the bishops of	19	MS SCOLDING: Good morning, Mr Iles, and thank you very much
20	the Church of England, and, as a priest, I can tell	20	for returning to provide us with gratefully received
21	you and I say this as a priest I cannot see the	21	assistance about the technical area of the Clergy
22	face of Jesus in the Archbishops of Canterbury or York.	22	Discipline Measure.
23	I see hypocrites and I see Pharisees, the people who	23	Just a few preliminaries: this isn't a test of
24	Jesus stood up against.	24	memory, so please feel free to refer to any notes or
25	I'm sorry to be so direct. I'm a Yorkshireman. But	25	documents. Secondly, we can stop at any time and for
	Page 61		Page 62
	Tage 01		1 450 02
1	any reason. Just raise your hand or indicate to me that	1	you also sit as a part-time member of the civil
1 2	any reason. Just raise your hand or indicate to me that you wish to do so. Next, there are two bundles in front	1 2	you also sit as a part-time member of the civil judiciary as a deputy district judge, as I understand
	,	1	•
2	you wish to do so. Next, there are two bundles in front	2	judiciary as a deputy district judge, as I understand
2	you wish to do so. Next, there are two bundles in front of you which have the vast majority of the relevant	2 3	judiciary as a deputy district judge, as I understand it. You are also what's called the Chancellor of
2 3 4	you wish to do so. Next, there are two bundles in front of you which have the vast majority of the relevant documents I am going to take you to, but exhibits will	2 3 4	judiciary as a deputy district judge, as I understand it. You are also what's called the Chancellor of Durham, which means you are a judge of the consistory
2 3 4 5	you wish to do so. Next, there are two bundles in front of you which have the vast majority of the relevant documents I am going to take you to, but exhibits will also be got up on screen. If, like me, you find reading	2 3 4 5	judiciary as a deputy district judge, as I understand it. You are also what's called the Chancellor of Durham, which means you are a judge of the consistory court, which is a court that deals with church buildings
2 3 4 5 6	you wish to do so. Next, there are two bundles in front of you which have the vast majority of the relevant documents I am going to take you to, but exhibits will also be got up on screen. If, like me, you find reading things difficult unless it is in slightly larger font,	2 3 4 5 6	judiciary as a deputy district judge, as I understand it. You are also what's called the Chancellor of Durham, which means you are a judge of the consistory court, which is a court that deals with church buildings and matters around the fabric of the church and the
2 3 4 5 6 7	you wish to do so. Next, there are two bundles in front of you which have the vast majority of the relevant documents I am going to take you to, but exhibits will also be got up on screen. If, like me, you find reading things difficult unless it is in slightly larger font, please do indicate and we can blow the font up as large	2 3 4 5 6 7	judiciary as a deputy district judge, as I understand it. You are also what's called the Chancellor of Durham, which means you are a judge of the consistory court, which is a court that deals with church buildings and matters around the fabric of the church and the surrounding areas, as I understand it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	you wish to do so. Next, there are two bundles in front of you which have the vast majority of the relevant documents I am going to take you to, but exhibits will also be got up on screen. If, like me, you find reading things difficult unless it is in slightly larger font, please do indicate and we can blow the font up as large as you need it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	judiciary as a deputy district judge, as I understand it. You are also what's called the Chancellor of Durham, which means you are a judge of the consistory court, which is a court that deals with church buildings and matters around the fabric of the church and the surrounding areas, as I understand it.  A. Yes, and also churchyards and consecrated land generally.  Q. You are also this is the reason that we have asked
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	you wish to do so. Next, there are two bundles in front of you which have the vast majority of the relevant documents I am going to take you to, but exhibits will also be got up on screen. If, like me, you find reading things difficult unless it is in slightly larger font, please do indicate and we can blow the font up as large as you need it.  We have two witness statements from you, Mr Iles:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	judiciary as a deputy district judge, as I understand it. You are also what's called the Chancellor of Durham, which means you are a judge of the consistory court, which is a court that deals with church buildings and matters around the fabric of the church and the surrounding areas, as I understand it.  A. Yes, and also churchyards and consecrated land generally.  Q. You are also this is the reason that we have asked you to give evidence here today what is known under
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	you wish to do so. Next, there are two bundles in front of you which have the vast majority of the relevant documents I am going to take you to, but exhibits will also be got up on screen. If, like me, you find reading things difficult unless it is in slightly larger font, please do indicate and we can blow the font up as large as you need it.  We have two witness statements from you, Mr Iles: one dated 9 November 2017, which has already been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	judiciary as a deputy district judge, as I understand it. You are also what's called the Chancellor of Durham, which means you are a judge of the consistory court, which is a court that deals with church buildings and matters around the fabric of the church and the surrounding areas, as I understand it.  A. Yes, and also churchyards and consecrated land generally.  Q. You are also this is the reason that we have asked you to give evidence here today what is known under the Clergy Discipline Measure as the "designated"
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	you wish to do so. Next, there are two bundles in front of you which have the vast majority of the relevant documents I am going to take you to, but exhibits will also be got up on screen. If, like me, you find reading things difficult unless it is in slightly larger font, please do indicate and we can blow the font up as large as you need it.  We have two witness statements from you, Mr Iles: one dated 9 November 2017, which has already been published on this investigation's website; and one dated 1 May 2019 at ACE026967. Chair and panel, behind tab A1 of your bundle.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	judiciary as a deputy district judge, as I understand it. You are also what's called the Chancellor of Durham, which means you are a judge of the consistory court, which is a court that deals with church buildings and matters around the fabric of the church and the surrounding areas, as I understand it.  A. Yes, and also churchyards and consecrated land generally.  Q. You are also this is the reason that we have asked you to give evidence here today what is known under the Clergy Discipline Measure as the "designated officer". Could you just explain very briefly what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	you wish to do so. Next, there are two bundles in front of you which have the vast majority of the relevant documents I am going to take you to, but exhibits will also be got up on screen. If, like me, you find reading things difficult unless it is in slightly larger font, please do indicate and we can blow the font up as large as you need it.  We have two witness statements from you, Mr Iles: one dated 9 November 2017, which has already been published on this investigation's website; and one dated 1 May 2019 at ACE026967. Chair and panel, behind tab A1	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	judiciary as a deputy district judge, as I understand it. You are also what's called the Chancellor of Durham, which means you are a judge of the consistory court, which is a court that deals with church buildings and matters around the fabric of the church and the surrounding areas, as I understand it.  A. Yes, and also churchyards and consecrated land generally.  Q. You are also this is the reason that we have asked you to give evidence here today what is known under the Clergy Discipline Measure as the "designated officer". Could you just explain very briefly what being the designated officer means?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	you wish to do so. Next, there are two bundles in front of you which have the vast majority of the relevant documents I am going to take you to, but exhibits will also be got up on screen. If, like me, you find reading things difficult unless it is in slightly larger font, please do indicate and we can blow the font up as large as you need it.  We have two witness statements from you, Mr Iles: one dated 9 November 2017, which has already been published on this investigation's website; and one dated 1 May 2019 at ACE026967. Chair and panel, behind tab A1 of your bundle.  Now, I'm not going to I am going to assume that you signed both of those witness statements, your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	judiciary as a deputy district judge, as I understand it. You are also what's called the Chancellor of Durham, which means you are a judge of the consistory court, which is a court that deals with church buildings and matters around the fabric of the church and the surrounding areas, as I understand it.  A. Yes, and also churchyards and consecrated land generally.  Q. You are also this is the reason that we have asked you to give evidence here today what is known under the Clergy Discipline Measure as the "designated officer". Could you just explain very briefly what being the designated officer means?  A. I have two main roles. One is to investigate cases that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	you wish to do so. Next, there are two bundles in front of you which have the vast majority of the relevant documents I am going to take you to, but exhibits will also be got up on screen. If, like me, you find reading things difficult unless it is in slightly larger font, please do indicate and we can blow the font up as large as you need it.  We have two witness statements from you, Mr Iles: one dated 9 November 2017, which has already been published on this investigation's website; and one dated 1 May 2019 at ACE026967. Chair and panel, behind tab A1 of your bundle.  Now, I'm not going to I am going to assume that you signed both of those witness statements, your signature, however, being subject to a cover. Did you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	judiciary as a deputy district judge, as I understand it. You are also what's called the Chancellor of Durham, which means you are a judge of the consistory court, which is a court that deals with church buildings and matters around the fabric of the church and the surrounding areas, as I understand it.  A. Yes, and also churchyards and consecrated land generally.  Q. You are also this is the reason that we have asked you to give evidence here today what is known under the Clergy Discipline Measure as the "designated officer". Could you just explain very briefly what being the designated officer means?  A. I have two main roles. One is to investigate cases that are referred to me by bishops and prepare a report for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	you wish to do so. Next, there are two bundles in front of you which have the vast majority of the relevant documents I am going to take you to, but exhibits will also be got up on screen. If, like me, you find reading things difficult unless it is in slightly larger font, please do indicate and we can blow the font up as large as you need it.  We have two witness statements from you, Mr Iles: one dated 9 November 2017, which has already been published on this investigation's website; and one dated 1 May 2019 at ACE026967. Chair and panel, behind tab A1 of your bundle.  Now, I'm not going to I am going to assume that you signed both of those witness statements, your signature, however, being subject to a cover. Did you sign both of those witness statements?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	judiciary as a deputy district judge, as I understand it. You are also what's called the Chancellor of Durham, which means you are a judge of the consistory court, which is a court that deals with church buildings and matters around the fabric of the church and the surrounding areas, as I understand it.  A. Yes, and also churchyards and consecrated land generally.  Q. You are also this is the reason that we have asked you to give evidence here today what is known under the Clergy Discipline Measure as the "designated officer". Could you just explain very briefly what being the designated officer means?  A. I have two main roles. One is to investigate cases that are referred to me by bishops and prepare a report for the President of Tribunals. The President then decides
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	you wish to do so. Next, there are two bundles in front of you which have the vast majority of the relevant documents I am going to take you to, but exhibits will also be got up on screen. If, like me, you find reading things difficult unless it is in slightly larger font, please do indicate and we can blow the font up as large as you need it.  We have two witness statements from you, Mr Iles: one dated 9 November 2017, which has already been published on this investigation's website; and one dated 1 May 2019 at ACE026967. Chair and panel, behind tab A1 of your bundle.  Now, I'm not going to I am going to assume that you signed both of those witness statements, your signature, however, being subject to a cover. Did you sign both of those witness statements?  A. Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	judiciary as a deputy district judge, as I understand it. You are also what's called the Chancellor of Durham, which means you are a judge of the consistory court, which is a court that deals with church buildings and matters around the fabric of the church and the surrounding areas, as I understand it.  A. Yes, and also churchyards and consecrated land generally.  Q. You are also this is the reason that we have asked you to give evidence here today what is known under the Clergy Discipline Measure as the "designated officer". Could you just explain very briefly what being the designated officer means?  A. I have two main roles. One is to investigate cases that are referred to me by bishops and prepare a report for the President of Tribunals. The President then decides if the complaint should go to a tribunal. And the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	you wish to do so. Next, there are two bundles in front of you which have the vast majority of the relevant documents I am going to take you to, but exhibits will also be got up on screen. If, like me, you find reading things difficult unless it is in slightly larger font, please do indicate and we can blow the font up as large as you need it.  We have two witness statements from you, Mr Iles: one dated 9 November 2017, which has already been published on this investigation's website; and one dated 1 May 2019 at ACE026967. Chair and panel, behind tab A1 of your bundle.  Now, I'm not going to I am going to assume that you signed both of those witness statements, your signature, however, being subject to a cover. Did you sign both of those witness statements?  A. Yes.  Q. Have you had an opportunity to read them recently?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	judiciary as a deputy district judge, as I understand it. You are also what's called the Chancellor of Durham, which means you are a judge of the consistory court, which is a court that deals with church buildings and matters around the fabric of the church and the surrounding areas, as I understand it.  A. Yes, and also churchyards and consecrated land generally.  Q. You are also this is the reason that we have asked you to give evidence here today what is known under the Clergy Discipline Measure as the "designated officer". Could you just explain very briefly what being the designated officer means?  A. I have two main roles. One is to investigate cases that are referred to me by bishops and prepare a report for the President of Tribunals. The President then decides if the complaint should go to a tribunal. And the second role is, if it does go to a tribunal, I am the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	you wish to do so. Next, there are two bundles in front of you which have the vast majority of the relevant documents I am going to take you to, but exhibits will also be got up on screen. If, like me, you find reading things difficult unless it is in slightly larger font, please do indicate and we can blow the font up as large as you need it.  We have two witness statements from you, Mr Iles: one dated 9 November 2017, which has already been published on this investigation's website; and one dated 1 May 2019 at ACE026967. Chair and panel, behind tab A1 of your bundle.  Now, I'm not going to I am going to assume that you signed both of those witness statements, your signature, however, being subject to a cover. Did you sign both of those witness statements?  A. Yes.  Q. Have you had an opportunity to read them recently?  A. Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	judiciary as a deputy district judge, as I understand it. You are also what's called the Chancellor of Durham, which means you are a judge of the consistory court, which is a court that deals with church buildings and matters around the fabric of the church and the surrounding areas, as I understand it.  A. Yes, and also churchyards and consecrated land generally.  Q. You are also this is the reason that we have asked you to give evidence here today what is known under the Clergy Discipline Measure as the "designated officer". Could you just explain very briefly what being the designated officer means?  A. I have two main roles. One is to investigate cases that are referred to me by bishops and prepare a report for the President of Tribunals. The President then decides if the complaint should go to a tribunal. And the second role is, if it does go to a tribunal, I am the advocate who presents the complaint.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	you wish to do so. Next, there are two bundles in front of you which have the vast majority of the relevant documents I am going to take you to, but exhibits will also be got up on screen. If, like me, you find reading things difficult unless it is in slightly larger font, please do indicate and we can blow the font up as large as you need it.  We have two witness statements from you, Mr Iles: one dated 9 November 2017, which has already been published on this investigation's website; and one dated 1 May 2019 at ACE026967. Chair and panel, behind tab A1 of your bundle.  Now, I'm not going to I am going to assume that you signed both of those witness statements, your signature, however, being subject to a cover. Did you sign both of those witness statements?  A. Yes.  Q. Have you had an opportunity to read them recently?  A. Yes.  Q. Are the matters set out there true, to the best of your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	judiciary as a deputy district judge, as I understand it. You are also what's called the Chancellor of Durham, which means you are a judge of the consistory court, which is a court that deals with church buildings and matters around the fabric of the church and the surrounding areas, as I understand it.  A. Yes, and also churchyards and consecrated land generally.  Q. You are also this is the reason that we have asked you to give evidence here today what is known under the Clergy Discipline Measure as the "designated officer". Could you just explain very briefly what being the designated officer means?  A. I have two main roles. One is to investigate cases that are referred to me by bishops and prepare a report for the President of Tribunals. The President then decides if the complaint should go to a tribunal. And the second role is, if it does go to a tribunal, I am the advocate who presents the complaint.  Q. Can I ask, when we spoke to you in March 2018, we asked
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	you wish to do so. Next, there are two bundles in front of you which have the vast majority of the relevant documents I am going to take you to, but exhibits will also be got up on screen. If, like me, you find reading things difficult unless it is in slightly larger font, please do indicate and we can blow the font up as large as you need it.  We have two witness statements from you, Mr Iles: one dated 9 November 2017, which has already been published on this investigation's website; and one dated 1 May 2019 at ACE026967. Chair and panel, behind tab A1 of your bundle.  Now, I'm not going to I am going to assume that you signed both of those witness statements, your signature, however, being subject to a cover. Did you sign both of those witness statements?  A. Yes.  Q. Have you had an opportunity to read them recently?  A. Yes.  Q. Are the matters set out there true, to the best of your knowledge and belief?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	judiciary as a deputy district judge, as I understand it. You are also what's called the Chancellor of Durham, which means you are a judge of the consistory court, which is a court that deals with church buildings and matters around the fabric of the church and the surrounding areas, as I understand it.  A. Yes, and also churchyards and consecrated land generally.  Q. You are also this is the reason that we have asked you to give evidence here today what is known under the Clergy Discipline Measure as the "designated officer". Could you just explain very briefly what being the designated officer means?  A. I have two main roles. One is to investigate cases that are referred to me by bishops and prepare a report for the President of Tribunals. The President then decides if the complaint should go to a tribunal. And the second role is, if it does go to a tribunal, I am the advocate who presents the complaint.  Q. Can I ask, when we spoke to you in March 2018, we asked you some questions about your training, in particular in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	you wish to do so. Next, there are two bundles in front of you which have the vast majority of the relevant documents I am going to take you to, but exhibits will also be got up on screen. If, like me, you find reading things difficult unless it is in slightly larger font, please do indicate and we can blow the font up as large as you need it.  We have two witness statements from you, Mr Iles: one dated 9 November 2017, which has already been published on this investigation's website; and one dated 1 May 2019 at ACE026967. Chair and panel, behind tab A1 of your bundle.  Now, I'm not going to I am going to assume that you signed both of those witness statements, your signature, however, being subject to a cover. Did you sign both of those witness statements?  A. Yes.  Q. Have you had an opportunity to read them recently?  A. Yes.  Q. Are the matters set out there true, to the best of your knowledge and belief?  A. Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	judiciary as a deputy district judge, as I understand it. You are also what's called the Chancellor of Durham, which means you are a judge of the consistory court, which is a court that deals with church buildings and matters around the fabric of the church and the surrounding areas, as I understand it.  A. Yes, and also churchyards and consecrated land generally.  Q. You are also this is the reason that we have asked you to give evidence here today what is known under the Clergy Discipline Measure as the "designated officer". Could you just explain very briefly what being the designated officer means?  A. I have two main roles. One is to investigate cases that are referred to me by bishops and prepare a report for the President of Tribunals. The President then decides if the complaint should go to a tribunal. And the second role is, if it does go to a tribunal, I am the advocate who presents the complaint.  Q. Can I ask, when we spoke to you in March 2018, we asked you some questions about your training, in particular in dealing with and managing vulnerable witnesses, and you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	you wish to do so. Next, there are two bundles in front of you which have the vast majority of the relevant documents I am going to take you to, but exhibits will also be got up on screen. If, like me, you find reading things difficult unless it is in slightly larger font, please do indicate and we can blow the font up as large as you need it.  We have two witness statements from you, Mr Iles: one dated 9 November 2017, which has already been published on this investigation's website; and one dated 1 May 2019 at ACE026967. Chair and panel, behind tab A1 of your bundle.  Now, I'm not going to I am going to assume that you signed both of those witness statements, your signature, however, being subject to a cover. Did you sign both of those witness statements?  A. Yes.  Q. Have you had an opportunity to read them recently?  A. Yes.  Q. Are the matters set out there true, to the best of your knowledge and belief?  A. Yes.  Q. Mr Iles, just to identify, you are a barrister employed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	judiciary as a deputy district judge, as I understand it. You are also what's called the Chancellor of Durham, which means you are a judge of the consistory court, which is a court that deals with church buildings and matters around the fabric of the church and the surrounding areas, as I understand it.  A. Yes, and also churchyards and consecrated land generally.  Q. You are also this is the reason that we have asked you to give evidence here today what is known under the Clergy Discipline Measure as the "designated officer". Could you just explain very briefly what being the designated officer means?  A. I have two main roles. One is to investigate cases that are referred to me by bishops and prepare a report for the President of Tribunals. The President then decides if the complaint should go to a tribunal. And the second role is, if it does go to a tribunal, I am the advocate who presents the complaint.  Q. Can I ask, when we spoke to you in March 2018, we asked you some questions about your training, in particular in dealing with and managing vulnerable witnesses, and you identified at that time that you had had some training
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	you wish to do so. Next, there are two bundles in front of you which have the vast majority of the relevant documents I am going to take you to, but exhibits will also be got up on screen. If, like me, you find reading things difficult unless it is in slightly larger font, please do indicate and we can blow the font up as large as you need it.  We have two witness statements from you, Mr Iles: one dated 9 November 2017, which has already been published on this investigation's website; and one dated 1 May 2019 at ACE026967. Chair and panel, behind tab A1 of your bundle.  Now, I'm not going to I am going to assume that you signed both of those witness statements, your signature, however, being subject to a cover. Did you sign both of those witness statements?  A. Yes.  Q. Have you had an opportunity to read them recently?  A. Yes.  Q. Are the matters set out there true, to the best of your knowledge and belief?  A. Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	judiciary as a deputy district judge, as I understand it. You are also what's called the Chancellor of Durham, which means you are a judge of the consistory court, which is a court that deals with church buildings and matters around the fabric of the church and the surrounding areas, as I understand it.  A. Yes, and also churchyards and consecrated land generally.  Q. You are also this is the reason that we have asked you to give evidence here today what is known under the Clergy Discipline Measure as the "designated officer". Could you just explain very briefly what being the designated officer means?  A. I have two main roles. One is to investigate cases that are referred to me by bishops and prepare a report for the President of Tribunals. The President then decides if the complaint should go to a tribunal. And the second role is, if it does go to a tribunal, I am the advocate who presents the complaint.  Q. Can I ask, when we spoke to you in March 2018, we asked you some questions about your training, in particular in dealing with and managing vulnerable witnesses, and you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	you wish to do so. Next, there are two bundles in front of you which have the vast majority of the relevant documents I am going to take you to, but exhibits will also be got up on screen. If, like me, you find reading things difficult unless it is in slightly larger font, please do indicate and we can blow the font up as large as you need it.  We have two witness statements from you, Mr Iles: one dated 9 November 2017, which has already been published on this investigation's website; and one dated 1 May 2019 at ACE026967. Chair and panel, behind tab A1 of your bundle.  Now, I'm not going to I am going to assume that you signed both of those witness statements, your signature, however, being subject to a cover. Did you sign both of those witness statements?  A. Yes.  Q. Have you had an opportunity to read them recently?  A. Yes.  Q. Are the matters set out there true, to the best of your knowledge and belief?  A. Yes.  Q. Mr Iles, just to identify, you are a barrister employed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	judiciary as a deputy district judge, as I understand it. You are also what's called the Chancellor of Durham, which means you are a judge of the consistory court, which is a court that deals with church buildings and matters around the fabric of the church and the surrounding areas, as I understand it.  A. Yes, and also churchyards and consecrated land generally.  Q. You are also this is the reason that we have asked you to give evidence here today what is known under the Clergy Discipline Measure as the "designated officer". Could you just explain very briefly what being the designated officer means?  A. I have two main roles. One is to investigate cases that are referred to me by bishops and prepare a report for the President of Tribunals. The President then decides if the complaint should go to a tribunal. And the second role is, if it does go to a tribunal, I am the advocate who presents the complaint.  Q. Can I ask, when we spoke to you in March 2018, we asked you some questions about your training, in particular in dealing with and managing vulnerable witnesses, and you identified at that time that you had had some training

1 1 training in respect of your designated officer role. Is talk about changes that might be made to it, everybody outside this room understands what's going on. But I'm 2 2 that still the case? 3 3 not going to take you back through the processes. A. No, I'd had training in respect of witnesses generally 4 as designated officer. 4 So my understanding is that a complaint is made 5 Q. Right. Have you had any specific training in dealing 5 under the Clergy Discipline Measure to a diocesan 6 with or managing vulnerable witnesses or vulnerable 6 bishop. That's right, isn't it? 7 7 people, the sort of advocates -- the Council of A. A complaint against a priest or deacon, yes. 8 Advocates provides some training which some individuals 8 Q. That complaint has to be made in writing? 9 undertake? 9 10 A. No, I haven't, but through the JSB I had some training. 10 Q. And then the bishop looks at it, but then passes it to 11 Q. Do you have sight of, or an understanding of, the issues 11 someone called the diocesan registrar, who provides some 12 legal advice about whether or not it meets the criteria 12 to do with vulnerable witnesses and quality and 13 discrimination raised in the Equal Treatment Bench Book 13 to be a complaint. That's right, isn't it? 14 via your judicial role? 14 A. That's the preliminary stage, yes. There are two things 15 15 A. Yes. the registrar in particular will advise on: one, if the 16 16 complaint is of sufficient substance; and the other is Q. You very usefully provided us with a very detailed 17 explanation, both in writing and orally, about the way 17 if the complainant has a proper interest to make the 18 that the Clergy Discipline Measure used to operate and 18 complaint. 19 now operates. I'm not going to take you back through 19 Q. Can I ask you about sufficient substance and proper 20 that, but just for the purposes of anyone who wants to 20 interest in the context of safeguarding. So in respect 21 follow along, that would be found at ACE025283, 21 of complaints which are made, even if they are not about 22 paragraphs 41 to 84. You set out a very comprehensive 22 abuse having taken place by the cleric or deacon but an 23 23 issue about risk management, shall we say, for example, 24 24 I'm just briefly going to recap my understanding, in the context of safeguarding, would they be considered 25 the way that the process works, so when we then go on to 25 to be of sufficient substance? Roughly, what does that Page 65 Page 66 Q. What's meant by "proper interest"? In lawyers' terms, 1 mean, in layman's terms? 2 2 we may well call it "standing". But for individuals who A. I don't know what you mean by a complaint about risk 3 3 management. aren't lawyers outside this room, for lay people, what 4 Q. For example, if the complaint was not one saying, "This 4 does it mean for somebody to have a proper interest in 5 5 vicar had sexually abused a child", but was a vicar had something? 6 sexually abused a child, then told, for example, the A. I think standing is a fairly good summary of what it 6 7 archdeacon and the archdeacon didn't pass that 7 8 information on. So it would be a failure to have due 8 Q. So it's --9 regard to the House of Bishops safeguarding guidance? 9 A. What it's designed to prevent is people making 10 A. So you mean a complaint against the archdeacon --10 complaints where they have no interest at all in making 11 O. Yes? 11 it, but they are, in effect, busybodies. 12 A. -- for not passing on --12 Q. So in the sort of area of law I practise in other than 13 Q. Information. 13 when I'm in this inquiry, you would say whether somebody 14 14 was an interfering busybody, whether they were sort of 15 O. In those sorts of situations, would that be considered 15 meddling in business in which they had no business. something which was of sufficient substance? 16 16 But, other than that, anybody who might be tangentially 17 17 involved would have a sufficient interest? 18 Q. What, roughly -- is there any guidance about what 18 A. A proper interest is not defined anywhere, and that's on 19 sufficient substance is? 19 purpose, because we don't want to exclude people from 20 A. It's covered in the Code of Practice, but, really, it is 20 making complaints. 21 a matter of commonsense. The preliminary stage is 21 Q. So, say, for example, we were talking about the 22 simply to weed out cases which are clearly of no 22 archdeacon who failed to pass the information on to the 23 substance, and then the complaint will go forward. So 23 statutory services, say, for example, a parish priest 24 safeguarding-related matters will easily satisfy the 24 found out about this, this failure, would they have 25 test of sufficient substance. 25 sufficient interest? Page 68 Page 67

1	A. Yes.	1	that. It's blindingly obvious. If there is a complaint
2	Q. Would the person who made the disclosure have sufficient	2	of sufficient substance and the respondent denies it and
3	interest?	3	there's evidence before the bishop that the complaint
4	A. Yes.	4	needs to be considered, then it will be referred for
5	Q. Fine. Thank you. So, once that stage has been passed,	5	investigation. They are serious complaints.
6	the registrar writes a report saying, in effect, it	6	Q. Would there be a situation whereby the bishop and the
7	meets the threshold stage, I'm assuming, and then the	7	individual concerned in respect of safeguarding would
8	next step is the bishop then has to make a decision, I'm	8	horse trade with, for example, the cleric saying, "Don't
9	assuming, about whether the complaint goes further	9	refer it to the Clergy Discipline Tribunal. I will
10	forward to what's called the Clergy Discipline Tribunal?	10	resign", or "I'll agree" because there are
11	A. No, the bishop then invites the respondent to respond to	11	circumstances in which, if the cleric agrees, the bishop
12	the complaint.	12	can impose a penalty by consent, can't he?
13	Q. And then makes the decision whether or not it can be	13	A. There should be no horse trading. If a respondent
14	dealt with by the bishop or whether it needs to be dealt	14	admits a complaint in writing, then the bishop can
15	with by the tribunal. That's right, isn't it?	15	propose a penalty. If the respondent accepts it, the
16	A. The bishop has a number of options, and one of those is	16	penalty is imposed. If the respondent doesn't accept
17	to refer it to the designated officer for investigation.	17	it, then it's still referred to the designated officer.
18	Q. In respect of safeguarding, what would be the	18	Q. Have you ever known any examples of horse trading taking
19	bishop's I mean, obviously there is a Code of	19	place, though? I know you say it shouldn't happen, but
20	Practice. Does the Code of Practice provide any	20	there is a difference between "shouldn't" and "doesn't"?
21	particular guidance as to what should happen in the case	21	A. I wouldn't know about it. I mean, the advice that goes
22	of safeguarding complaints in terms of them being	22	out clearly from the Clergy Discipline Commission is
23	referred to the designated officer for further	23	that there should be no such horse trading.
24	investigation?	24	Q. So once it comes to you, you then undertake an
25	A. The Code of Practice doesn't really need to deal with	25	investigation, as I understand it?
	Page 69		Page 70
	1 age 07		1 age 70
1	A. I mean, I have no reason to believe that there is horse	1	A. And that's a specific provision under section 30 of
2	trading. I can't say either way there is or there	2	the measure. If there is a conviction for an offence
3	isn't, but I have no reason to believe that there is,	3	other than a purely summary offence, then the bishop can
4	and bishops are told there shouldn't be, and they should	4	remove from office and can prohibit, and there doesn't
5	only offer a penalty by consent once there is an	5	need to be a complaint even. The bishop can do it
6	admission in writing.	6	acting on the conviction.
7	Q. So similar to, for example, the administration of	7	Q. Of his own volition, so to speak? So it's almost like
8	a caution: it has to be clear what it is that's being	8	a sort of automatic penalty, sort of automatic barring
9	the discipline is being submitted, so to speak, the	9	almost?
10	person has to be clear about what the particular issue	10	A. Well, it's not automatic, because the bishop has to
11	is and what they're saying that they have done?	11	impose it. The bishop will consider the circumstances
12	A. Yes.	12	and impose a penalty, and before the bishop does that,
13	Q. So in circumstances where they don't agree to a penalty	13	the bishop will consult the President of Tribunals about
14	by consent and the issue is related to safeguarding, it	14	the suitable penalty.
15	then comes to you, as the designated officer, who then	15	Q. And the President of Tribunals now is
16	undertakes an investigation; is that right?	16	Lady Justice Asplin, but until recently, it was
17	A. Yes.	17	Lord Justice McFarlane, who is now the President of
18	Q. And you would meet with victims and survivors, I am	18	the Family Division?
19	Q. And you would meet with victims and survivors, I am assuming, of the alleged abuse at that stage and/or of	19	A. Yes.
19 20	Q. And you would meet with victims and survivors, I am assuming, of the alleged abuse at that stage and/or of the proven abuse if it's in the case of somebody who has	19 20	A. Yes.  Q. When you become involved in the investigatory stage, do
19 20 21	Q. And you would meet with victims and survivors, I am assuming, of the alleged abuse at that stage and/or of the proven abuse if it's in the case of somebody who has already been convicted?	19 20 21	<ul><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. When you become involved in the investigatory stage, do you interview all the various witnesses, both the</li></ul>
19 20 21 22	<ul><li>Q. And you would meet with victims and survivors, I am assuming, of the alleged abuse at that stage and/or of the proven abuse if it's in the case of somebody who has already been convicted?</li><li>A. If there is a conviction, then there is a nice, easy way</li></ul>	19 20 21 22	A. Yes.  Q. When you become involved in the investigatory stage, do
19 20 21	Q. And you would meet with victims and survivors, I am assuming, of the alleged abuse at that stage and/or of the proven abuse if it's in the case of somebody who has already been convicted?	19 20 21	<ul><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. When you become involved in the investigatory stage, do you interview all the various witnesses, both the</li></ul>

18 (Pages 69 to 72)

a penalty.

Q. But let's assume there isn't --

Page 71

24

25

24

25

the individuals who made the complaint that then led to

Page 72

a member of the clergy, for example, making a complaint

- on their behalf?

  A. I will see the i
- $2\,$   $\,$   $\,$  A. I will see the relevant people. Sometimes the person
- 3 who is the subject matter of the complaint isn't the
- 4 complainant, but I will see him or her. If it's the
- 5 archdeacon who is making the complaint on behalf of
- 6 the survivor, I might meet the archdeacon, I might not
- 7 need to. The archdeacon is often acting simply on the
- 8 evidence of the survivor. Also, I will meet the
- 9 respondent.
- Q. Can I just double-check: is the appeal to the discipline
- 11 tribunal in terms of, if it goes to a full trial, is
- 12 that something which is decided on the facts, what us
- lawyers would call a merits-based decision, or is it
- 14 a review of any previous decision that anyone's reached?
- 15 A. The president will look at the case and decide if
- 16 there's a case that the respondent needs to answer
- before the tribunal. So the president is not making
- 18 findings of fact, but is looking at the whole case and
- 19 deciding, yes, this needs to go to a tribunal.
- 20 Q. What would be the criteria that would make it go to
- 21 a tribunal, if there were facts in issue, I'm assuming?
- A. Yes, and then, if the facts were proved, showed there was misconduct.
- Q. In fact, is it misconduct or is it serious misconduct?
- 25 A. Misconduct.

2

10

18

- 1 Q. Right.
- 2 A. But the measure is designed for serious misconduct.
- Q. Yes. Not sort of, "I'm sorry, I don't like the hymns
- 4 that you're playing"?
- 5 A. Exactly, yes. The relevant provision under the measure
  - is conduct unbecoming or inappropriate. That's
- 7 generally the category that safeguarding cases will come
- 8 under.

6

14

17

22

1

7

9

- 9 Q. Then, if the matter goes to a tribunal, there are
- 10 findings adverse to the cleric or deacon, there are
- 11 a range of penalties which can be imposed, the most
- 12 severe of which is prohibition for life, as I understand
- it; is that correct?
  - A. Yes, coupled with removal from office, if they are still
- in office at the time.
- 16 Q. So it is prohibition for life and removal from office.
  - Can I just ask: in Wales, they have the power, in
- 18 effect, to laicize the individual, so they can depose
- 19 them from Holy Orders. You no longer have that under
- the Clerical Discipline Measure, although I believe it
- 21 still does exist under the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction
  - Measure, although I might be wrong about that?
- 23 A. No, you're right. That's in respect of doctrine, ritual

Page 74

- 24 and ceremonial --
- Q. Yes. Can I just ask, why was it -- I know that that

# Page 73

- right to depose from Holy Orders was abolished in 2003.
- Why did the church, at that time, feel that it was
- 3 appropriate to get rid of that ultimate penalty?
- 4 A. Well, it's before my time in the legal office, but my
- 5 understanding is that there was quite a lot of
- ${\it 6} \qquad {\it discussion, the ological \ discussion, about \ whether \ or \ not}$
- 7 Orders can be removed, and the view was taken that you
- 8 can't do it. Once a priest, always a priest. And
- 9 I suppose that the practical difference between
  - prohibition for life and deposition actually is none.
- 11 Prohibition for life is preventing a priest from
- 12 exercising any functions of the priest's Orders, and
- people say, "Well, they can still call themselves
- 14 Reverend". Well, anyone can call himself or herself
- 15 Reverend. You don't have to be a Church of England
- 16 priest to call yourself Reverend.
- 17 Q. Is it a criminal offence to go around calling yourself
  - a Reverend? In some other professions, for example, if
- 19 you go around calling yourself, for example, Doctor --
- 20 A. No, it is not. If you pretended to be a priest --
- 21 I think there is a famous case, isn't there, where
- 22 someone walked into a shop and pretended to be a priest

Page 75

- and obtained a pecuniary deception, but that's
- different. There's nothing to stop you from calling
   yourself Reverend.

- Q. But can you understand how, in particular, some victims
- 2 and survivors find it galling that an individual who has
- 3 so abused the office of Holy Orders is still entitled to
- 4 use the terminology, and whilst it is not of much
- 5 practical significance -- I completely recognise that --
- 6 it is symbolically quite important?
  - A. I do understand that, yes. But even if they were
- 8 deposed, they could still call themselves Reverend, as
  - can anyone.
- Q. Can I just ask, how many times a year, particularly
- since 2016 when the measure was amended to include
- 12 a number of safeguarding -- well, sort of beefed-up,
- 13 I suppose is the easiest way to say it, in respect of
- 14 various aspects of safeguarding, how many times a year
- do you investigate complaints concerning sexual abuse
- against children since the 2016 measure, either directly
- or indirectly, by way of the example I gave earlier, in
- 18 terms of failing to do something?
- 19 A. Well, there are cases before 2016. It is not just since
- 20 **2016.** All 2016 does is remove the limitation period.
- 21 But it wasn't a bar before that, and complaints --
- complainants could get permission from the President to
   make the complaint out of time.
- Q. Roughly how many times a year do you deal, as
   a designated officer, with these issues to do with child

1 1 sexual abuse? Is it quite rare? Is it very common? to deal with any of those cases yet? A. Nothing has been referred to me yet, no. 2 2 A. It's fairly rare. The cases that come to me will --3 well, they have all been brought after the child has 3 Q. Have you had to deal --4 become an adult. There was a tribunal last year which 4 A. I say nothing yet. One of the very early cases which 5 related to sexual abuse when the complainant was 16 and 5 did go to a tribunal was in terms of a priest who did 6 17 and the behaviour also started when she was 15. She not follow the diocesan safeguarding policy and ignored 6 7 7 made the complaint when she was in her early 20s, and advice given to him by the safeguarding adviser, and 8 that went to the tribunal, and the priest was removed a complaint was brought against him by the safeguarding 9 from office and prohibited for life. advisor, and that went to a tribunal and misconduct was 10 10 Q. Is that the most recent example, or is that something proved. So there was that one case, but that was in the 11 which happens fairly regularly? 11 early days of the measure. 12 12 Q. You mean in 2003/2004, at some point around that period? A. That's the most recent example that's been to 13 a tribunal. I mean, you see, because most cases of 13 A. It was probably about 2008/2009, I can't remember. 14 14 Q. Just out of interest, how many tribunal hearings are child sex abuse will be dealt with through the criminal 15 there a year? So about anything, not just safeguarding, 15 courts, and there's a conviction and the bishop will 16 deal with it. In this particular case, the police 16 so we can get an idea. 17 looked into it and there was a decision made not to 17 A. Well, this year, there will be at least four. Last 18 18 prosecute and so the complaint came through the CDM. year, I think there were about four. 19 Q. Can I just ask a couple of other things. Have you had 19 O. So there's --20 to deal, or has the tribunal yet had to deal, with any 20 A. The number is -- I think the number is increasing. 21 21 case where an individual has failed to have due regard Q. And have you had to deal with, as yet, any case about 22 22 to the House of Bishops' safeguarding guidance, where the failure to undergo training, because, for example, 23 there isn't a criminal conviction but there's the kind 23 now if you refuse to undergo training and there's no 24 24 of risk management failures in terms of processes that reasonable excuse, so to speak, you can be subject to 25 I identified earlier. Has the tribunal or yourself had 25 clerical discipline. Is that something which you are Page 77 Page 78 1 likely to see as the designated officer, or is that individuals involved in the process say; another which 2 something that's likely to be dealt with by the bishop 2 was a consultation by the House of Bishops of bishops 3 3 at the initial stage, in terms of penalty? and other senior individuals involved in respect of 4 4 safeguarding, including, I suspect, yourself, about the A. None has been referred to me so far. 5 Q. So one assumes, given that there have been, you know, 5 Clerical Discipline Measure and whether it worked and 6 tens of thousands of people trained, but there are also whether it didn't work. 6 7 tens of thousands of people awaiting training, that 7 Ralph, would you mind getting up ACE027659. Now, 8 there must be some examples of those cases. I think 8 this is a paper that was presented to the National 9 Graham Tilby, in his witness statement, says there's Safeguarding Steering Group about the reform of 10 something like 72 cases that were brought in respect of 10 the Clerical Discipline Measure. 11 CDM in respect of safeguarding issues. But that's the 11 Now, can you just explain why the strands of work --12 sort of thing that, therefore, if you're not seeing 12 and we can see them here at 1(c), there are three 13 them, the bishops are dealing with at their end, so to 13 strands of work that have been undertaken over the past 14 speak? It wouldn't necessarily be coming to you for 14 18 months, shall we say, about this. Why did the church 15 feel the need to examine these issues in the way that it further investigation? 15 16 A. If there are complaints about not doing the training, 16 17 then, yes, the bishop must be dealing with it, but 17 A. Because there were certain concerns expressed. 18 I would imagine it is a fairly open and cut case, 18 Q. Do you share those concerns, on a personal level -- not 19 because either the priest is undergoing training or the 19 as the designated officer, but as a ...? 20 priest isn't. So there are factual matters to be 20 A. I can understand there are concerns, but -- I mean, if 21 21 you're asking me for my view of the CDM, I do think it 22 Q. In respect of the process as it currently operates, 22 works well for serious cases. For the cases that 23 there have been sort of two papers which have been 23 concern this inquiry, I think the CDM, it has worked.

written: one by the National Safeguarding Team, who have

looked at what victims and survivors and various other

Page 79

24

25

24

25

I'm not saying it's perfect, and it can always be

Page 80

tweaked, and it was tweaked under the latest amendments,

3

5

6

8

14

25

1

8

9

- 1 and, again, it can be tweaked again. But it does work 2 for serious cases.
- 3 Q. When you mean serious cases, you mean cases where there
- 4 have been convictions? Because, arguably, you haven't
- 5 really tested it as against cases which involve what
- 6 I would call more general failures of safeguarding --
- 7 that's right, isn't it? On the basis of what you have
- 8 said, there haven't been any cases which have come to
- Q the tribunal yet?
- 10 A. I am talking about where there's been sexual abuse.
- 11 Q. Yes, where the sexual abuse has been proven by way of 12 a conviction, then the process you say works quite well?
- 13 A. Yes, and in terms of complaints that have been referred
- 14 to me that involve sexual abuse, again, I think the
- 15 measure does work. It can be made to work and it does
- 16 work. I refer to the case I did last year, which was
- 17 a particularly nasty one, and it went to the tribunal
- 18 and a finding was made.
- 19 Q. Can I identify, however, that Mr Matthew Ineson,
- 20 formally the Reverend Matthew Ineson, identified to us
- 21 in evidence this morning that he had brought a number of
- 22 complaints about a variety of diocesan bishops and other
- 23 senior members, and he sought to extend time
- 24 I believe -- I think he was 54 days overdue. So he was
- 25 approximately six weeks, by my estimation, overdue, and

- all those complaints were struck out as being outside
- 2 the limitation time. So from his perspective, he would
  - say it isn't working well. Is there anything you would
- 4 like to say about that?
  - A. I can't talk about his cases because they have not been
    - referred to me. I don't know about them. I have not
- 7 had any dealings with them. And I wouldn't presume to
  - comment on them.
- 9 Q. Now, can I ask something more broadly, which is, one of
- 10 the issues that was being raised that Meg Munn raised
- 11 with us yesterday in respect of limitation was that
- 12 there should be -- at the moment, the one-year extension
- 13 for bringing a complaint exists automatically in the
  - case of sexual abuse but not in the case of other forms
- 15 of abuse. Do you have any views, as the designated
- 16 officer, of whether or not the automatic extension in
- 17 respect of sexual abuse should be extended to anything
- 18 either to do with any form of abuse or to do with issues
- 19 around abuse?
- 20 A. I think the lawyer in me would immediately say, how do
- 21 vou define abuse?
- 22 Q. Well, I mean, the Children Act 1989 would be a starting
- 23 point, for example?
- 24 A. It's a starting point, but there are all sorts of
  - different forms of abuse, and abuse not just to

# Page 81

- 1 children, but to adults. So you'd have to have a pretty
  - robust and clear definition of "abuse" before you start
- extending the limitation period.
- 4

2

- 5
- 6 be made for permission to make a complaint out of time,
- 7 and where there is good reason, permission will be
- 8 given. You've mentioned Mr Ineson. I can't talk about
- his case because I don't know about it and I have not
- 10 been involved in it. But there is a system whereby
- 12 of time.
- 13
- 14 because the guidance to which due regard has to be given
- 15
- 16 there is already guidance produced by your National
- 17
- 18 colleagues in the legal office, which defines the
- 19
- 20 know it when you see it. Just as you said it is obvious
- 2.1
- 22
- 23 I might like to call the screening stage, the very low
- 24
- 25 obvious what's abuse when you see it?

- 3
  - Q. But your guide --
    - A. What you need to remember also is that applications can
- 11 permission can be granted for complaints to be made out
  - Q. Can I just press you slightly on the abuse point,

  - does identify, as far as I'm aware, what abuse is. So
- Safeguarding Team, I'm assuming in conjunction with your
- different forms of abuse. Some people might say, you
  - that there are cases which -- that all safeguarding
- cases pass through the sufficient interest test, what
- hurdle you have to get over, some might say it is

Page 83

A. The trouble is, if you start defining things, you can exclude what you don't intend to exclude.

Page 82

- 2 3 Q. Yes. So the law of unintended consequences?
- 4 A. Yes. And in terms of whether the limitation period
- 5 should be extended in other cases where it's something
- 6 that will be looked at, clearly. You asked me for my
- 7 view. I'm not a policy maker.
  - O. No, I know.
  - A. I'm an advisor. So it's not right for me to express my
- 10 views on terms of policy. That would be misleading.
- 11 Q. Okay. So can we go to the paper that's prepared by the
- 12 bishops about their experience of CDM. Ralph, 13 ACE027685, paragraph 9, page 6. Don't worry about that.
- 14 Can we see page 10, please, Ralph. Sorry, that's my
- 15 fault. In terms of the amount of time that bishops have
- 16 to spend on Clerical Discipline Measure matters, they
- 17 have indicated in their guidance that it varies between
- 18 nought to four days per month, depending upon whether or not there's a CDM complaint currently in play. Do they 19
- 20 ever complain to you when they're bringing the
- 2.1 complaint, or have you heard complaints that that takes
- 22 up too much of their time, and that they'd like it to
- 23 either take up less of their time or for that particular 24 issue to come off their plate and onto another plate --
- 25 for example, yours?

1 1 A. Until I read this, I didn't know what they were saying. a bit like judgments? 2 2 Four days a month seems quite a lot. A. I think, when they're appointed, they have a session 3 Q. Yes, it seems quite a lot for maybe one issue or one 3 with the provincial registrar in which they cover 4 Clerical Discipline Measure. 4 5 Then can we go, please, to paragraphs 27 and 28, 5 Q. Now, can I just double-check, the provincial registrar 6 6 is the legal advisor for either Canterbury or York, please, Ralph, at page 8: 7 "Some think the bishop's role is conflicted because 7 there are two of them? 8 she/he is both judge and jury." 8 A. There are two, yes. 9 Let's accept that the vast majority of complaints 9 Q. And they provide sort of general legal advice? 10 under CDM are going to be resolved with the diocesan 10 A. The relevant provincial registrar, as I understand it, 11 bishop. It is really going to be very few cases that 11 will have a meeting with a newly consecrated bishop and 12 12 you will see and even fewer cases that ultimately end up CDM is one of the areas that they will cover with the 13 going to a tribunal. They then say the bishop is an 13 bishop. 14 isolated role and that they have both pastoral and 14 I have done some seminars with bishops in which 15 15 disciplinary roles, and they found it quite difficult to we've looked solely at the CDM. 16 balance that. Can I ask a question: have you ever been 16 Q. Do you think your advice on the basis of what they say 17 asked -- you're obviously a lawyer, you're used to 17 there might have gone in one ear and out the other, so 18 exercising forensic functions, you're used to 18 to speak? 19 adjudicating, you do adjudicate in other 19 A. It's always been a concern with bishops that they have 20 jurisdictions -- to give the bishops any training or 20 a tension between the pastoral role and the disciplinary 2.1 21 provide them with any guidance about how they can make role. In many ways, the disciplinary role is all part 22 these sorts of decisions? 22 of the pastoral role. Inasmuch as they sit in the quasi 23 A. Yes. I have had some training days with bishops. 23 judicial role, they are advised that the pastoral aspect 24 24 Q. So they have all had, what, a day's training on sort of of their function should be done on their behalf by 25 reaching decisions, writing things which might look 25 others so that there is no conflict between the two Page 85 Page 86 1 roles. They are responsible for ensuring that there is to what's been said. Do you think that's an unfair 2 2 proper pastoral care given, and they have to ensure that characterisation of the length of time that such 3 3 that is done. Then they are free to carry out their proceedings can take if they proceed to the stage at 4 4 quasi judicial function under the CDM. Sometimes it which you become involved? 5 happens around the other way, that the bishop will 5 A. I'm not sure that refers to me. There is another 6 prefer the pastoral angle and will delegate to another reference to the DOFA in paragraph 86, where it is 6 7 bishop within the diocese, so a suffragan bishop or an 7 reference to other agencies, eg the police and DOFAs. 8 assistant bishop, to perform the decision making under 8 I don't think that's referring to me. I don't know who 9 it is referring to. 10 Q. You have no involvement, I'm assuming, other than 10 Q. It does say, "If the matter is referred to the DOFA, the 11 potentially providing off-the-record advice about those proceedings move slowly". I think it is only fair that 11 12 sorts of cases? 12 I give you an opportunity to say that that's not true, 13 A. I won't -- I don't get involved in advising bishops 13 or "That's not me"? 14 before they send cases to me in the individual case. 14 A. As I said, I've never heard my role described as DOFA --15 When I've done seminars, then we have touched on it as 15 designated officer for allegations. I don't recognise 16 a topic. 16 that. And the use again, in paragraph 86, "alongside 17 Q. Can I ask, at the last two sentences of paragraph 28, it 17 other agencies", clearly suggests it is not me. 18 says: 18 Q. Who do you think it might be, then? 19 "In safeguarding and other criminal cases, the 19 A. I don't know. 20 involvement of the designated officer for allegations 20 Q. Can I just identify --21 and the police can lead to inordinate and unexplained 21 A. Can I just say, if a complaint is referred to me and the 22 delays. If the matter is referred to the DOFA, the 22 bishop wants to know how it is progressing, then they 23 proceedings move slowly. 'Justice delayed is justice 23 get in touch and they're told. Sometimes it's the 24 denied'." 24 bishop's chaplain that will get in touch, either by 25 It is only fair I give you an opportunity to respond 25 email or telephone, and I tell them how things are

Page 87

1	going.	1	there are some sentencing guidelines, so to speak, which
2	Q. One of the issues that victims and survivors have raised	2	roughly identify so, for example, somebody who is
3	about complaints generally and about the management of	3	convicted of sexual abuse against a child should be
4	safeguarding overall is an issue about not being kept up	4	prohibited for life and removed from office; those sorts
5	to date. So one of those situations that, even if there	5	of things. Do you think it would be a good idea to have
6	is no news, they'd like to know. When things come to	6	a sort of list of penalties or maybe to expand that
7	you, do you update the complainants on a sort of monthly	7	guidance so it was a bit clearer that there was a sort
8	basis or something, even if it's just to say, "We are	8	of tariff rate, for example, a bit like there is in
9	currently investigating", in a similar way to the way	9	sentencing of, you know, "This is roughly what you will
10	the police do sometimes. They just say, "No news, but	10	get for this and this is roughly what you will get for
11	it is still carrying on", or is that something that	11	that", or do you think the current guidance is clear
12	doesn't happen routinely?	12	enough on that issue?
13	A. No, I don't have it diarised to do every month. I will	13	A. It was reviewed fairly recently, and it wasn't amended
14	tell them at the beginning and, when I meet them, I will	14	drastically.
15	explain the processes and how long I expect it to take.	15	Q. So this is something that's new to you, in terms of this
16	And then I inform them when the report is finished and	16	being a particular concern or complaint?
17	it's gone to the president and I tell them how long it	17	A. Yes.
18	will be, probably, before the report comes back the	18	Q. Then, at paragraph 35, it says:
19	answer comes back from the president. And they're	19	"The requirement to publish a penalty does not
20	always free when I see them, I say, "If you've got	20	encourage clergy to accept a penalty by consent and can
21	any queries, you can simply get in touch with me either	21	represent a further humiliation."
22	by email or phone". I will answer.	22	I mean, do you think that that's a fair assessment
23	Q. Can we go to paragraph 33, please, Ralph, which is on	23	of the necessity for there to be transparency? Some
24	page 8, and paragraph 35. Some thought there might be	24	people would say it's necessary that people know when
25	a lack of parity about penalties. I certainly have seen	25	people have been subject to discipline, for all sorts of
	Page 89		Page 90
	1 age 07	I	1 age 70
			0
1	very good reasons.	1	A. It is the bishop who suspends but there is a right of
1 2	very good reasons.  So do you agree with what the House of Bishops says	1 2	
	So do you agree with what the House of Bishops says in respect of paragraph 35 about the fact that		A. It is the bishop who suspends but there is a right of
2	So do you agree with what the House of Bishops says	2 3 4	A. It is the bishop who suspends but there is a right of appeal to the President.      Q. Do you agree with what's said there, that there has been disquiet expressed, shall we say, about the use of
2 3 4 5	So do you agree with what the House of Bishops says in respect of paragraph 35 about the fact that publication should maybe not take place?  A. Again, you're asking me, really, to be a policy maker.	2 3 4 5	A. It is the bishop who suspends but there is a right of appeal to the President.  Q. Do you agree with what's said there, that there has been disquiet expressed, shall we say, about the use of suspension, feeling that it isn't a neutral act but it's
2 3 4 5 6	So do you agree with what the House of Bishops says in respect of paragraph 35 about the fact that publication should maybe not take place?	2 3 4 5 6	A. It is the bishop who suspends but there is a right of appeal to the President.  Q. Do you agree with what's said there, that there has been disquiet expressed, shall we say, about the use of suspension, feeling that it isn't a neutral act but it's sort of, you know, presuming guilt
2 3 4 5 6 7	So do you agree with what the House of Bishops says in respect of paragraph 35 about the fact that publication should maybe not take place?  A. Again, you're asking me, really, to be a policy maker.  All I can say is that the policy is this, that for proceedings that the outcome of proceedings should be	2 3 4 5 6 7	A. It is the bishop who suspends but there is a right of appeal to the President.  Q. Do you agree with what's said there, that there has been disquiet expressed, shall we say, about the use of suspension, feeling that it isn't a neutral act but it's sort of, you know, presuming guilt  A. I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	So do you agree with what the House of Bishops says in respect of paragraph 35 about the fact that publication should maybe not take place?  A. Again, you're asking me, really, to be a policy maker.  All I can say is that the policy is this, that for proceedings that the outcome of proceedings should be transparent, and if misconduct is found either by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. It is the bishop who suspends but there is a right of appeal to the President.  Q. Do you agree with what's said there, that there has been disquiet expressed, shall we say, about the use of suspension, feeling that it isn't a neutral act but it's sort of, you know, presuming guilt  A. I  Q. — or do you think that's just because people don't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	So do you agree with what the House of Bishops says in respect of paragraph 35 about the fact that publication should maybe not take place?  A. Again, you're asking me, really, to be a policy maker.  All I can say is that the policy is this, that for proceedings that the outcome of proceedings should be transparent, and if misconduct is found either by a tribunal or a penalty imposed by the bishop, then it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. It is the bishop who suspends but there is a right of appeal to the President.  Q. Do you agree with what's said there, that there has been disquiet expressed, shall we say, about the use of suspension, feeling that it isn't a neutral act but it's sort of, you know, presuming guilt  A. I  Q or do you think that's just because people don't understand the process yet?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	So do you agree with what the House of Bishops says in respect of paragraph 35 about the fact that publication should maybe not take place?  A. Again, you're asking me, really, to be a policy maker.  All I can say is that the policy is this, that for proceedings that the outcome of proceedings should be transparent, and if misconduct is found either by a tribunal or a penalty imposed by the bishop, then it should be published. It is done in other professions,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. It is the bishop who suspends but there is a right of appeal to the President.  Q. Do you agree with what's said there, that there has been disquiet expressed, shall we say, about the use of suspension, feeling that it isn't a neutral act but it's sort of, you know, presuming guilt  A. I  Q or do you think that's just because people don't understand the process yet?  A. Well, I can understand from a respondent's point of view
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	So do you agree with what the House of Bishops says in respect of paragraph 35 about the fact that publication should maybe not take place?  A. Again, you're asking me, really, to be a policy maker.  All I can say is that the policy is this, that for proceedings that the outcome of proceedings should be transparent, and if misconduct is found either by a tribunal or a penalty imposed by the bishop, then it should be published. It is done in other professions, and the view that the Clergy Discipline Commission takes	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. It is the bishop who suspends but there is a right of appeal to the President.</li> <li>Q. Do you agree with what's said there, that there has been disquiet expressed, shall we say, about the use of suspension, feeling that it isn't a neutral act but it's sort of, you know, presuming guilt</li> <li>A. I</li> <li>Q or do you think that's just because people don't understand the process yet?</li> <li>A. Well, I can understand from a respondent's point of view that if he or she is suspended, it probably doesn't feel</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	So do you agree with what the House of Bishops says in respect of paragraph 35 about the fact that publication should maybe not take place?  A. Again, you're asking me, really, to be a policy maker. All I can say is that the policy is this, that for proceedings that the outcome of proceedings should be transparent, and if misconduct is found either by a tribunal or a penalty imposed by the bishop, then it should be published. It is done in other professions, and the view that the Clergy Discipline Commission takes is that clergy should be no exception to the general	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. It is the bishop who suspends but there is a right of appeal to the President.</li> <li>Q. Do you agree with what's said there, that there has been disquiet expressed, shall we say, about the use of suspension, feeling that it isn't a neutral act but it's sort of, you know, presuming guilt</li> <li>A. I</li> <li>Q or do you think that's just because people don't understand the process yet?</li> <li>A. Well, I can understand from a respondent's point of view that if he or she is suspended, it probably doesn't feel like a neutral act.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	So do you agree with what the House of Bishops says in respect of paragraph 35 about the fact that publication should maybe not take place?  A. Again, you're asking me, really, to be a policy maker.  All I can say is that the policy is this, that for proceedings that the outcome of proceedings should be transparent, and if misconduct is found either by a tribunal or a penalty imposed by the bishop, then it should be published. It is done in other professions, and the view that the Clergy Discipline Commission takes is that clergy should be no exception to the general rule.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. It is the bishop who suspends but there is a right of appeal to the President.</li> <li>Q. Do you agree with what's said there, that there has been disquiet expressed, shall we say, about the use of suspension, feeling that it isn't a neutral act but it's sort of, you know, presuming guilt</li> <li>A. I</li> <li>Q or do you think that's just because people don't understand the process yet?</li> <li>A. Well, I can understand from a respondent's point of view that if he or she is suspended, it probably doesn't feel like a neutral act.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	So do you agree with what the House of Bishops says in respect of paragraph 35 about the fact that publication should maybe not take place?  A. Again, you're asking me, really, to be a policy maker.  All I can say is that the policy is this, that for proceedings that the outcome of proceedings should be transparent, and if misconduct is found either by a tribunal or a penalty imposed by the bishop, then it should be published. It is done in other professions, and the view that the Clergy Discipline Commission takes is that clergy should be no exception to the general rule.  Q. Could I take you to page 14, please, paragraph 86	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. It is the bishop who suspends but there is a right of appeal to the President.</li> <li>Q. Do you agree with what's said there, that there has been disquiet expressed, shall we say, about the use of suspension, feeling that it isn't a neutral act but it's sort of, you know, presuming guilt</li> <li>A. I</li> <li>Q or do you think that's just because people don't understand the process yet?</li> <li>A. Well, I can understand from a respondent's point of view that if he or she is suspended, it probably doesn't feel like a neutral act.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. But it doesn't mean that any decision has been taken</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	So do you agree with what the House of Bishops says in respect of paragraph 35 about the fact that publication should maybe not take place?  A. Again, you're asking me, really, to be a policy maker.  All I can say is that the policy is this, that for proceedings that the outcome of proceedings should be transparent, and if misconduct is found either by a tribunal or a penalty imposed by the bishop, then it should be published. It is done in other professions, and the view that the Clergy Discipline Commission takes is that clergy should be no exception to the general rule.  Q. Could I take you to page 14, please, paragraph 86 onwards. This, again, is some concerns that the bishops	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. It is the bishop who suspends but there is a right of appeal to the President.</li> <li>Q. Do you agree with what's said there, that there has been disquiet expressed, shall we say, about the use of suspension, feeling that it isn't a neutral act but it's sort of, you know, presuming guilt</li> <li>A. I</li> <li>Q or do you think that's just because people don't understand the process yet?</li> <li>A. Well, I can understand from a respondent's point of view that if he or she is suspended, it probably doesn't feel like a neutral act.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. But it doesn't mean that any decision has been taken about whether or not misconduct has been proved. But</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	So do you agree with what the House of Bishops says in respect of paragraph 35 about the fact that publication should maybe not take place?  A. Again, you're asking me, really, to be a policy maker.  All I can say is that the policy is this, that for proceedings that the outcome of proceedings should be transparent, and if misconduct is found either by a tribunal or a penalty imposed by the bishop, then it should be published. It is done in other professions, and the view that the Clergy Discipline Commission takes is that clergy should be no exception to the general rule.  Q. Could I take you to page 14, please, paragraph 86 onwards. This, again, is some concerns that the bishops have:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. It is the bishop who suspends but there is a right of appeal to the President.</li> <li>Q. Do you agree with what's said there, that there has been disquiet expressed, shall we say, about the use of suspension, feeling that it isn't a neutral act but it's sort of, you know, presuming guilt</li> <li>A. I</li> <li>Q or do you think that's just because people don't understand the process yet?</li> <li>A. Well, I can understand from a respondent's point of view that if he or she is suspended, it probably doesn't feel like a neutral act.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. But it doesn't mean that any decision has been taken about whether or not misconduct has been proved. But I can see that the respondents may not see it like that,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	So do you agree with what the House of Bishops says in respect of paragraph 35 about the fact that publication should maybe not take place?  A. Again, you're asking me, really, to be a policy maker.  All I can say is that the policy is this, that for proceedings that the outcome of proceedings should be transparent, and if misconduct is found either by a tribunal or a penalty imposed by the bishop, then it should be published. It is done in other professions, and the view that the Clergy Discipline Commission takes is that clergy should be no exception to the general rule.  Q. Could I take you to page 14, please, paragraph 86 onwards. This, again, is some concerns that the bishops have:  "What procedures or aspects of the CDM do not work	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. It is the bishop who suspends but there is a right of appeal to the President.</li> <li>Q. Do you agree with what's said there, that there has been disquiet expressed, shall we say, about the use of suspension, feeling that it isn't a neutral act but it's sort of, you know, presuming guilt</li> <li>A. I</li> <li>Q or do you think that's just because people don't understand the process yet?</li> <li>A. Well, I can understand from a respondent's point of view that if he or she is suspended, it probably doesn't feel like a neutral act.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. But it doesn't mean that any decision has been taken about whether or not misconduct has been proved. But I can see that the respondents may not see it like that, but the fact is, a suspension is a holding matter until</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	So do you agree with what the House of Bishops says in respect of paragraph 35 about the fact that publication should maybe not take place?  A. Again, you're asking me, really, to be a policy maker.  All I can say is that the policy is this, that for proceedings that the outcome of proceedings should be transparent, and if misconduct is found either by a tribunal or a penalty imposed by the bishop, then it should be published. It is done in other professions, and the view that the Clergy Discipline Commission takes is that clergy should be no exception to the general rule.  Q. Could I take you to page 14, please, paragraph 86 onwards. This, again, is some concerns that the bishops have:  "What procedures or aspects of the CDM do not work well in the safeguarding context?"	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. It is the bishop who suspends but there is a right of appeal to the President.</li> <li>Q. Do you agree with what's said there, that there has been disquiet expressed, shall we say, about the use of suspension, feeling that it isn't a neutral act but it's sort of, you know, presuming guilt</li> <li>A. I</li> <li>Q or do you think that's just because people don't understand the process yet?</li> <li>A. Well, I can understand from a respondent's point of view that if he or she is suspended, it probably doesn't feel like a neutral act.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. But it doesn't mean that any decision has been taken about whether or not misconduct has been proved. But I can see that the respondents may not see it like that, but the fact is, a suspension is a holding matter until a complaint has been determined.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	So do you agree with what the House of Bishops says in respect of paragraph 35 about the fact that publication should maybe not take place?  A. Again, you're asking me, really, to be a policy maker.  All I can say is that the policy is this, that for proceedings that the outcome of proceedings should be transparent, and if misconduct is found either by a tribunal or a penalty imposed by the bishop, then it should be published. It is done in other professions, and the view that the Clergy Discipline Commission takes is that clergy should be no exception to the general rule.  Q. Could I take you to page 14, please, paragraph 86 onwards. This, again, is some concerns that the bishops have:  "What procedures or aspects of the CDM do not work well in the safeguarding context?"  "See the same question" I just wanted to ask	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. It is the bishop who suspends but there is a right of appeal to the President.</li> <li>Q. Do you agree with what's said there, that there has been disquiet expressed, shall we say, about the use of suspension, feeling that it isn't a neutral act but it's sort of, you know, presuming guilt</li> <li>A. I</li> <li>Q or do you think that's just because people don't understand the process yet?</li> <li>A. Well, I can understand from a respondent's point of view that if he or she is suspended, it probably doesn't feel like a neutral act.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. But it doesn't mean that any decision has been taken about whether or not misconduct has been proved. But I can see that the respondents may not see it like that, but the fact is, a suspension is a holding matter until a complaint has been determined.</li> <li>Q. Can I take you to paragraph 87. This is about risk</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	So do you agree with what the House of Bishops says in respect of paragraph 35 about the fact that publication should maybe not take place?  A. Again, you're asking me, really, to be a policy maker.  All I can say is that the policy is this, that for proceedings that the outcome of proceedings should be transparent, and if misconduct is found either by a tribunal or a penalty imposed by the bishop, then it should be published. It is done in other professions, and the view that the Clergy Discipline Commission takes is that clergy should be no exception to the general rule.  Q. Could I take you to page 14, please, paragraph 86 onwards. This, again, is some concerns that the bishops have:  "What procedures or aspects of the CDM do not work well in the safeguarding context?"  "See the same question" I just wanted to ask you really about suspension, that it is not seen as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. It is the bishop who suspends but there is a right of appeal to the President.</li> <li>Q. Do you agree with what's said there, that there has been disquiet expressed, shall we say, about the use of suspension, feeling that it isn't a neutral act but it's sort of, you know, presuming guilt</li> <li>A. I</li> <li>Q or do you think that's just because people don't understand the process yet?</li> <li>A. Well, I can understand from a respondent's point of view that if he or she is suspended, it probably doesn't feel like a neutral act.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. But it doesn't mean that any decision has been taken about whether or not misconduct has been proved. But I can see that the respondents may not see it like that, but the fact is, a suspension is a holding matter until a complaint has been determined.</li> <li>Q. Can I take you to paragraph 87. This is about risk assessments. So this is about where somebody has been</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	So do you agree with what the House of Bishops says in respect of paragraph 35 about the fact that publication should maybe not take place?  A. Again, you're asking me, really, to be a policy maker.  All I can say is that the policy is this, that for proceedings that the outcome of proceedings should be transparent, and if misconduct is found either by a tribunal or a penalty imposed by the bishop, then it should be published. It is done in other professions, and the view that the Clergy Discipline Commission takes is that clergy should be no exception to the general rule.  Q. Could I take you to page 14, please, paragraph 86 onwards. This, again, is some concerns that the bishops have:  "What procedures or aspects of the CDM do not work well in the safeguarding context?"  "See the same question" I just wanted to ask you really about suspension, that it is not seen as a neutral act. Plainly, the guidance identifies that it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. It is the bishop who suspends but there is a right of appeal to the President.</li> <li>Q. Do you agree with what's said there, that there has been disquiet expressed, shall we say, about the use of suspension, feeling that it isn't a neutral act but it's sort of, you know, presuming guilt</li> <li>A. I</li> <li>Q or do you think that's just because people don't understand the process yet?</li> <li>A. Well, I can understand from a respondent's point of view that if he or she is suspended, it probably doesn't feel like a neutral act.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. But it doesn't mean that any decision has been taken about whether or not misconduct has been proved. But I can see that the respondents may not see it like that, but the fact is, a suspension is a holding matter until a complaint has been determined.</li> <li>Q. Can I take you to paragraph 87. This is about risk assessments. So this is about where somebody has been tried and found not guilty. I am assuming does the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	So do you agree with what the House of Bishops says in respect of paragraph 35 about the fact that publication should maybe not take place?  A. Again, you're asking me, really, to be a policy maker.  All I can say is that the policy is this, that for proceedings that the outcome of proceedings should be transparent, and if misconduct is found either by a tribunal or a penalty imposed by the bishop, then it should be published. It is done in other professions, and the view that the Clergy Discipline Commission takes is that clergy should be no exception to the general rule.  Q. Could I take you to page 14, please, paragraph 86 onwards. This, again, is some concerns that the bishops have:  "What procedures or aspects of the CDM do not work well in the safeguarding context?"  "See the same question" I just wanted to ask you really about suspension, that it is not seen as a neutral act. Plainly, the guidance identifies that it is not a neutral act. Can I check to make sure: does	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. It is the bishop who suspends but there is a right of appeal to the President.</li> <li>Q. Do you agree with what's said there, that there has been disquiet expressed, shall we say, about the use of suspension, feeling that it isn't a neutral act but it's sort of, you know, presuming guilt</li> <li>A. I</li> <li>Q or do you think that's just because people don't understand the process yet?</li> <li>A. Well, I can understand from a respondent's point of view that if he or she is suspended, it probably doesn't feel like a neutral act.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. But it doesn't mean that any decision has been taken about whether or not misconduct has been proved. But I can see that the respondents may not see it like that, but the fact is, a suspension is a holding matter until a complaint has been determined.</li> <li>Q. Can I take you to paragraph 87. This is about risk assessments. So this is about where somebody has been tried and found not guilty. I am assuming does the tribunal have power to order a risk assessment and that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	So do you agree with what the House of Bishops says in respect of paragraph 35 about the fact that publication should maybe not take place?  A. Again, you're asking me, really, to be a policy maker.  All I can say is that the policy is this, that for proceedings that the outcome of proceedings should be transparent, and if misconduct is found either by a tribunal or a penalty imposed by the bishop, then it should be published. It is done in other professions, and the view that the Clergy Discipline Commission takes is that clergy should be no exception to the general rule.  Q. Could I take you to page 14, please, paragraph 86 onwards. This, again, is some concerns that the bishops have:  "What procedures or aspects of the CDM do not work well in the safeguarding context?"  "See the same question" I just wanted to ask you really about suspension, that it is not seen as a neutral act. Plainly, the guidance identifies that it is not a neutral act. Can I check to make sure: does suspension lie entirely within the gift of the bishop or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. It is the bishop who suspends but there is a right of appeal to the President.</li> <li>Q. Do you agree with what's said there, that there has been disquiet expressed, shall we say, about the use of suspension, feeling that it isn't a neutral act but it's sort of, you know, presuming guilt</li> <li>A. I</li> <li>Q or do you think that's just because people don't understand the process yet?</li> <li>A. Well, I can understand from a respondent's point of view that if he or she is suspended, it probably doesn't feel like a neutral act.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. But it doesn't mean that any decision has been taken about whether or not misconduct has been proved. But I can see that the respondents may not see it like that, but the fact is, a suspension is a holding matter until a complaint has been determined.</li> <li>Q. Can I take you to paragraph 87. This is about risk assessments. So this is about where somebody has been tried and found not guilty. I am assuming does the tribunal have power to order a risk assessment and that somebody isn't permitted to practice in office until</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	So do you agree with what the House of Bishops says in respect of paragraph 35 about the fact that publication should maybe not take place?  A. Again, you're asking me, really, to be a policy maker.  All I can say is that the policy is this, that for proceedings that the outcome of proceedings should be transparent, and if misconduct is found either by a tribunal or a penalty imposed by the bishop, then it should be published. It is done in other professions, and the view that the Clergy Discipline Commission takes is that clergy should be no exception to the general rule.  Q. Could I take you to page 14, please, paragraph 86 onwards. This, again, is some concerns that the bishops have:  "What procedures or aspects of the CDM do not work well in the safeguarding context?"  "See the same question" I just wanted to ask you really about suspension, that it is not seen as a neutral act. Plainly, the guidance identifies that it is not a neutral act. Can I check to make sure: does	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. It is the bishop who suspends but there is a right of appeal to the President.</li> <li>Q. Do you agree with what's said there, that there has been disquiet expressed, shall we say, about the use of suspension, feeling that it isn't a neutral act but it's sort of, you know, presuming guilt</li> <li>A. I</li> <li>Q or do you think that's just because people don't understand the process yet?</li> <li>A. Well, I can understand from a respondent's point of view that if he or she is suspended, it probably doesn't feel like a neutral act.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. But it doesn't mean that any decision has been taken about whether or not misconduct has been proved. But I can see that the respondents may not see it like that, but the fact is, a suspension is a holding matter until a complaint has been determined.</li> <li>Q. Can I take you to paragraph 87. This is about risk assessments. So this is about where somebody has been tried and found not guilty. I am assuming does the tribunal have power to order a risk assessment and that</li> </ul>

Page 91

1	A. It's the bishop who will direct that there's to be	1	the past. If misconduct is proved and it's relating to
2	a risk assessment.	2	safeguarding, then you don't need a risk assessment.
3	Q. But, I mean, does the tribunal have the power to	3	Q. Can I just clarify, a number of people have given
4	recommend that the bishop can then implement? Or is	4	evidence to us that they think that the Clerical
5	that not a penalty which is currently on offer?	5	Discipline Measure is not a suitable tool for risk
6	A. A risk assessment is not a penalty.	6	management. I'm assuming on the basis of the evidence
7	Q. Okay.	7	you've just given that you agree with that.
8	A. They're two entirely different things. The tribunal is	8	A. It's not meant to be anything to do with risk
9	concerned with whether or not there's been misconduct.	9	management. It's about, at the upper level, removing
10	If it finds there's been misconduct, it will make the	10	from office clergy who are not fit to hold office.
11	finding and impose a penalty as appropriate. If there	11	Q. Can we get up, if you wouldn't mind, ACE027659 at
12	hasn't been misconduct, that's it. The complaint is	12	paragraph 6, which is the report that went to the
13	dismissed. If the bishop, on reviewing the case as	13	National Safeguarding Steering Group prepared by,
14	a whole, decides that nonetheless there should be a risk	14	I suspect, the National Safeguarding Team, about the
15	assessment, then the bishop can direct that there shall	15	outcome of the CDM.
16	be a risk assessment.	16	Can I ask, this acts in defence of the CDM, as it is
17	Q. So this whole part of the concerns that the bishops have	17	currently drafted, on the basis that the previous system
18	explained is really a bit misplaced, because that's	18	was so defective as to be unworkable:
19	really nothing to do with the Clergy Discipline Measure.	19	"It routinely delivers appropriate disciplinary
20	That's what happens once the Clergy Discipline Measure	20	outcomes fairly, transparently and at modest cost, which
21	has gone away or once the penalty has been imposed?	21	is an important consideration."
22	A. Or it might be, where there has not been a complaint in	22	I'm assuming, by the way that's drafted, that the
23	the first place, the bishop can require a risk	23	cost issue is an important consideration. What do they
24	assessment. The risk assessment is forward looking and	24	mean? Dioceses don't have to pay for the costs of this.
25	misconduct is about whether or not it has happened in	25	I'm assuming this is all borne by the central the
	Page 93		Page 94
1	Church Commissioners, the National Church Institutions,	1	arrangements need improvement. Firstly, poor
2	pay for the running of the Clergy Discipline Measure?	2	communication, which I think, as far as you're
3	A. I think it's meant to refer to the comparison with the	3	concerned, at your end, is really about I think
4	previous Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction Measure, where it	4	that's aimed more at bishops than it is at anything
5	was very much more adversarial, a complainant against	5	else. But it identifies that there needs to be improved
6	a respondent. The complainant paid the costs, legal	6	communication. As a result of that discussion, are
7	costs and legal representation, of bringing the	7	there any moves afoot to change the way that you
8	complaint, and in the few cases that went to, then, the	8	communicate with those undergoing discipline?
9	consistory court, the costs were absolutely	9	A. Well, I imagine these are things that will be looked at
10	astronomical.	10	by the Working Group.
11	Q. As I understand, there may be only one or two cases that	11	Q. The absence of adequate pastoral support. Do you
12	ever went to that stage?	12	provide do you or your office provide any pastoral
13	A. Yes.	13	I don't personally mean providing pastoral support, but
14	Q. When you say the costs were absolutely astronomical,	14	do you offer pastoral support or is that all run through
15	would that be sort of hundreds of thousands of pounds?	15	the Diocesan Safeguarding Advisor and the diocesan
16	A. We are talking about	16	service?
17	Q. This is 20, 30 years ago?	17	A. We are a legal office. Pastoral support is entirely
18	A 20, 30 years ago. I can't remember the figures	18	a matter for the bishop.
19	now	19	Q. But you wouldn't be able to say I mean, would you, or
20	Q. But?	20	have you ever said to the bishop, "Look, this case is
21	A but there were thousands and thousands and thousands	21	very harrowing, very difficult". You identified the
22	of pounds, and even now a case would not cost that much,	22	case you did last year. "I really think you need to put
23	even allowing for inflation over a long period of time.	23 24	in place some pastoral support", or has that never been
24	Q. Thank you. Can I take you now to paragraph 7, which	25	necessary because it's always been there?  A. I have, on occasion, drawn it to the attention of
25	identified a number of areas in which the current	23	A. I have, on occasion, mayn it to the attention of
	Page 95		Page 96
	<u> </u>		~

1 1 the archdeacon that it would be a good idea to keep in asked about or is that anything which sounds sensible to 2 touch with the complainant from a pastoral angle, ves. 2 3 That's when the archdeacon's been the -- the complainant 3 A. I have not been asked about it, no. 4 and the survivor has been the main witness. 4 Q. Again, the issue of restoration of the ability to depose 5 Q. Yes. Can I identify "the need for more developed and 5 somebody from Holy Orders. So, can I understand, what 6 extensive guidance and training, in particular for new 6 engagement would you have, once the matter came to you, 7 bishops and archdeacons, than is provided at the 7 in respect of communication within support for 8 moment". Is that anything that you can comment on or do 8 survivors? 9 you think that the current guidance is adequate? 9 A. I would be in touch with the survivor, and I meet the 10 10 A. If I'm asked to do training, then I will do it. I have survivor and I explain what the process is. I always 11 been asked to do it in the past and I have laid it on. 11 ensure that the survivor has somebody with him or her of 12 Q. Now can I just go further down -- would you mind going 12 their own choosing. I don't see them on their own. And 13 on to the next page, please, Ralph. I have dealt with 13 they know that they can contact me whenever they want 14 the time limit. I have dealt with the issue of delay. 14 to. What was the rest of the question? 15 "CDM be amended". Can we go down to the bottom two, (i) 15 Q. No, it was simply, is there anything else you do in 16 16 terms of the provision of management of and (i), please: 17 "A suggestion has been made, which seems worthy of 17 the communication with a victim and survivor in cases 18 further consideration, that the CDM be amended so as to 18 involving sexual abuse? 19 allow bishops to impose a formal rebuke or other lesser 19 A. Right. Once it goes to a tribunal, then, again, I'm in 20 penalty without consent ..." 20 touch with the survivor because I need to put in the 21 21 Would that be ever involve issues to do with evidence and say that I worked with the survivor on 22 22 safeguarding, for example, failure to attend producing the relevant evidence. This is done in 23 23 safeguarding training might be one of the areas where written form and the survivor will give evidence before 24 one might think that you could impose a formal rebuke 24 the tribunal on the basis of the written evidence, in 25 without consent. Is that anything that you have been 25 effect, be cross-examined on it. Page 97 Page 98 1 Q. Can I just identify, in respect of written evidence, we 1 detail at that stage. 2 have talked a lot about things need to be in writing, 2 When I meet them, then they will tell me their 3 complaints need to be in a particular form. How 3 story, and a lot more detail will emerge. When it comes 4 4 legalistic is this process? I mean, because there's to producing a witness statement, then, using the 5 a difference between -- for example, I'm thinking about 5 material they have given me, I help them produce the 6 the small claims jurisdiction of the civil courts, 6 witness statement. 7 7 Q. The crux of the issue, as has been explained by other whereby you pretty much allow people just to write 8 a long letter saying, "This is what I think happened", 8 individuals before this tribunal, is whether or not 9 and put something at the end saying, "This is true, to diocesan bishops should be responsible for the first 10 the best of my knowledge and belief", and that would 10 stage, shall we say, of the process, or whether or not 11 it would be more sensibly delegated to somebody like you 11 stand. Whereas, if you tried do that in the middle of 12 the High Court, they would get very upset and say, "Why 12 to make all decisions about discipline, and, therefore, 13 13 the bishop's role was simply pastoral, somebody would haven't you done a proper witness statement?" 14 14 make a complaint, it would go to a commission or So what sort of level of formality is required? I'm 15 15 somebody which looked a bit like you and they could make just thinking that you may well have survivors who have 16 16 maybe quite poor levels of literacy, may not have the relevant screening processes. English as their first language, may find it difficult 17 17 Because, at the moment, certainly some individuals 18 here and individuals who have given evidence to us, have 18 to articulate in writing but could maybe articulate very 19 19 expressed the view that there is inconsistency and powerfully orally. Is there a dispensation so oral 20 a degree of arbitrariness in terms of the way that 20 complaints could be raised and/or matters could be 2.1 penalties are applied and in terms of the manner in 21 explained orally? 22 which safeguarding difficulties are dealt with, and that 22 A. The evidence that goes before the tribunal won't simply 23 23 be what was produced in the very beginning on the it would be better dealt with by a more independent 24 body. Do you have any views about that or is that 24 complaint form because often they don't go into very 25 a policy issue rather than a lawyer's issue? 25 much detail and they don't need to go into very much

Page 99

6

1	A.	That is a policy issue.
2	0	C I I I

- 2 Q. Can I ask you a couple of questions on the basis of your
- 3 witness statement. You identified a particular concern.
- 4 You said that there is a possibility that under
- 5 article 9 of the European Convention on Human Rights --
- 6 let's just remind everybody, that's the right to
- 7 practice one's own religion and beliefs -- that if
- 8 matters were removed from the bishops in terms of if
- 9 disciplinary matters were removed from the bishops, that
- may well cause some doctrinal and significant
- 11 faith-based difficulties.
- Now, I think when I asked somebody some questions
- about this last week, I think I, in fact, had
- 14 misinterpreted what you said. So you're not saying that
- there's any issue under article 9 if matters were to be
- moved from a diocesan bishop if they were to delegate
- their powers of discipline to you, for example, or to
- 18 a tribunal. There wouldn't be any issues under
- 19 article 9 then, would there?

24

2

- 20 A. They already can delegate -- as I indicated earlier,
- 21 they can delegate the decision-making stage to
- 22 a suffragan bishop or an assistant bishop. There are
- various stages of a complaint that are carried out by

others, but it's carried out in the name of the bishop.

25 If a complaint is referred to the tribunal, then it's

### Page 101

- 1 Q. Can I just double-check as well, Dr Bursell has raised
  - some issues -- raised some issues when he gave evidence
- 3 to us last week, and I think I know the answer to these,
- 4 but I would be most grateful for your clarification.
- 5 If a priest is accused of abuse and then resigns,
- 6 would the complaints process stop now?
- 7 A. There's no automatic termination of a complaint, no.
- ${\bf 8} \qquad \quad {\bf A \ complainant \ can \ continue \ with \ the \ complaint \ and \ it \ can}$
- 9 go to a tribunal and the tribunal can impose
- 10 a prohibition. There is no need to remove from office
- because there's been a resignation, but the tribunal can
- 12 impose a prohibition.
- 13 Q. If the complainant withdraws the complaint, what then
- happens? Does the matter disappear or can somebody else
- 15 take it over, so to speak?
- 16 A. It doesn't necessarily disappear. There can be another
- 17 complainant substituted. The bishop can substitute
- another complainant. And if it gets to the stage that
- 19 I'm involved, then the President can order that there be
- 20 a substituted complainant.
- $\label{eq:Q.Because I'm just thinking, particularly -- not so much} 21 \qquad Q. \ \ Because I'm just thinking, particularly -- not so much}$
- 22 in terms of -- but if clerical abuse were to take place,
- 23 for example, within the family, you may well have
- 24 a complainant who was a child or another family member
- 25 who might withdraw the complaint because of legitimate

## Page 103

- 1 the Bishop's Disciplinary Tribunal, and it's all done in
- 2 the name of the bishop, and the bishop is responsible
  - within the diocese for discipline.
- 4 Q. So what you're really saying --
- 5 A. That's in the prayer book, that's in Canon law, and you
  - can trace it back to 1549, Archbishop Cranmer's first
- 7 prayer book. It is not a new thing. It is doctrinal.
- 8 You can trace it back to the New Testament. The church
- 9 is responsible for its own discipline.
- 10 Q. So what you're saying is, there might be issues about
- 11 article 9 if discipline was removed entirely from the
- 12 church --
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. -- and a body outside the church were to impose
- 15 discipline against clerics?
- 16 A. Ye
- 17 Q. But not if the church, itself, decided to set up a body
- which had a degree of independence to exercise the
- 19 diocesan bishop's power of discipline on behalf of
- the bishops?
- 21 A. I understand that article 9 is a conditional right only.
- Q. It is a qualified right?
- 23 A. It is a qualified right. But, nonetheless, it is
- 24 a doctrinal matter that bishops are responsible for
- 25 discipline within their own diocese.

# Page 102

- 1 issues they had about the impact it was having upon
- their family life more widely. In those sorts of
- 3 circumstances, would there be a substitution of an
  - archdeacon or something of that nature who could then
- 5 pursue the complaint?

4

- 6 A. There could be, yes. The difficulty is, of course, if
- 7 the main witness won't cooperate, then the substituted
- 8 complainant will have a problem in trying to prove the
- 9 complaint, because the evidence simply won't be there if
- people won't cooperate with the substituted complainant.
- 11 Q. Hasn't an issue which has been looked at and I think
- largely dealt with in the criminal law, for example, in
- respect of domestic abuse, you can now bring complaints
- 14 even if the complainant withdraws their complaint using
- 15 the material and evidence which has already been
- 16 gathered?
- 17 A. But you still need that material if they have put it in.
  - Q. Yes.

18

- 19 A. The difficulty you have is that the person would not be
- 20 there before a tribunal to give evidence. You then only
- 21 have -- if you've got written material, you've only got
- 22 written material. You can't cross-examine written
- material. You can't question written material.
   Q. I'm just going to, I suspect, possibly challenge an
- 25 assumption, which is, why should somebody have to come

1 along and be subject to oral cross-examination? For 1 2 example, in lots of criminal prosecutions, particularly 2 Q. Most of them are either High Court judges or other 3 where complainants are vulnerable, there is now a whole 3 judges of significant experience? 4 process of having specialist advocates, for the judge 4 A. Circuit judges, most of them. 5 sort of saying, "You're only allowed to ask these sorts 5 Q. Circuit judges. Can I ask about pre-ordination 6 of questions; you can't really undertake allegations. Some concern was expressed in the context 6 7 7 cross-examination", there's a system for intermediaries. of Chichester about the fact that, at the moment, one 8 I'm just trying to think, in cases involving abusive 8 couldn't bring a Clergy Discipline Measure complaint Q behaviour, particularly sexual abuse but other forms of 9 about allegations which had taken place prior to 10 10 abuse as well, could there not be a system of, for someone's ordination. Do you agree with that, or do you 11 example, video recording evidence --11 think that conduct unbecoming could include conduct 12 A. There is. I have a tribunal coming up in October and in 12 unbecoming before a cleric took Holy Orders? 13 that, already, there have been directions given by the 13 A. If there's a conviction post ordination that relates to 14 tribunal chair about the questions that can be asked of 14 pre-ordination misconduct, then the bishop can impose 15 15 the witness. So all of that can be covered. It's all a penalty. If there's no conviction, then 16 part of case management and the tribunal chair can give 16 pre-ordination misconduct can't be the subject of 17 directions as appropriate to ensure that the evidence 17 a complaint. 18 that's needed can be given and is covered. 18 Clergy are subject to different standards once they 19 Q. That is not currently in the guidance, though, is it? 19 are ordained from what is the behaviour of lay people, 20 So that's something which happens but isn't necessarily 20 for instance. I mean, to give you an example, adultery. 21 flagged up or adverted to. Am I right in that or have 21 If adultery is committed post ordination, that is 22 I misread the guidance? 22 misconduct. But adultery committed before ordination, 23 A. No, that's probably right, yes. You need to remember 23 well, that's not misconduct, and it wouldn't be 24 24 that the tribunal chairs are all experienced and they appropriate to bring a complaint of adultery which took 25 will come across vulnerable witnesses in their secular 25 place before ordination. Page 105 Page 106 1 Q. But we are not talking about adultery, we're talking 1 about it would be something else, but at the moment, it 2 2 seems to -- you seem to be in a quite difficult position 3 3 A. No, but I'm giving you an example of that. That's why of not being able to look at them? 4 4 A. That's right, unless it's criminal and there's been there is what there is. 5 5 Q. I'm just thinking, in respect of abusive behaviours, in a conviction. 6 particular sexual abuse, on the basis that somebody has 6 MS SCOLDING: I don't think I have any further questions for 7 to be of good repute when they are ordained, and there 7 you, but if you would like to wait there. Chair and 8 are various Safer Recruitment checks, et cetera, 8 panel, do you have any questions? 9 et cetera, if matters were to come to light which 9 THE CHAIR: Ms Sharpling? 10 postdate ordination, but which relate to behaviour which 10 Questions by THE PANEL 11 could amount to criminal behaviour or would be 11 MS SHARPLING: Just one question, if I may, and it is to do 12 considered to be conduct unbecoming, would that not be 12 with conflicts of interest and how that operates within 13 something that you could consider bringing a complaint 13 the tribunal process. 14 about in respect of just simply not telling the truth or 14 When a case is referred to the registrar at the 15 not being absolutely frank, particularly as the whole 15 initial stages -- I think I'm right in saying that's the 16 discernment process seems to privilege frankness, truth 16 case -- and the registrar is in some way connected to 17 and, you know, confessing all, shall we say? 17 the person being complained about, would it, in normal 18 A. It's one of the things that's going to be looked at. 18 circumstances, be the case that the registrar would Q. Because I'm just thinking, for example, in the 19 recuse himself or herself from carrying on further with 19 20 profession that we are both members of, if there were to 20 the case? 21 be a conviction or if there were to be issues which 21 A. Yes. Somebody else would do the preliminary scrutiny 22 arose before somebody became a barrister but which 22 report instead of the registrar, yes. 23 related to their integrity generally, then that would be 23 MS SHARPLING: It is reliant on the registrar, as it would 24 something which that professional body could look at, 24 in most practice, of putting his or her hand up and 25 I'm assuming. I mean, whether or not it did anything 25 saying, "I know this person and I can't proceed". Page 107 Page 108

		1	
1	A. Yes.	1	if you are inside these professions, we all understand
2	MS SHARPLING: Thank you.	2	our professional obligations. But, of course, justice
3	A. Usually, there would be another diocesan registrar, so	3	has to be seen to be done, and there are sort of
4	the registrar of a different diocese would be asked to	4	apparent bias and apparent conflicts of interest: do you
5	do it.	5	think that that issue has really been looked at or
6	MS SHARPLING: I see. Thank you.	6	explored in terms of potential conflicts of interest?
7	THE CHAIR: Thank you. We have no further questions. Thank	7	A. I can understand that, but the registrar is an advisor.
8	you very much, Mr Iles.	8	The registrar doesn't make decisions. It is the bishop
9	MS SCOLDING: Sorry, Ms McNeill has just adverted to the	9	that makes decisions. And the preliminary scrutiny
10	fact that there is one question on my list which	10	stage, the report is sent to the respondent and the
11	I haven't asked you: are diocesan registrars ever truly	11	complainant, so they see what the registrar's advice is.
12	independent? Because they have been advising the	12	It's not done secretly. It's done quite openly.
13	diocesan bishop they advise the diocesan bishop in	13	MS SCOLDING: Thank you very much. Thank you very much,
14	all sorts of issues. So should they be the people who	14	Mr Iles. I'm so sorry, chair and panel, for omitting
15	advise in respect of discipline or do you think the	15	that question during the course of my questioning.
16	relationship is all a bit too cosy.	16	Chair, I don't know whether or not it would be
17	A. The diocesan registrar is the bishop's legal secretary,	17	suitable to rise for an early lunch break and, if so,
18	the advisor to the bishop. So necessarily it's not	18	whether or not you want still to return at 2.00 pm or
19	an independent solicitor who has no connection with the	19	whether or not you'd like to return earlier than that?
20	diocese. It is the bishop's legal secretary, who is the	20	THE CHAIR: We will take the lunch break and return at
21	diocesan registrar. Inevitably, they will have a close	21	1.45 pm.
22	relationship. But the registrar is a solicitor and	22	MS SCOLDING: Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr Iles.
23	under professional duties and will give the advice that	23	(The witness withdrew)
24	the registrar sees fit.	24	(12.43 pm)
25	Q. But you can understand how, from the outside I mean,	25	(The short adjournment)
	D 400		D 440
	Page 109		Page 110
1	(1.45 pm)	1	font size is most appropriate, given your ocular vision,
2	MS SCOLDING: Good afternoon, chair and panel. This	2	given your vision.
3	afternoon we will hear evidence from Archbishop Sentamu.	3	We have one witness statement from you,
4	Please would you administer the oath, usher?	4	Archbishop Sentamu. It is behind, chair and panel,
5	ARCHBISHOP JOHN SENTAMU (sworn)	5	tab A1 of the bundle. And for those with access to the
6	Examination by MS SCOLDING	6	system, it's ACE923700.
7	MS SCOLDING: Good afternoon. I understand I should call	7	If I can just identify, it is a 43-page witness
8	you Archbishop Sentamu; is that correct?	8	statement, Archbishop Sentamu.
9	A. Yes, counsel to the inquiry.	9	A. Yes.
10	Q. Thank you very much. First, a few preliminary things.	10	Q. It identifies in fact, your signature is covered
11	Firstly, this isn't a test of memory, so please feel	11	over, but did you sign this witness statement?
12	agree to refer to notes or to refresh your memory by way	12	A. Yes, I did.
13	of your witness statement or any other documents at any	13	Q. Are the facts, as set out in this witness statement,
14	time.	14	true, to the best of your knowledge and belief?
15	Secondly, we can have a break at any time you need	15	A. They are true, to the best of my knowledge, thank you.
16	it, and for any reason. Please just indicate that, and	16	Q. Have you had an opportunity to read this witness
17	that will take place. In any event, we are likely to	17	statement recently and refresh your memory?
18	have a break at around 3.00 pm for around 15 minutes for	18	A. Yes, about twice in the last few days.
19	the purposes of the transcribers.	19	Q. Thank you very much. Just a little bit, as far as your
20	Next, there are two paper bundles, which should be	20	background, both theological and otherwise, is
21	in front of you, which have some relevant documents that	21	concerned. I understand from your witness statement
22	we may well look at this afternoon. However, you will	22	that you were a former practising lawyer and judge in
23	also see there's a screen right next to you, and	23	Uganda, who then came to the United Kingdom as a result
24	therefore we will also pull up those documents on the	24	of Idi Amin coming to power and you were arrested and
25	screen and we can enlarge those documents to whichever	25	subject to abuse by the Idi Amin regime.
	D 111		D 110
	Page 111		Page 112

1 1 Q. Which consists of 12 dioceses? You then trained for ordination at Ridley Hall, 2 Cambridge, and you then undertook various priestly --2 A. Yes. 3 you were a priest in various parishes, mainly in 3 Q. Which are geographically the northern half of 4 South London. You then became an honorary Canon of 4 the country; is that correct? 5 Southwark Cathedral from 1993 to 1996. You became 5 A. Yes, from Isle of Man, plus the Scottish borders and 6 Bishop of Stepney from 1996 to 2002. And, importantly, 6 then down to Nottingham. 7 7 Q. What are your safeguarding roles and responsibilities as for these purposes, you were one of the members of the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry panel, and therefore you 8 Archbishop of York? 9 Q have maybe more insight than others into the way that an A. I sit as a co-chair of the Bishops' Council nationally, 10 10 inquiry works. and all the policies -- and oversee the work that is 11 You were then Bishop of Birmingham from 2002 to 2005 11 done by the National Safeguarding Team. I'm a member of 12 and you were then installed, as I understand is the 12 the House of Bishops and, therefore, when bishops 13 correct terminology, as Archbishop of York, a post you 13 produce their practice guidance and information, I am 14 have held since 2005. 14 part of that body that actually is responsible for the 15 You are the Bishop of the Diocese of York, but you 15 policies on safeguarding. 16 are also a Primate of England. What does that mean, 16 Q. How about in your role -- because you are not only an 17 please, Archbishop Sentamu? 17 archbishop, but you are also a diocesan bishop. In your 18 18 role as diocesan bishop, what role do you have in A. "Primate" means the first among equals, but I'm also 19 a Metropolitan, which means I've got real authority in 19 respect of safeguarding? 20 terms of the consecration of bishops, the discipline of 20 A. My role is to ensure that resources are made available 21 bishops and you end up also being a Member of the House 21 for our safeguarding group, the two bodies that actually 22 22 of Lords and a Privy Councillor. do safeguarding. The first is the operational body, 23 Q. So you are the Metropolitan, as I understand it, of 23 where there is a committee chaired by the Archdeacon of the Province of York? 24 East Riding, and where that particular operational body 24 25 25 tries to support our two safeguarding experts, and then A. Yes. Page 113 Page 114 1 there is the strategic board chaired by an independent is your Diocesan Safeguarding Advisor. I am going to 2 chair and whose role is to ensure that the policies are 2 come on to ask about your role -- the role of 3 3 being implemented and, if the Director of Safeguarding the Provincial Safeguarding Advisor. She isn't a member 4 4 of your senior staff with your diocesan bishop mitre on, in the end is either not being listened to -- you know, 5 5 that's the first point of appeal, because it's got an so to speak 6 independent chair to ensure that our policies are being 6 So what happens in respect of safeguarding? If you 7 embedded in -- throughout all the diocese. 7 ever become involved in any individual safeguarding 8 O. As far as the role within the diocese is concerned, it 8 decisions or anything like that, who makes the decision? 9 sounds, therefore, that because of the various roles you 9 Is it you or her? 10 undertake, sort of the day-to-day responsibility as 10 A. Oh, she's the advisor. She takes the decision. It 11 a diocesan bishop is run via the diocesan group that you 11 would be a strange person -- you appoint somebody who is 12 have constructed, and you would only become involved, 12 a professional and they are good in their job and then 13 I'm assuming, if matters needed to be escalated to your 13 you take it away from them? I can't see that happening. 14 14 level? So actually that's why she's not a member of my 15 15 A. Yes. leadership team, because around my leadership team 16 Q. Is that right? 16 table, we talk about all kinds of different things, and 17 A. Yes, the day-to-day reporting by the Diocesan 17 actually we could compromise her professionalism and her 18 18 Safeguarding Advisor is to the separate general -independence if she was part of our team, because, in 19 rather, the Diocesan Secretary and Chief Executive. But 19 the long run, she has got to go to it, as it were, 20 the body, because it includes an archdeacon and 20 fresh, without all kinds of different ideas bubbling in 21 a bishop, they ensure that whatever that -- whatever is 21 the back of her head. And I think that's why she isn't 22 22 required is being supplied, and I think we are very a member of the leadership team. 23 fortunate that Julie O'Hara has joined us, a real, real 23 Q. Does it make any difference, in terms of how seriously 24 professional, and we are in a very different place. 24 she's taken and whether or not her advice is followed, 25 Q. Can I just identify, in terms of -- obviously Ms O'Hara 25 the fact that she isn't a member of your senior Page 115 Page 116

1	leadership team?	1	see the independent chair and they would do the
2	A. I have not, since she arrived, heard of anyone	2	investigation and find out, and 99 per cent I think the
3	disregarding her advice, except in one particular case,	3	decision will be to uphold what the Safeguarding Advisor
4	which is Y3, this is a clergy person, where there was	4	had given. But I have not been in a position to just
5	this him wanting to be a bit awkward, but I'm afraid	5	I have never disagreed in terms of what her advice is.
6	he had to be pulled in. That's not acceptable.	6	Q. Right, okay, but you would view the role of
7	Q. As far as you're aware, you have also talked about the	7	the independent chair of the Diocesan Safeguarding
8	fact that there is what I think we have known in other	8	Advisory Panel as being the person to whom the Diocesan
9	dioceses been called the Diocesan Safeguarding Advisory	9	Safeguarding Advisor would go?
10	Panel, which you say is chaired by an independent	10	A. Yes.
11	person. You have also identified that they are a sort	11	Q. And they would then but, I mean, they have no power
12	of mechanism for scrutiny, so to speak. What is their	12	over you, though, do they? I mean, neither Ms O'Hara
13	role and how far would they become involved if there was	13	nor the independent chair of the Diocesan Safeguarding
14	a dispute between yourself or another member of	14	Advisory Panel has any directive powers against you.
15	the senior leadership team, who were clerics, and the	15	They have influence, but not power?
16	Diocesan Safeguarding Advisor about safeguarding issues?	16	A. I mean, I wouldn't say that Professor Sue Proctor hasn't
17	A. Well, if, to take an example, you know, Julie comes and	17	actually got power, because she is the professional.
18	advises me, "Vicar X, this is what should happen with	18	And because she is the professional I'm an amateur at
19	this particular thing, because our core group have met	19	this, so I have got to really take seriously what I am
20	and we have made a recommendation". For example, they	20	being told. And because there's a core group, which is
21	made a recommendation that somebody who was in training,	21	not just herself, she's got a core group around her, and
22	about to be ordained, that they hold the view the person	22	they work very collaboratively, and their advice, as far
23	should not be ordained [a certain date]. That was their	23	as I'm concerned today, is always very sound. So the
24	advice. And I had to accept the advice.	24	power actually lies in their ability, because of their
25	Supposing I disagreed. She had the right to go and	25	professionalism, and the way the advice is given, you
	Page 117		Page 118
	-		
	1 41.1.4	,	and a second
1	know, this is it.	1	safeguarding, because we have all had to work together
2	Q. As far as you're concerned in respect of a core group,	2	collaboratively, over the witness statements, to check
3	Q. As far as you're concerned in respect of a core group, do you find I mean, that is something which has only	2 3	collaboratively, over the witness statements, to check our record and actually it has had a most positive
2 3 4	Q. As far as you're concerned in respect of a core group, do you find I mean, that is something which has only been in place over the past three or four years. Has	2 3 4	collaboratively, over the witness statements, to check our record and actually it has had a most positive effect, that the Diocesan Safeguarding Advisor doesn't
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>Q. As far as you're concerned in respect of a core group,</li> <li>do you find I mean, that is something which has only</li> <li>been in place over the past three or four years. Has</li> <li>that led, do you think, to an improvement in</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	collaboratively, over the witness statements, to check our record and actually it has had a most positive effect, that the Diocesan Safeguarding Advisor doesn't feel alone, because this has been a joint so you have
2 3 4 5 6	Q. As far as you're concerned in respect of a core group, do you find I mean, that is something which has only been in place over the past three or four years. Has that led, do you think, to an improvement in safeguarding decision making in the context of	2 3 4 5 6	collaboratively, over the witness statements, to check our record and actually it has had a most positive effect, that the Diocesan Safeguarding Advisor doesn't feel alone, because this has been a joint so you have given us an opportunity to be partners in the diocese
2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. As far as you're concerned in respect of a core group, do you find I mean, that is something which has only been in place over the past three or four years. Has that led, do you think, to an improvement in safeguarding decision making in the context of the diocese?	2 3 4 5 6 7	collaboratively, over the witness statements, to check our record and actually it has had a most positive effect, that the Diocesan Safeguarding Advisor doesn't feel alone, because this has been a joint so you have given us an opportunity to be partners in the diocese about safeguarding, which I think is really it's been
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. As far as you're concerned in respect of a core group, do you find I mean, that is something which has only been in place over the past three or four years. Has that led, do you think, to an improvement in safeguarding decision making in the context of the diocese?</li> <li>A. Without it, I think we would still be struggling.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	collaboratively, over the witness statements, to check our record and actually it has had a most positive effect, that the Diocesan Safeguarding Advisor doesn't feel alone, because this has been a joint so you have given us an opportunity to be partners in the diocese about safeguarding, which I think is really it's been hard work, but it's been good news.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. As far as you're concerned in respect of a core group, do you find I mean, that is something which has only been in place over the past three or four years. Has that led, do you think, to an improvement in safeguarding decision making in the context of the diocese?</li> <li>A. Without it, I think we would still be struggling.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	collaboratively, over the witness statements, to check our record and actually it has had a most positive effect, that the Diocesan Safeguarding Advisor doesn't feel alone, because this has been a joint so you have given us an opportunity to be partners in the diocese about safeguarding, which I think is really it's been hard work, but it's been good news.  Q. Were you not partners before that? It is very rare that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. As far as you're concerned in respect of a core group, do you find I mean, that is something which has only been in place over the past three or four years. Has that led, do you think, to an improvement in safeguarding decision making in the context of the diocese?</li> <li>A. Without it, I think we would still be struggling.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. You know, there is a bit of a delay when the core group</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	collaboratively, over the witness statements, to check our record and actually it has had a most positive effect, that the Diocesan Safeguarding Advisor doesn't feel alone, because this has been a joint so you have given us an opportunity to be partners in the diocese about safeguarding, which I think is really it's been hard work, but it's been good news.  Q. Were you not partners before that? It is very rare that anybody says thank you to us for investigating them,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. As far as you're concerned in respect of a core group, do you find — I mean, that is something which has only been in place over the past three or four years. Has that led, do you think, to an improvement in safeguarding decision making in the context of the diocese?</li> <li>A. Without it, I think we would still be struggling.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. You know, there is a bit of a delay when the core group wants to involve the police, and in some cases I've been</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	collaboratively, over the witness statements, to check our record and actually it has had a most positive effect, that the Diocesan Safeguarding Advisor doesn't feel alone, because this has been a joint so you have given us an opportunity to be partners in the diocese about safeguarding, which I think is really it's been hard work, but it's been good news.  Q. Were you not partners before that? It is very rare that anybody says thank you to us for investigating them, but?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. As far as you're concerned in respect of a core group, do you find I mean, that is something which has only been in place over the past three or four years. Has that led, do you think, to an improvement in safeguarding decision making in the context of the diocese?</li> <li>A. Without it, I think we would still be struggling.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. You know, there is a bit of a delay when the core group wants to involve the police, and in some cases I've been a bit again, in one of those cases that you chose,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	collaboratively, over the witness statements, to check our record and actually it has had a most positive effect, that the Diocesan Safeguarding Advisor doesn't feel alone, because this has been a joint so you have given us an opportunity to be partners in the diocese about safeguarding, which I think is really it's been hard work, but it's been good news.  Q. Were you not partners before that? It is very rare that anybody says thank you to us for investigating them, but?  A. Well, you have made it you brought a possibility for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. As far as you're concerned in respect of a core group, do you find I mean, that is something which has only been in place over the past three or four years. Has that led, do you think, to an improvement in safeguarding decision making in the context of the diocese?</li> <li>A. Without it, I think we would still be struggling.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. You know, there is a bit of a delay when the core group wants to involve the police, and in some cases I've been a bit again, in one of those cases that you chose, where there was a real delay by the police's</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	collaboratively, over the witness statements, to check our record and actually it has had a most positive effect, that the Diocesan Safeguarding Advisor doesn't feel alone, because this has been a joint so you have given us an opportunity to be partners in the diocese about safeguarding, which I think is really it's been hard work, but it's been good news.  Q. Were you not partners before that? It is very rare that anybody says thank you to us for investigating them, but?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. As far as you're concerned in respect of a core group, do you find I mean, that is something which has only been in place over the past three or four years. Has that led, do you think, to an improvement in safeguarding decision making in the context of the diocese?</li> <li>A. Without it, I think we would still be struggling.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. You know, there is a bit of a delay when the core group wants to involve the police, and in some cases I've been a bit again, in one of those cases that you chose,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	collaboratively, over the witness statements, to check our record and actually it has had a most positive effect, that the Diocesan Safeguarding Advisor doesn't feel alone, because this has been a joint so you have given us an opportunity to be partners in the diocese about safeguarding, which I think is really it's been hard work, but it's been good news.  Q. Were you not partners before that? It is very rare that anybody says thank you to us for investigating them, but?  A. Well, you have made it you brought a possibility for us. People could assume that because they are part of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. As far as you're concerned in respect of a core group, do you find I mean, that is something which has only been in place over the past three or four years. Has that led, do you think, to an improvement in safeguarding decision making in the context of the diocese?</li> <li>A. Without it, I think we would still be struggling.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. You know, there is a bit of a delay when the core group wants to involve the police, and in some cases I've been a bit again, in one of those cases that you chose, where there was a real delay by the police's investigation, by the same police force, and then, in</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	collaboratively, over the witness statements, to check our record and actually it has had a most positive effect, that the Diocesan Safeguarding Advisor doesn't feel alone, because this has been a joint so you have given us an opportunity to be partners in the diocese about safeguarding, which I think is really it's been hard work, but it's been good news.  Q. Were you not partners before that? It is very rare that anybody says thank you to us for investigating them, but?  A. Well, you have made it you brought a possibility for us. People could assume that because they are part of the same committee, part of the same group, that they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. As far as you're concerned in respect of a core group, do you find — I mean, that is something which has only been in place over the past three or four years. Has that led, do you think, to an improvement in safeguarding decision making in the context of the diocese?</li> <li>A. Without it, I think we would still be struggling.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. You know, there is a bit of a delay when the core group wants to involve the police, and in some cases I've been a bit — again, in one of those cases that you chose, where there was a real delay by the police's investigation, by the same police force, and then, in another case, they acted pretty promptly in gathering</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	collaboratively, over the witness statements, to check our record and actually it has had a most positive effect, that the Diocesan Safeguarding Advisor doesn't feel alone, because this has been a joint so you have given us an opportunity to be partners in the diocese about safeguarding, which I think is really it's been hard work, but it's been good news.  Q. Were you not partners before that? It is very rare that anybody says thank you to us for investigating them, but?  A. Well, you have made it you brought a possibility for us. People could assume that because they are part of the same committee, part of the same group, that they are all sharing the same information, when actually they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. As far as you're concerned in respect of a core group, do you find I mean, that is something which has only been in place over the past three or four years. Has that led, do you think, to an improvement in safeguarding decision making in the context of the diocese?</li> <li>A. Without it, I think we would still be struggling.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. You know, there is a bit of a delay when the core group wants to involve the police, and in some cases I've been a bit again, in one of those cases that you chose, where there was a real delay by the police's investigation, by the same police force, and then, in another case, they acted pretty promptly in gathering the evidence. So I actually think that without the core</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	collaboratively, over the witness statements, to check our record and actually it has had a most positive effect, that the Diocesan Safeguarding Advisor doesn't feel alone, because this has been a joint so you have given us an opportunity to be partners in the diocese about safeguarding, which I think is really it's been hard work, but it's been good news.  Q. Were you not partners before that? It is very rare that anybody says thank you to us for investigating them, but?  A. Well, you have made it you brought a possibility for us. People could assume that because they are part of the same committee, part of the same group, that they are all sharing the same information, when actually they may not be. What you have done, particularly with those
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. As far as you're concerned in respect of a core group, do you find — I mean, that is something which has only been in place over the past three or four years. Has that led, do you think, to an improvement in safeguarding decision making in the context of the diocese?</li> <li>A. Without it, I think we would still be struggling.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. You know, there is a bit of a delay when the core group wants to involve the police, and in some cases I've been a bit — again, in one of those cases that you chose, where there was a real delay by the police's investigation, by the same police force, and then, in another case, they acted pretty promptly in gathering the evidence. So I actually think that without the core group, without having a safeguarding operation body and</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	collaboratively, over the witness statements, to check our record and actually it has had a most positive effect, that the Diocesan Safeguarding Advisor doesn't feel alone, because this has been a joint so you have given us an opportunity to be partners in the diocese about safeguarding, which I think is really it's been hard work, but it's been good news.  Q. Were you not partners before that? It is very rare that anybody says thank you to us for investigating them, but?  A. Well, you have made it you brought a possibility for us. People could assume that because they are part of the same committee, part of the same group, that they are all sharing the same information, when actually they may not be. What you have done, particularly with those four cases we have been looking at, everybody has had to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. As far as you're concerned in respect of a core group, do you find I mean, that is something which has only been in place over the past three or four years. Has that led, do you think, to an improvement in safeguarding decision making in the context of the diocese?</li> <li>A. Without it, I think we would still be struggling.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. You know, there is a bit of a delay when the core group wants to involve the police, and in some cases I've been a bit again, in one of those cases that you chose, where there was a real delay by the police's investigation, by the same police force, and then, in another case, they acted pretty promptly in gathering the evidence. So I actually think that without the core group, without having a safeguarding operation body and without the strategic body, I think things would fall</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	collaboratively, over the witness statements, to check our record and actually it has had a most positive effect, that the Diocesan Safeguarding Advisor doesn't feel alone, because this has been a joint so you have given us an opportunity to be partners in the diocese about safeguarding, which I think is really it's been hard work, but it's been good news.  Q. Were you not partners before that? It is very rare that anybody says thank you to us for investigating them, but?  A. Well, you have made it you brought a possibility for us. People could assume that because they are part of the same committee, part of the same group, that they are all sharing the same information, when actually they may not be. What you have done, particularly with those four cases we have been looking at, everybody has had to look at it carefully and make sure that there are no
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. As far as you're concerned in respect of a core group, do you find — I mean, that is something which has only been in place over the past three or four years. Has that led, do you think, to an improvement in safeguarding decision making in the context of the diocese?</li> <li>A. Without it, I think we would still be struggling.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. You know, there is a bit of a delay when the core group wants to involve the police, and in some cases I've been a bit — again, in one of those cases that you chose, where there was a real delay by the police's investigation, by the same police force, and then, in another case, they acted pretty promptly in gathering the evidence. So I actually think that without the core group, without having a safeguarding operation body and without the strategic body, I think things would fall between two stools. And I actually think that it is</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	collaboratively, over the witness statements, to check our record and actually it has had a most positive effect, that the Diocesan Safeguarding Advisor doesn't feel alone, because this has been a joint so you have given us an opportunity to be partners in the diocese about safeguarding, which I think is really it's been hard work, but it's been good news.  Q. Were you not partners before that? It is very rare that anybody says thank you to us for investigating them, but?  A. Well, you have made it you brought a possibility for us. People could assume that because they are part of the same committee, part of the same group, that they are all sharing the same information, when actually they may not be. What you have done, particularly with those four cases we have been looking at, everybody has had to look at it carefully and make sure that there are no loopholes anymore. At the moment, we are going through
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. As far as you're concerned in respect of a core group, do you find — I mean, that is something which has only been in place over the past three or four years. Has that led, do you think, to an improvement in safeguarding decision making in the context of the diocese?</li> <li>A. Without it, I think we would still be struggling.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. You know, there is a bit of a delay when the core group wants to involve the police, and in some cases I've been a bit — again, in one of those cases that you chose, where there was a real delay by the police's investigation, by the same police force, and then, in another case, they acted pretty promptly in gathering the evidence. So I actually think that without the core group, without having a safeguarding operation body and without the strategic body, I think things would fall between two stools. And I actually think that it is really now what — and I think I would say later on,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	collaboratively, over the witness statements, to check our record and actually it has had a most positive effect, that the Diocesan Safeguarding Advisor doesn't feel alone, because this has been a joint so you have given us an opportunity to be partners in the diocese about safeguarding, which I think is really it's been hard work, but it's been good news.  Q. Were you not partners before that? It is very rare that anybody says thank you to us for investigating them, but?  A. Well, you have made it you brought a possibility for us. People could assume that because they are part of the same committee, part of the same group, that they are all sharing the same information, when actually they may not be. What you have done, particularly with those four cases we have been looking at, everybody has had to look at it carefully and make sure that there are no loopholes anymore. At the moment, we are going through all our clergy files before SCIE come and, again, that's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. As far as you're concerned in respect of a core group, do you find — I mean, that is something which has only been in place over the past three or four years. Has that led, do you think, to an improvement in safeguarding decision making in the context of the diocese?</li> <li>A. Without it, I think we would still be struggling.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. You know, there is a bit of a delay when the core group wants to involve the police, and in some cases I've been a bit — again, in one of those cases that you chose, where there was a real delay by the police's investigation, by the same police force, and then, in another case, they acted pretty promptly in gathering the evidence. So I actually think that without the core group, without having a safeguarding operation body and without the strategic body, I think things would fall between two stools. And I actually think that it is really now what — and I think I would say later on, probably I had better say it now, I want to thank this</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	collaboratively, over the witness statements, to check our record and actually it has had a most positive effect, that the Diocesan Safeguarding Advisor doesn't feel alone, because this has been a joint so you have given us an opportunity to be partners in the diocese about safeguarding, which I think is really it's been hard work, but it's been good news.  Q. Were you not partners before that? It is very rare that anybody says thank you to us for investigating them, but?  A. Well, you have made it you brought a possibility for us. People could assume that because they are part of the same committee, part of the same group, that they are all sharing the same information, when actually they may not be. What you have done, particularly with those four cases we have been looking at, everybody has had to look at it carefully and make sure that there are no loopholes anymore. At the moment, we are going through all our clergy files before SCIE come and, again, that's being done collaboratively.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. As far as you're concerned in respect of a core group, do you find I mean, that is something which has only been in place over the past three or four years. Has that led, do you think, to an improvement in safeguarding decision making in the context of the diocese?</li> <li>A. Without it, I think we would still be struggling.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. You know, there is a bit of a delay when the core group wants to involve the police, and in some cases I've been a bit again, in one of those cases that you chose, where there was a real delay by the police's investigation, by the same police force, and then, in another case, they acted pretty promptly in gathering the evidence. So I actually think that without the core group, without having a safeguarding operation body and without the strategic body, I think things would fall between two stools. And I actually think that it is really now what and I think I would say later on, probably I had better say it now, I want to thank this inquiry for inviting our diocese to be one of those they</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	collaboratively, over the witness statements, to check our record and actually it has had a most positive effect, that the Diocesan Safeguarding Advisor doesn't feel alone, because this has been a joint so you have given us an opportunity to be partners in the diocese about safeguarding, which I think is really it's been hard work, but it's been good news.  Q. Were you not partners before that? It is very rare that anybody says thank you to us for investigating them, but?  A. Well, you have made it you brought a possibility for us. People could assume that because they are part of the same committee, part of the same group, that they are all sharing the same information, when actually they may not be. What you have done, particularly with those four cases we have been looking at, everybody has had to look at it carefully and make sure that there are no loopholes anymore. At the moment, we are going through all our clergy files before SCIE come and, again, that's being done collaboratively.  Now, you may say to me, ''Why didn't you do it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. As far as you're concerned in respect of a core group, do you find — I mean, that is something which has only been in place over the past three or four years. Has that led, do you think, to an improvement in safeguarding decision making in the context of the diocese?</li> <li>A. Without it, I think we would still be struggling.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. You know, there is a bit of a delay when the core group wants to involve the police, and in some cases I've been a bit — again, in one of those cases that you chose, where there was a real delay by the police's investigation, by the same police force, and then, in another case, they acted pretty promptly in gathering the evidence. So I actually think that without the core group, without having a safeguarding operation body and without the strategic body, I think things would fall between two stools. And I actually think that it is really now what — and I think I would say later on, probably I had better say it now, I want to thank this inquiry for inviting our diocese to be one of those they want to look at in the four case studies and I have to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	collaboratively, over the witness statements, to check our record and actually it has had a most positive effect, that the Diocesan Safeguarding Advisor doesn't feel alone, because this has been a joint so you have given us an opportunity to be partners in the diocese about safeguarding, which I think is really it's been hard work, but it's been good news.  Q. Were you not partners before that? It is very rare that anybody says thank you to us for investigating them, but?  A. Well, you have made it you brought a possibility for us. People could assume that because they are part of the same committee, part of the same group, that they are all sharing the same information, when actually they may not be. What you have done, particularly with those four cases we have been looking at, everybody has had to look at it carefully and make sure that there are no loopholes anymore. At the moment, we are going through all our clergy files before SCIE come and, again, that's being done collaboratively.  Now, you may say to me, "Why didn't you do it before?". Well, I think we stopped assuming that we are

Page 119

A. Yes.

- 1 challenges that you have been throwing at us, really, 2 and for that I'm very grateful. 3 Q. Thank you. Can I ask you about what your role is in 4 respect of the province? So you have a Provincial 5 Safeguarding Advisor, a Provincial Chaplain and 6 a Provincial Registrar. What do they do in respect of 7 safeguarding and how do they support your work? 8 A. As soon as information comes from a diocese about 9 safeguarding, that's referred immediately to the 10 Provincial Chaplain, who is, again, a trained 11 safeguarding person in her previous role where she was 12 working in the army, and then the registrar is copied in 13 to what has come into the diocese, into the office at 14 Bishopthorpe, and then they give out advice on what 15 needs to happen and our advice is sent back to the 16 diocese where it came from. 17 Now, even if it is to do with the bishop, again, 18 that information is gathered by the Provincial Chaplain 19 and the registrar and then write a report on what they 20 would like to happen in this particular case, and then 21 it is investigated. 22 So without that Provincial Chaplain, I think the 23 registrar was always struggling. 24 Q. So prior -- the Provincial Safeguarding Advisor was only 25 appointed in 2016. Page 121 1 other reports that came out in 2013 and 2014? 2 A. We were trying to do our best with my Provincial 3 Chaplain and the registrar but you needed a safeguarding 4 person who is trained in order to deal with the 5
- provincial cases. Cahill, in fact, flagged up, not only 6 for my diocese, but also all other dioceses, and it led 7 to the possibility of employing one full-time 8 Safeguarding Advisor for the church, and that has increased in numbers. It set out the possibility of 10 a National Safeguarding Team, the possibility that, out 11 of that, the whole question of reviewing the seal of 12 the confessional. That really -- Cahill I think flagged 13 up the inadequacies which were there in the 14 Church of England nationally. 15 Q. As archbishop, you obviously have attended a number of 16 meetings of the National Safeguarding Panel. You are 17 also on the National Safeguarding -- or, rather, 18 a representative of yours is on the National 19 Safeguarding Steering Group. 20 At any point between 2005 and the outcome of 2.1 the Cahill report, which is 2014, were you attempting to 22 drive through changes in safeguarding or, again, is this 23 something that you have come to rather than 24 independently being proactive about it? 25 A. When Cahill started, we realised that Waddington and his Page 123

2 3 resources for the northern province, so to speak? 4 5 Q. Was that acceptable or adequate, in terms of your role 6 and managing the archiepiscopal role that you play? 7 A. I think there was no money. This particular bill is now coming out of the Archbishops' Council nationally via 9 the Church Commissioners and I think everybody thought 10 you sort out your diocese properly, it is going to be 11 okay, but the resources are to be put in. I mean, the 12 report of the independent chair of our board, in her 13 report to the council, said, for example, in the last three years we have had to spend £191,000 in order to 14 15 make sure that our system is working properly. There 16 were no resources. And somehow there was a wish that, 17 you know, everything must be okay. That's the bit that 18 Judge Cahill in fact criticises. What she says about 19 the systemic failure. The system was assuming you're 20 doing it, but, actually, there were a lot of gaps. 21 Q. You have obviously been the Archbishop of York since 22 2005. Was it something that you had recognised as being 23 a gap, ie, the absence of provincial safeguarding 24 advice, or was it something that you only came to 25 realise in the light of the Cahill Report and various Page 122 name and his file were in what you call the clergy 2 files, so we had to get them back from the institute

O. Prior to that, were there any dedicated safeguarding

3 that actually guards all these files. And immediately 4 I realised: by the way, this guy died; his file is not 5 in our office, but in another place. What if a lot of those dead clergy had abused people? So I set up 6 a review of the dead clergy files. They were all looked 7 8 at by a very experienced person. And then tried to persuade the rest of the dioceses, through our meeting 10 of the diocesan -- the bishops, that we are starting 11 this, because you'd better do it as well because you may 12 be shocked to discover that those files that have been 13 buried away a long time ago, there were abusers and 14 there could still be survivors. 15 Q. You didn't manage to persuade all dioceses. I think 16 some dioceses have done what they have called a deceased 17 clergy review, including obviously your diocese. But 18 not every diocese has done one. That's right, isn't it? 19 In fact, they are not going to do one even in the Past 20 Cases Review 2. Do you think that's an omission, 21 22 A. Well, we ended up, as a result of this review, me seeing 23 I think four survivors whose stories were horrendous, 24 and if bishops really are concerned about survivors who 25 have probably kept quiet because the clergy person died,

"What can I do about it?", I think once they tell in the 1 was, in the words of Sir Roger Singleton, I think he 1 2 diocese, which we did, we did publicise it in the 2 called it a curate's egg: good in parts but with significant omissions. So significant, in fact, that 3 3 papers, we put it on the website, that we are now 4 looking at these dead clergy files, and "If you have 4 a number of dioceses are going to have to go back and do 5 suffered abuse, please come forward", and we had four, 5 it again? 6 6 A. I won't agree, because, again, we did all the past cases and some of their stories were so horrendous. 7 7 So I want to suggest to the rest of my brother and -- which now -- of course noncurrent ones. We had 8 bishops, please, please, look at those dead clergy 8 professionals that were looking at all our files, but, 9 files, because there may be a lot of people who were 9 again, you see, we didn't even include in that Past 10 10 abused, and they need actually a lot of help and a lot Cases Review all officers of the church, who should have 11 11 been included. of support. 12 Q. And in fact you didn't include deceased clergy -- or you 12 Q. I know you have talked about the deceased clergy files, 13 and we will go in a minute to the recommendations that 13 only included deceased clergy, I think, about whom some 14 were made as a result of that to the diocese. But I'd 14 issue has been raised previously, rather than looking 15 15 through all of them? like to take you back a tiny bit to a few years prior to 16 16 that, which is not long after your installation as the A. Yes. 17 Archbishop of York. The then Archbishop of Canterbury 17 Q. Do you agree, therefore, that when there was various 18 instigated -- I'm assuming with your knowledge and 18 sorts of publicity and press releases which were issued 19 approval -- the Past Cases Review. Were you involved at 19 in around 2009, which said, "There are only" -- you 20 all in setting up the terms of reference or in anything 20 know, "There are a very few number of referrals made. 21 21 to do with that particular review? We can assure everyone that the church is a safe place", 22 A. It came to the House of Bishops, so all of us agreed 22 that that was an incorrect statement? 23 those terms and that's why I'm surprised there could 23 A. I think that was what I call a sort of hopeful comfort. 24 24 still be people who are not revisiting the clergy files. But you can only comfort people hopefully if you've got 25 Q. Do you recognise, therefore, that the Past Cases Review 25 the facts. And if you've gone through all the files. Page 125 Page 126 postdating 2014. Do you think that the diocese has put 1 So, as far as I'm concerned, unless everybody has 2 carried out a review of the dead clergy files, is 2 the needs of the victim as paramount in all those cases, 3 3 which is the first recommendation, the first analysis, looking constantly at the files they have got at 4 4 in effect? present, and you've got professionals who are good at 5 A. I think we, in the Diocese of York, have put victims and having an eye and looking carefully where things may 5 6 have been missed, then I'm afraid it cannot -- it wasn't survivors at the heart of all our work, and, therefore, 6 7 adequate. It wasn't adequate at all. 7 where there has been an omission, it isn't because we 8 Q. Can I just get up, just briefly, the recommendations 8 don't regard the importance. I mean, I have gone out of 9 that were made in the Deceased Clergy Review, which was my way actually to make sure that anybody who 10 in 2014. So it happened at around the same time as the 10 discloses -- we have got to make sure we take them 11 Cahill Report. 11 seriously and that I have actually, probably, in the 12 12 ministry that I've been doing over the last 14 years in 13 Q. It's, Ralph, ACE025007\_003. These are the lessons 13 York, I think I've seen something like 15 people. 14 learned in detail. Can we go to 002, which is the 14 O. Thank you. 15 previous page, which sets out the five recommendations. 15 A. And some of them have made all kinds of different 16 "Lessons learned from this analysis are outlined in 16 challenges, answers. I mean, even as of yesterday, one 17 brief below". The first one of those is: 17 of the survivors of Waddington wrote to me, because 18 "That any future procedures and actions taken ensure 18 I said, "Please" -- I wrote to all of them and I said, 19 the needs of the victim of an offence are paramount and 19 "By the way, there may be matters that come in the 20 the support needs of the person making the allegation 20 hearing and this could reignite the bad memories that 21 are also considered." 21 you have got, and, please, if you need more support, 22 Do you consider that you do that and that you have 22 more care, let us know", and one of them wrote in to say 23 done that following the Deceased Clergy Review? 23 that, you know, he's about to lose his house, the 24 A. For survivors? 24 support has not been adequate, and so I immediately have 25 Q. Not just them, but anyone who makes a complaint of abuse 25 told the bishop concerned that, "Look, this is what this

Page 127

person is saying, and you're supposed to have supported them", but also I he made a suggestion that, "Would you please highlight the real worry some of us who survived have got about paedophiles being given only an 18-month sentence when some of us have got a life sentence? Could you raise that in some quarter?". So I'm raising it in this inquiry, that it will be good to  responsibility actually did lie with the Bishop of Sheffield.  Q. Yes.  A. I got a copy on the back of another letter he'd we to me, and I assumed that the bishop was going to with this in a timely fashion because he had already dealt with another safeguarding matter in relation	deal ly iship
you please highlight the real worry some of us who survived have got about paedophiles being given only an 18-month sentence when some of us have got a life sentence? Could you raise that in some quarter?". So  Q. Yes.  A. I got a copy on the back of another letter he'd we to me, and I assumed that the bishop was going to with this in a timely fashion because he had already	deal ly iship
survived have got about paedophiles being given only an 18-month sentence when some of us have got a life sentence? Could you raise that in some quarter?". So  4 A. I got a copy on the back of another letter he'd was going to to me, and I assumed that the bishop was going to with this in a timely fashion because he had already	deal ly iship
an 18-month sentence when some of us have got a life  5 to me, and I assumed that the bishop was going to 6 sentence? Could you raise that in some quarter?". So 6 with this in a timely fashion because he had already	deal ly iship
6 sentence? Could you raise that in some quarter?". So 6 with this in a timely fashion because he had already	dy nship
	nship
7 I'm raising it in this inquiry that it will be good to 7 dealt with another safeguarding matter in relation	_
i in raising it in this inquiry, that it will be good to	was he
8 look at the survivors of abuse having this life sentence 8 to Mr Ineson very propitiously, so my assumption	
because they were actually damaged very, very badly, and 9 was going to take this disclosure pretty seriously seriou	ınd
then the person who's done it, you know, only gets 10 deal with it, because that's where both the pastor	al
11 18 months, that looks so unjust. 11 care really lay, and I happened to have been copic	ed in,
12 Q. Thank you very much for raising that with us. 12 <b>but I assumed that the bishop was going to be doi</b>	ng it.
Obviously, the views and issues around victims and 13 Those people who are in my responsibility, I m	_
survivors are at the very heart of everything we try and 14 <b>you try to expedite it as quickly as possible. So</b>	
do in every investigation, but thank you.  15 Q. But what I think Mr Ineson would say if he was spe	
16 Can I just identify, I know that you have just said 16 to you now is he would say his case has been very we	
this, but we heard evidence from Mr Ineson this morning, 17 publicised, he has stood outside synod and said, "The	
who is a survivor of abuse by an individual, 18 are the needs. I have these needs. I feel as if the	
19 Mr Devanamanikkam, the Reverend Trevor Devanamanikkam, 19 church hasn't taken me seriously, has ignored and	
20 and he indicates and identified that he made a number of 20 dismissed my Clerical Discipline Measures. I disclose	ed
21 disclosures to bishops, some of them in the context of 21 to all sorts of people. They didn't do anything. They	
	ι.
paramount. What would you like to say about that?  24 would say he was at and I am asking this question	
25 <b>A. I think Mr Ineson, when I look, the diocese and the</b> 25 behalf of David Greenwood of Switalskis, who repre	sents
Page 129 Page 130	
1 Mr Ineson, so this isn't a question from me, this is 1 Sainsburys Local that caused the problem. Thank you	1
2 a question from him, really to say that when you were at 2 very much, everyone, for bearing with us in that short	
3 the Mr Ineson was at the presentation that was given 3 break. In particular, Archbishop Sentamu.	
4 at synod by victims and survivors, as I understand it, 4 Sorry, I was in the middle of asking you a question	
5 last July. You were also present at that. And he 5 about Mr Ineson. I will go back to the beginning of	
6 described to us this morning in evidence:  6 that question, and this is a question I'm asking on	
7 "At the end of the meeting, I was approached by 7 behalf of David Greenwood, who represents Mr Inesc	n in
8 John Sentamu, who grabbed me by the shoulder and spoke 8 these proceedings.	11 111
9 right in my face. He said that one day we should talk. 9 Mr Ineson, in his second statement, identified that	
near. I would be happy to come to him. He said we  11 which took place with various victims and survivors I  12 which took place with various victims and survivors I  13 which took place with various victims and survivors I	ist
should pray together."  12 year, he recalls as follows, and I will read it to you  13 year, the recalls as follows, and I will read it to you	
Mr Ineson then says he said this would never happen, 13 verbatim:	
"At the end of the meeting, I was approached by	a had
15 (Fire alarm) 15 John Sentamu [Archbishop Sentamu], who grabbed n	-
MS SCOLDING: I'm so sorry, Archbishop Sentamu. I don't 16 shoulder and spoke right in my face. He said that one	
think this is a scheduled fire alarm, so we need to  17 day we should talk. I responded by saying I was happ	•
evacuate the building. Could the fire stewards please 18 to talk and, as I lived only half an hour away, I would	
put on the relevant tabards? 19 be happy to come to him. He then said we should pra	У
20 Archbishop Sentamu, just to indicate, you are under 20 together. I told him this would never happen, but	
21 oath, but I know you know what that means. 21 I would be happy to talk to him. He then asked me w	
22 (2.19 pm) 22 I wanted and I told him an apology. He said apologie	s
23 (A short break) 23 mean different things to different people and that I ha	1
24 (2.29 pm) 24 put a boulder between him and I. I told him that the	
25 MS SCOLDING: Thank you very much. I understand it was the 25 only thing in front of him was the hope that he would	
Page 131 Page 132	
33 (Pages 12)	

3

5

9

10

25

7

8

- 1 one day answer for his actions. He shrugged, let go of 2 me and walked away. I reported this to Heather from the
- 3 NST outside the room, but nothing was done."
- 4 I suppose the question is, was that appropriate
- 5 behaviour towards Mr Ineson in the context of the event
- 6 and what was being spoken of and what did you mean --
- 7 that's my first question, and then I will ask you my
- 8 second question?
- 9 A. If that's how I behaved, it's totally inappropriate. It 10 would be totally inappropriate. But I -- the room was
- 11 a very small room and there were about probably
- 12 40 people there, a room which should be occupied by
- 13 around 15 people. I was on my way out, but, as you
- 14 know, with people so close to one another, he said to
- 15 me -- I said hello, and then he said to me, "All you
- 16 need to do is apologise. Apologise. Apologise". And
- 17 I said, "Well, I hope one day we will be able to sit
- 18 down and say a prayer together", in a sort of a -- maybe
- 19 I think I shouldn't probably have done it. I took him
- 20 to be an honourable man, and so I put my hand on his
- 21 shoulder and said, "I hope one day we will be able to
  - meet and say a prayer together" and I left, and there
- 23 were witnesses there that day.
- 24 Q. So can you remember saying he had put a boulder between
- 25 him and you?

22

1

2

7

8

18

# Page 133

- Q. But should CDM have got in the way of the pastoral
  - support? Because, in a way, one of them -- you don't
- 3 have to wait for the outcome of the Clergy Discipline
- 4 Measure to pick up the telephone -- for somebody to pick
- 5 up the telephone and say, "How can I help?" Obviously,
- 6 you might not have been the appropriate person because
  - I know he was one of the people against whom a Clerical Discipline Measure complaint was issued, so I understand
- 9 why not you, but someone. Do you think there is still
- 10 that failure to put survivors at the centre of thoughts,
- 11 particularly if there are ongoing disciplinary issues
- 12 involving a number of clerics?
- 13 A. I mean, I think in this particular case I would say 14
- that, at one time, everybody was expecting the case was 15 going to go to court and then the perpetrator killed
- 16 himself and then that created a sort of a delay. But
- 17 I'm reliably informed that Moira from the National
- Safeguarding Team has been in contact with Mr Ineson,
- 19 not just once, but actually on a more regular basis.
- 20 Q. Can I also ask you about -- we heard this morning from
- 21 Mr Ineson that he brought several Clerical Discipline
- 22 Measure complaints, including one against you, and it
- 23 was, I believe, six weeks -- 54 days out of time. Now,
- 24 you could have chosen to have taken the time point or 25
  - not to have taken the time point. As I understand it,

Page 135

- A. No. And I couldn't say a thing like that. That's why
- 2 I said, when you read it, out that would be very
  - inappropriate for anybody to say to anybody. No,
- 4 I didn't, and there were witnesses who were around.
  - Q. Do you agree -- I think Bishop Peter Hancock has
    - described on one occasion the treatment of
- 6
- 7 Reverend Ineson by the church as a whole as "shabby and
- 8 shambolic". Do you agree with that assessment?
  - A. I think that's right. I think Peter is -- because,
    - unfortunately, because of the number of Clergy
- 11 Discipline Measure complaints support -- and they had
- 12 all to be dissolved and dealt with and it took a very
- 13 long time, and in the meantime, I think what hasn't
- 14 happened is that the -- where the original complaint
- 15 started, more support should have been given, though I know that Moira from the National Safeguarding Team
- 16 17 has also been spending quite a lot of time trying to
- 18 support Mr Ineson, but every time, I think -- if all of
- 19 us have behaved very badly, it's taken too long to set
- 20 up an inquiry into all that material and it had to wait
- 21 until all the Clergy Discipline Measure complaints have
- 22 actually stopped. So there's been a delay but, on
- 23 behalf of the church, I would say that, yeah, he hasn't
- 24 been given the sort of maximum support that was
  - required.

## Page 134

- 1 you did make an application to say that this complaint
  - 2 was out of time which it would have been in your gift
- 3 not to object to that, as it is always in any litigant's
- 4 gift to do things or not do things. Do you think it was
- 5 right to object to the complaint on the basis of time,
- 6 or do you think it would have been better to have let
  - the substance of the complaint be looked at and
  - examined?
- 9 A. Well, the President of the Tribunal asks, if he is going
- to set aside the time limit, reasons why the time limit 10
- 11 should be set aside, and in the application by Mr Ineson
- 12 to the President of the Tribunals, he actually did not
- 13 give what the evidence was that demanded this to be set
- 14 aside. All I said to the President of the Tribunal was
- 15 that the facts in here have not actually been put into
- 16 this -- but President of the Tribunal has got power to
- 17 do whatever he wants to do, and he chose not to do it.
- 18 And when you are dealing with the Clergy Discipline
- 19 Measure, which is part of the law of England, not just
- 20 the church's law, it is part of the law of England, and
- 2.1 you've got a judge of appeal looking at all the facts in
- 22 the round and decides he is not going to allow the
- 23 appeal to be heard because the evidence that was in the
  - appeal to the President wasn't probably as clear as
  - probably it is now, so, you know, I have always believed

Page 136

24

25

6

8

14

17

### in the rule of law, by the way.

1

9

17

22

25

1

2

5

8

9

- 2 Q. Can I ask you as well, in terms of putting victims and 3 survivors in the middle of things, we heard some
- 4 evidence earlier in the week from AN-A88, who is an
- 5 anonymous witness, but she's a complainant in respect of
- 6 the Bishop Victor Whitsey, and she said you and
- 7 Bishop Peter Forster had given a joint apology after
- 8 Operation Coverage, which was the investigation by
  - Cheshire Police, had published their report. You then
- 10 published an apology on the website.
- 11 She described that apology in evidence to us last
- 12 week that it was an apology of an armchair Christian,
- 13 which means nothing. It was a candy floss apology. Do
- 14 you have anything you want to say about that? I think
- 15 what she said is, she wasn't written to herself
- 16 individually, and she just read it on a website, rather
  - than -- and nobody has ever offered to come and speak to
- 18 her or anyone -- I mean, obviously that's more of
- 19 a diocesan issue than it is an archiepiscopal issue,
- 20 I do recognise that, but as you were a joint signatory
- 2.1 to the apology, I wanted to give you a chance to comment
  - upon her evidence in that respect?
- 23 A. Where the police supplied us with the names and
- 24 addresses of those who had been abused by
  - Page 137

Bishop Whitsey, a letter was written personally to the

- person.
- 2 Where we didn't get the addresses -- and I need to
- 3 go back and check whether she is one of those whose name
- 4 was not supplied to us, and the address -- you know, the
- 5 address wasn't given, but I did remember signing these
  - letters personally and, where we were not able to get
- 7 the addresses of people, that's when it went on the
  - website. So it wasn't just a website and that's it.
- 9 Q. Can I also check, have you had a chance to read the SCIE
- 10 final overview report, the second half of it, which is
- 11 to do with the experiences of victims and survivors? 12 Have you had an opportunity to look at that or read that
- 13 subsequent to its publication in April of this year?
- 15 Q. Ralph, would you mind getting up ACE0267124. It is also
- 16 under SCI000005. That's the first page. Could we go to
  - 124, please, Ralph. These are the conclusions as the
- 18 themes and a summary of the findings which is presented
- 19 in the table below. Ralph, would you mind getting the
- 20 table up? In particular, I'm looking at the first three
- 21 issues. They are all about leadership and culture. 22
- They identify that there needs to be more valuing the 23 service of abusers -- can everybody read that clearly
- 24 now? Archbishop Sentamu, can we all read it clearly?
- 25 A. Yes.

## Page 138

- Q. "Public narratives the church tells about its own
  - safeguarding journey of improvement do not adequately
- 3 recognise the contributions of survivors of
- 4 church-related abuse. This makes it less likely that
  - good practice is achieved in recognising people,
- 6 disclosing abuse and sharing concerns as playing
- 7 a valuable service to the church."
  - Do you agree with that, that that has been the
  - position to date? That's what victims and survivors are
- 10 telling you. I don't know whether you have any
- 11 particularly different view, Archbishop Sentamu?
- 12 A. I have no reason to doubt that that's the case. I mean,
- 13 survivors should be really seen as the -- in helping us
- 14 to come to terms with our failures. In order to move
- 15 forward, their advice is invaluable, really, and I saw
- 16 this in the case of the Cahill case, because, by
- 17 engaging with those four people, some change and some
- 18 good has come out of it. I will never see those four as
- 19 really not being at the forefront of challenging me,
- 20 challenging the diocese, challenging the
- 21 Church of England, that without their experience, which
- 22 is ghastly, they can bring us to a much better place
- 23 because they're speaking not from theories, and what
- 24 they want are not theories, what they want are actual 25 practical solutions. So they have got a very important

Page 139

- role to play and, without that, I could never have
- 2 looked at the dead clergy files. You suddenly realise
- 3 they have a voice which we must hear.
- 4 Q. When you say "they have a voice that we must hear", do
- 5 you have any practical suggestions for how their voice
- is heard? I think Jo Kind, who gave an address to synod 6
- 7 when you were there, said, "We want you to walk with us.
- 8
- We don't want things to be done to us. We want you to
- walk with us". Do you have any practical suggestions?
- 10 Obviously you are at the end of a long and extremely
- 11 distinguished clerical career. I know you are about to
- 12 leave the archiepiscopate. So if you have any words of
- 13 wisdom for the rest of the church about how do you walk
- 14 with people in this situation?
- 15 A. We must be prepared to drop whatever we are doing if
- 16 a survivor wants us to get in touch with them. The
- 17 young man I have just told you about in the Cahill case
- 18 with Waddington, and another one, I had to travel a long
- 19 way, which was quite a long way from York to where he
- 20 lives in Oxford, in order to be able to hear and talk.
- 21 So you've got to keep in touch. You just can't say, "We
- have given you some pastoral support. You had some 22
- counselling, and that's it". I think you've got to 24 revisit and revisit, making sure that people are being
- 25 supported.

Page 140

23

1 1 Q. But you haven't done that in respect of Mr Ineson, responding to disclosures of abuse or safeguarding 2 2 though, have you? concerns makes it more likely that people who come 3 3 forward to flag up mistakes in the past will experience A. Because --4 4 Q. Or not you personally, but the church as a whole? defensive responses when they raise poor past responses 5 A. Well, again, as I said at the beginning, the abuse --5 by people in the church." 6 where the complaint did rise, the responsibility there, That's a rather long sentence. It's the sort of 6 7 7 sentence I normally write, much to the disgust of really, you know, they should be put in -- putting in 8 a lot of effort. I can only speak of the cases that everybody around me. However, I think what it is trying 9 actually I have been -- where people have made 9 to say is it isn't enough saying, "We have made 10 disclosures to me, I've done my best to continue 10 a mistake". Do you, yourself, consider you have made 11 following people. 11 personal mistakes in respect of responding to disclosures of abuse during the course of your clerical 12 12 For the four survivors from the dead clergy files, 13 again, I have kept in touch with the people, and in fact 13 career? 14 14 A. I'm just scratching my head. If somebody makes one of them, as a result of all of this, constant 15 15 a disclosure to me of abuse and I swept it under the checking that people are all right, decided to get 16 16 married. So I actually think that our pastoral support 17 still leaves a lot to be desired. 17 Q. Not necessarily swept it under the carpet --A. Hand on heart, I don't think so. Where there have been 18 18 Q. Can I take you to the bottom of the page, Ralph, 19 number 3, please: 19 disclosures, I have been willing to apologise to the 20 "A lack of role models and leadership ..." 20 person, trying to do the best I can to support them. 2.1 21 I mean, the tragedy in all of this is, when -- again, If one can look on the right: 22 22 "3. Leadership and culture. An open, learning going back to Waddington, when the disclosure was made, 23 23 culture -- personally holding your hands up to past Waddington was still alive. Had it been taken 24 24 failures. A lack of role models and leadership about seriously, it would have led to his prosecution, and so 25 25 how to hold your hands up to personal mistakes in that's a very, very big failure. And because I occupied Page 141 Page 142 1 a place where my other predecessors were before, all 1 "There was then no policy for training bishops and 2 I can say -- apologise and say I'm sorry. I'm sorry, 2 other senior staff and the policies did not deal with 3 we, as a system, didn't really pay great attention until 3 the conflict between a bishop's pastoral and 4 4 the person went on television, and when I watched it, disciplinary responsibilities. Further, the policies 5 5 I said, "That person, to me, is a reliable witness, so for our application in ..." 6 something has got to be done about this". 6 Would you please go up to the next page: 7 Q. Can I ask you about, in -- you identify at paragraph 5 7 "'... individual dioceses did not contemplate 8 of your witness statement, and you say -- Ralph, would 8 interdiocese issues. Nor was there any guidance in our 9 you mind putting this on screen, please, ACE923700\_002. 9 national policies in relation to cross-jurisdictional 10 It might not be "9". It might be "023", but it is 10 issues affecting provinces of the Anglican Communion 11 written as "9" on my -- no? 11 other than the Church of England." 12 Can I ask you about this, paragraph 5. You identify 12 You then go on to identify in particular some of 13 13 the number of failings in the Church of England in the changes in the criminal law that took place in the 14 respect of child sexual abuse. You then talk about the 14 1980s and 1990s, for example, abolishing the rule in 15 Cahill Report and say a lot more about the report later: 15 respect of corroboration, the introduction of 16 "For now, I would note an important observation she 16 the Children Act 1989, the difference in terms of 17 made in her report, namely, that one should 'not judge 17 the investigation of sexual offences, those sorts of 18 yesterday's actions by today's standards'." 18 issues which you set out at paragraph 7 of your witness 19 It then goes on to say -- Ralph, would you mind 19 20 going down to the bottom of the page: 20 Obviously, there were changes in the criminal law, 21 "'The report acknowledges that it is important not 21 but can I just identify, what were you saying, what were 22 to judge yesterday's action bis today's standards. In 22 you trying to mean that you mustn't judge yesterday's 23 the last 10-15 years, public attitudes as well as 23 actions by today's standards if those actions were the 24 policies and practices in relation to these issues have 24 sexual abuse of a child which, irrespective -- which 25 changed dramatically ... 25 from time immemorial has been seen as a criminal Page 143

- 1 activity? Are you not trying to excuse a failure to
- 2 take seriously child sexual abuse in the past by saying,
- 3 "Well, things were different then"?
- 4 A. No, I'm not excusing. I'm just simply stating a fact.
- 5 For example, I go on where I say, you know, and I have
- 6 noted this was compounded by a separate rule requiring
- 7 corroboration of a complaint of sexual offence, a rule
- 8 which was only abolished in 1995. Even the courts were
- Q treating children really in a way that I don't think
- 10 they should have treated them that way, and the church
  - lives in a culture of accepting -- I go on to say,
- 12 because the church is the church, they should have
- 13 actually put the children at the heart of all the
- 14 decisions that were being taken. But we find
- 15 ourselves -- so I'm not making an excuse at all. I'm
- 16 just flagging up that, sadly, in this country, when it
  - came to children, until the law of corroboration had
- 18 been abolished, there were many cases of abuse in the
- 19 courts which unfortunately collapsed, and the church
- 20 really shouldn't pride itself that, well, we were like
- 21 them. No, I think our standards should have been much
- 22 higher.

11

17

2

10

20

- 23 Q. You're saying what happened is the church fell into the
- 24 trap of thinking, "Well, if the criminal law doesn't
- 25 look at it, then we don't look at it", but in fact, the

### Page 145

- 1 attitudes at large as well as a number of other cases we
  - have been involved in. How often do you come across
- 3 that sort of talk now?
- 4 A. I have come across where -- in my own diocese, where
- 5 three clergy persons were convicted, and the parishes
- 6 where they had served, they all tell you it couldn't be
- 7 true, in spite of the fact that people have been
- 8 convicted. And another one writing to me that, "Please
- 9 do not make a mistake of punishing this lovely person".
  - So I'm afraid, on the ground, there are areas where the message hasn't got through that safeguarding is not
- 11 12 an optional extra, it is not an add-on, it is really at
- 13 the heart of the Christian faith.
- 14 Q. What's your role, as an archbishop and as a bishop, to 15
- correct those erroneous assumptions, and what can the 16 church do to try and drill into those assumptions,
- 17
- assumptions which are shared by those people who don't
- 18 have a Christian faith as well? How much of it is
- 19 a problem of the Church of England and how much of it is
  - a problem of our society as a whole?
- 21 A. I think society, since Jimmy Savile, has been
- 22 conscientised, but I don't think it is that deep yet.
- 23 It has not become part of our DNA. Not only in --
- 24 I think in the church there is a shift which is
- 25 beginning to happen, but you still get these shockers

## Page 147

- 1 moral authority that you have as the church --
- 2 A. Yes.

6

14

- 3 Q. -- should have meant that clerics should have been held
- 4 to higher standards than those that were in place for
- 5 the rest of society?
  - A. I totally agree, I couldn't agree more.
- 7 Q. Therefore, in fact, the church were operating to laxer
- 8 standards when it came to looking at cases of child
- 9 sexual abuse?
- 10 A. Absolutely. What I still find difficult is you can say
- 11 it to some people and there is still this -- no
- 12 corroboration and, therefore, do we really believe his
- 13 story? But I think the National Safeguarding Team have
  - helped us, in that, when a disclosure of an abuse has
- 15 happened, you've got to take that on its face value and
- 16 use not the criminal standard, but the civil standard of
- 17 grounds of probability, and if we had done that,
- 18 actually, we would have been in a very different place.
- 19 Q. The issue that you have just identified, which is people
- 20 still saying, "Well, unless there is corroborative 21
- evidence, I don't think there can be sexual offending or 22
- I don't think one should judge someone in that respect",
- 23 and other similar sorts of attitudes, how prevalent are 24
- they still in the church? They were obviously very 25 prevalent and the Cahill Report really shows those

### Page 146

- that come up, and you say to yourself, "I beg your
- 2 pardon, someone has been to court, has been convicted of
- 3 12 abuse numbers, and you are still telling me what
- 4 a fantastic priest he was and you're still telling me he
- 5 couldn't have done that". Well, the courts have found
- the person guilty. And in that case, what has happened, 6
- 7 in this particular place -- and how a meeting had to be
- 8 held with all the parishioners who worshipped there and
  - told, "This is fact, this isn't fantasy".
- 10 Q. And how do you think that attitude -- those very
- 11 culturally engrained attitudes -- can be changed by the
- 12

9

- 13 A. For the church to recognise everybody has got a duty
- 14 towards safeguarding. It is not just the Safeguarding
- 15 Advisor, it is not just the bishop, it is not just the
- 16 archdeacon, but every member who worships in a church,
- 17 it is our duty to protect, our duty to make sure our
- 18 places are safe, our duty, collectively, to make sure we
- 19 have got the best practice and that our churches are
- 20 safe. They can only be made safe by the whole majority
- 21 not just a few things. I think -- you know, I remember
- 22 that whole harrowing case, the Soham murders, and the
- 23 Bichard Report, I think it's paragraph 12 -- page 12,
- paragraph 79, where he says that, for all of those 25 people involved in safeguarding, they have got to,

Page 148

24

1 sadly, recognise that they can never guarantee there 1 serious level. As you may or may not know, they 2 will be an abuse. "Our job" -- and this is what he 2 categorise indecent images of children, and they were 3 3 the most serious indecent images of children. I'm not said, "Our job, should they want to practise their 4 devious acts, our job is to make sure that it is 4 even going to say the kinds of imagery that they would 5 difficult for them to do it". And until we get that 5 have been. 6 position in the rest of the church, I think it will He then said, when he asked him in questions, about 7 7 always be very, very difficult. why he didn't recommend that he's prohibited for life, 8 So, for me, I think training -- training has 8 he said to us: 9 started, which was never before, and because training is 9 "As we all know, the courts deal in different ways 10 now being done on a very high professional level -- and 10 with people convicted of downloading child pornography 11 I can only speak about my diocese -- and what has also 11 and today, you know, that seems to be evolving. 12 been amazing for me, the number of courses they put on 12 I suppose I would also, in my own mind, regard the fact 13 for lay people and lay leaders as well as clergy is 13 that pornography is so ubiquitously available and 14 14 huge, and if we do not actually complete all our viewed, in my own mind, could it be the case that some 15 training by 2019, I just want to say to our Diocesan 15 people would be easily misled into viewing child 16 Secretary and Chair of the Board of Finance, we should 16 pornography who themselves would not dream of abusing 17 probably put in more money to make sure that all our 17 a child and, in my mind, completely, absolutely yes. 18 18 But I think in the case of people who do get drawn into training is completed. 19 Q. When you talk about cultural attitudes in the church, we 19 the sick desire to download, maybe the two are not." 20 heard from one of the bishops in your province, 20 Now, I understood that to be that there is 21 Bishop Forster, last week, and he identified there was 2.1 a distinct difference between actual abuse of a child 22 an issue which was about how long a particular 22 and viewing indecent images of a child: 23 individual, a particular priest, should be disqualified 23 "I'm not defending it in the slightest. Indeed, 24 after he had been convicted of possessing 8,000 indecent 24 I wouldn't want to put weight on that point and it 25 images of children, of which over 800 were at the most 25 wasn't the basis on which Sir Andrew ..." Page 149 Page 150 1 That is Sir Andrew McFarlane, who was then the chair 1 Q. Can I also ask you, Bishop Forster, also, when asked 2 of the Clerical Discipline Commission. 2 about -- he had received a confidential disclosure. 3 3 Is there anything you want to say about that, and Obviously, all your clerics provide confidential 4 about a statement like that, in respect of, in fact, the 4 disclosures which include any problems that have been in 5 longest-serving bishop in the Church of England, about 5 their past. Within that confidential disclosure, the 6 that attitude and approach towards indecent images of individual concerned had identified that he had been 6 7 children? 7 accused of abuse in the 1970s. The police hadn't been 8 A. I just -- I mean, I just find that shocking. Did he 8 told about it and he was then just moved parish by the 9 realise that indecent images of children is an abuse? 9 then Bishop Victor Whitsey and was told really not to do 10 Q. Well, I think --10 it again. When asked whether or not permission to 11 11 officiate should have been reviewed, he said: A. So children have been abused, and you then separate the 12 physical -- children are being abused. So any indecent 12 "The renewal of his permission to officiate for five 13 years, the focus in my own mind, as I think I say in my 13 image of a child is an abusive act, and, therefore, it 14 14 witness statement, was on risk assessment and seems to me to try and draw that very subtle, 15 15 I discussed this with my chaplain at the time. We knew, nonexistent distinction doesn't wear with me. I knew, the four parishes in which Dickenson had served. 16 All I would say, that if in my heart I haven't got 16 17 17 survivors and victims as at the centre of whatever I'm There had never been any hint of problem in his ministry. He was now 80." 18 trying to do, then, really, I ought to go for more 18 19 19 Just to indicate that Reverend Dickenson has lessons, more classes, more training, because I can't --20 subsequently been convicted, as I understand it, of 20 an indecent image of a child is an abuse, and because it 2.1 21 sexual offending: is an abuse, you should never draw a distinction -- of 22 22 "His ministry was quite minimal. I mean, in those course a physical one could be very harmful as well, but 23 those children that are appearing in those images have 23 days, of course, PTO was simply a recognition that you 24 were still alive, almost. I mean, it didn't imply any 24 been abused, and I -- I'm sorry, I can't separate it 25 great involvement in ministry. Now that's changed. So 25 out. Page 151 Page 152

1 his ministry was fairly minimal, and I made a judgment, 1 decisions when deciding whether or not matters should be 2 which I accept was a misjudgment, that the ongoing risk 2 referred to statutory authorities. He was making that 3 from him was very small." 3 decision. So, firstly, did anybody draw that particular 4 So what do you say -- is there anything you'd like 4 part of the SCIE report to your attention at the time in 5 to say about that and about the approach to granting 5 2017 when it was published? 6 PTO, which was kind of almost as if to say, "Well, 6 A. Sadly, no. That wasn't done. 7 I have to be given a reason not to grant it rather than 7 Q. Had they done so, what would your response have been? 8 to be given a reason to grant it"? 8 I mean, I know I'm asking you a hypothetical question --9 A. Well, in that evidence he talks about talking to his 9 A. Had I been told that this is what they were trying to 10 10 chaplain. Where was the Diocesan Safeguarding Advisor? say, I would have invited the bishop to explain why he 11 Q. He didn't show her. He didn't tell her. 11 thinks he should not use his Safeguarding Officer, why 12 A. Well, that's shocking too. Because I would have 12 he should be the one that controls all the machineries, 13 thought, whenever there's been a disclosure, the first 13 because safeguarding requires real professionals to be 14 point of call is not my chaplain, it's the Diocesan 14 the ones that give the advice, not because they happen 15 Safeguarding Advisor, to look at it in the round and 15 to be bishop. So I would have had a really clear 16 then give advice. 16 conversation with him and I want to hope that he would 17 Q. But if I could identify that the failures -- well, I say 17 accept my advice, just like he did accept the advice to 18 the failures. The potential failures of the Bishop of 18 delegate all his functions, as far as safeguarding are 19 Chester in this regard were picked up in the SCIE report 19 concerned, to the Suffragan Bishop of Birkenhead. 20 which was published, I think, in 2017 in respect of 20 Q. Now, Mr Tilby told me yesterday that in fact what 21 21 Chester. I don't think I need to get the actual passage happened was they amended the regulations in respect of 22 up. But what it basically says was, there was some 22 Diocesan Safeguarding Advisors, particularly because of 23 concerns that the Diocesan Safeguarding Advisor was not, 23 the issue that was raised within this SCIE report in 24 24 in effect, being allowed to perform the advice, and that order to avoid the situation happening again. Did your 25 the Bishop of Chester wasn't delegating safeguarding 25 Provincial Safeguarding Advisor or anyone from the Page 153 Page 154 1 national team alert you to this as a potential issue, professional. But yet, there was no obvious way in 2 because I'm just thinking you may have wished to have 2 which that individual could be held accountable for 3 delegated the safeguarding responsibilities to somebody 3 those purported or possible failings in respect of 4 else within that diocese in advance of when that then 4 safeguarding. Do you think that's not a missing link in 5 5 took place in January 2019. terms of the powers that either you, as archbishop, 6 A. I think, had I been made aware of it, and the Provincial should have or the National Safeguarding Team or someone 6 7 Safeguarding Advisor would have been the first to seek 7 8 8 an opinion, certainly the same advice I gave you A. I would say that Lord Acton, speaking to a fairly individualising person, called Hugh Creighton, who was 9 recently would be put in place. Because you cannot --9 10 well, maybe people can. It is not good practice, it is 10 Bishop of London and he was a law unto himself -- this 11 not even gospel message, to disregard the advice of 11 is going back many, many years ago. He said that 12 a professional in an area where you are not the expert. 12 "Absolute power corrupts absolutely". "Power tends to 13 I mean it just doesn't -- I just can't ... 13 corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely". 14 Q. But doesn't this raise a wider issue? Whatever the 14 Bishops have got to be aware that if they've got 15 rights and wrongs of the situation, and I recognise that 15 absolute power, it will corrupt them, and if you've got 16 there's outstanding Clerical Discipline Measure against 16 authority which is unquestioned, and people have this 17 Bishop Forster, so one has to sort of, in a way, kind of 17 mistaken trust because you happen to wear a dog collar 18 identify -- I think I will leave that there, but doesn't 18 and live in a lovely house, we end up in this kind of 19 it raise a more general issue in respect of the fact of 19 20 the unaccountability of the diocesan bishop? 20 So for me, I would say -- I would characterise it in 21 21 terms of abuse of power and questions of authority is no Now, in this case, you've got a Diocesan 22 Safeguarding Advisor who wasn't being told all the 22 longer acceptable, as far as I can make out, and 23 information. You've got a Diocesan Bishop who's making 23 certainly trust should not be assumed without being 24 safeguarding decisions, something which you, yourself, 24 earned. I think trust should be earned, not something, 25 say you wouldn't do because you don't feel you're the 25 because you wear a purple shirt, that people will trust Page 155 Page 156

1	you. So I I mean, I think that's the thing which we	1	hasn't been suspended. Was any consideration ever given
2	in the church have got to deal with.	2	by yourself to suspending Bishop Forster?
3	MS SCOLDING: Thank you very much. I notice the time, chair	3	A. Section 37 of the Clergy Discipline Measure lays down
4	and panel. I think I've gone slightly over my 3.00 pm,	4	clearly on what grounds you can suspend. And the one
5	but obviously we had the slight hiatus with the fire.	5	which is most powerful is, if there is going to be risk
6	Thank you very much, Archbishop Sentamu. I do have	6	or damage or harm done to somebody, and then, really,
7	some more questions for you, but, chair, is this the	7	when that is the case, you really should suspend the
8	correct moment to have a brief break?	8	person. But in this particular instance, having
9	THE CHAIR: Yes. We will return at 3.25 pm.	9	consulted the Vicar General, who is the chancellor of
10	MS SCOLDING: Thank you very much, chair and panel.	10	our diocese, a retired district judge, because at the
11	(3.08 pm)	11	time, you know, my Provincial Registrar had died, so
12	(A short break)	12	there was a gap there, and the advice I got, which
13	(3.26 pm)	13	I happen to have agreed with, is that suspension really
14	MS SCOLDING: Archbishop Sentamu, if we can just continue	14	within the measure, I couldn't see whether there was
15	for a couple more questions about Bishop Forster. You	15	going to be any risk at all to people, and also I had
16	have talked very powerfully about the abuse of power.	16	already persuaded him to delegate all his safeguarding
17	I suppose the obvious question I would ask you is,	17	matters to, you know, the Bishop of Birkenhead, and not
18	why you were aware, certainly at some points in	18	just by telling him I'm delegating this, but, actually,
19	respect of 2017 and 2018, firstly about his grant of	19	an instrument, a legal instrument, had been drawn up,
20	permission to officiate in respect of the Reverend	20	which means he couldn't take it back at all.
21	Dickson, and, secondly, his conduct in respect of	21	So because there wasn't perceived risk, really,
22	the Whitsey investigation and in other issues. Why	22	that's why he has not been suspended, and if you would
23	didn't you consider suspending him? I mean, as	23	like to see my legal reasoning, I have got a copy.
24	I understand it, he hasn't been suspended even to date.	24	Q. That's fine. I think you have explained your legal
25	He no longer undertakes safeguarding functions, but he	25	reasoning. But I suppose I'm interested in discussing
	75 (75		70
	Page 157		Page 158
1	that legal reasoning with you, because it goes to the	1	you a copy and then you will see where it goes.
2	heart of what could be one of the gaps in the Clergy	2	Q. Can I ask you I mean, obviously we don't know why the
3	Discipline Measure. You said there wasn't a risk to		
	T	3	Bishop of Lincoln has been suspended or it is not
4	someone. But obviously if he was certainly he had	3 4	Bishop of Lincoln has been suspended or it is not entirely clear, but we do know it wasn't because of any
4 5	•		•
	someone. But obviously if he was certainly he had	4	entirely clear, but we do know it wasn't because of any
5	someone. But obviously if he was certainly he had been in charge of safeguarding until a particular	4 5	entirely clear, but we do know it wasn't because of any abuse himself?
5 6	someone. But obviously if he was certainly he had been in charge of safeguarding until a particular moment. He was still, and is still, the diocesan	4 5 6	entirely clear, but we do know it wasn't because of any abuse himself?  A. Yes.
5 6 7	someone. But obviously if he was certainly he had been in charge of safeguarding until a particular moment. He was still, and is still, the diocesan bishop, although I know he is due to retire very shortly. There is, at the very least, the theoretical	4 5 6 7	entirely clear, but we do know it wasn't because of any abuse himself?  A. Yes.  Q. It was because of the management of safeguarding
5 6 7 8	someone. But obviously if he was certainly he had been in charge of safeguarding until a particular moment. He was still, and is still, the diocesan bishop, although I know he is due to retire very	4 5 6 7 8	entirely clear, but we do know it wasn't because of any abuse himself?  A. Yes.  Q. It was because of the management of safeguarding allegations.
5 6 7 8 9	someone. But obviously if he was certainly he had been in charge of safeguarding until a particular moment. He was still, and is still, the diocesan bishop, although I know he is due to retire very shortly. There is, at the very least, the theoretical possibility of risk in those circumstances, isn't there,	4 5 6 7 8 9	entirely clear, but we do know it wasn't because of any abuse himself?  A. Yes.  Q. It was because of the management of safeguarding allegations.  A. Yes.
5 6 7 8 9	someone. But obviously if he was certainly he had been in charge of safeguarding until a particular moment. He was still, and is still, the diocesan bishop, although I know he is due to retire very shortly. There is, at the very least, the theoretical possibility of risk in those circumstances, isn't there, if not the practical reality of risk, because he is	4 5 6 7 8 9	entirely clear, but we do know it wasn't because of any abuse himself?  A. Yes.  Q. It was because of the management of safeguarding allegations.  A. Yes.  Q. So yourself and Archbishop Justin Welby have reached
5 6 7 8 9 10	someone. But obviously if he was certainly he had been in charge of safeguarding until a particular moment. He was still, and is still, the diocesan bishop, although I know he is due to retire very shortly. There is, at the very least, the theoretical possibility of risk in those circumstances, isn't there, if not the practical reality of risk, because he is still in charge?  A. You mean as a diocesan bishop?	4 5 6 7 8 9 10	entirely clear, but we do know it wasn't because of any abuse himself?  A. Yes.  Q. It was because of the management of safeguarding allegations.  A. Yes.  Q. So yourself and Archbishop Justin Welby have reached different conclusions about whether or not the clergy
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	someone. But obviously if he was certainly he had been in charge of safeguarding until a particular moment. He was still, and is still, the diocesan bishop, although I know he is due to retire very shortly. There is, at the very least, the theoretical possibility of risk in those circumstances, isn't there, if not the practical reality of risk, because he is still in charge?	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	entirely clear, but we do know it wasn't because of any abuse himself?  A. Yes. Q. It was because of the management of safeguarding allegations.  A. Yes. Q. So yourself and Archbishop Justin Welby have reached different conclusions about whether or not the clergy whether or not suspension should be used in similar
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	someone. But obviously if he was certainly he had been in charge of safeguarding until a particular moment. He was still, and is still, the diocesan bishop, although I know he is due to retire very shortly. There is, at the very least, the theoretical possibility of risk in those circumstances, isn't there, if not the practical reality of risk, because he is still in charge?  A. You mean as a diocesan bishop?  Q. Yes.  A. But this rather important work of safeguarding, he	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	entirely clear, but we do know it wasn't because of any abuse himself?  A. Yes.  Q. It was because of the management of safeguarding allegations.  A. Yes.  Q. So yourself and Archbishop Justin Welby have reached different conclusions about whether or not the clergy whether or not suspension should be used in similar situations inasmuch as they both involve not any
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	someone. But obviously if he was certainly he had been in charge of safeguarding until a particular moment. He was still, and is still, the diocesan bishop, although I know he is due to retire very shortly. There is, at the very least, the theoretical possibility of risk in those circumstances, isn't there, if not the practical reality of risk, because he is still in charge?  A. You mean as a diocesan bishop?  Q. Yes.  A. But this rather important work of safeguarding, he hasn't got at all any at all, it's all been taken	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	entirely clear, but we do know it wasn't because of any abuse himself?  A. Yes.  Q. It was because of the management of safeguarding allegations.  A. Yes.  Q. So yourself and Archbishop Justin Welby have reached different conclusions about whether or not the clergy whether or not suspension should be used in similar situations inasmuch as they both involve not any allegations of abuse, but about what may or may not have happened in respect of managing safeguarding generally.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	someone. But obviously if he was certainly he had been in charge of safeguarding until a particular moment. He was still, and is still, the diocesan bishop, although I know he is due to retire very shortly. There is, at the very least, the theoretical possibility of risk in those circumstances, isn't there, if not the practical reality of risk, because he is still in charge?  A. You mean as a diocesan bishop?  Q. Yes.  A. But this rather important work of safeguarding, he hasn't got at all any at all, it's all been taken away, and that's, for me, the thing which concerns me.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	entirely clear, but we do know it wasn't because of any abuse himself?  A. Yes.  Q. It was because of the management of safeguarding allegations.  A. Yes.  Q. So yourself and Archbishop Justin Welby have reached different conclusions about whether or not the clergy whether or not suspension should be used in similar situations inasmuch as they both involve not any allegations of abuse, but about what may or may not have happened in respect of managing safeguarding generally.  It's just interesting that you have reached
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	someone. But obviously if he was certainly he had been in charge of safeguarding until a particular moment. He was still, and is still, the diocesan bishop, although I know he is due to retire very shortly. There is, at the very least, the theoretical possibility of risk in those circumstances, isn't there, if not the practical reality of risk, because he is still in charge?  A. You mean as a diocesan bishop?  Q. Yes.  A. But this rather important work of safeguarding, he hasn't got at all any at all, it's all been taken away, and that's, for me, the thing which concerns me. And the fact that he wasn't an abuser had he been	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	entirely clear, but we do know it wasn't because of any abuse himself?  A. Yes.  Q. It was because of the management of safeguarding allegations.  A. Yes.  Q. So yourself and Archbishop Justin Welby have reached different conclusions about whether or not the clergy whether or not suspension should be used in similar situations inasmuch as they both involve not any allegations of abuse, but about what may or may not have happened in respect of managing safeguarding generally.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	someone. But obviously if he was certainly he had been in charge of safeguarding until a particular moment. He was still, and is still, the diocesan bishop, although I know he is due to retire very shortly. There is, at the very least, the theoretical possibility of risk in those circumstances, isn't there, if not the practical reality of risk, because he is still in charge?  A. You mean as a diocesan bishop?  Q. Yes.  A. But this rather important work of safeguarding, he hasn't got at all any at all, it's all been taken away, and that's, for me, the thing which concerns me. And the fact that he wasn't an abuser had he been found there's evidence about him abusing, then he	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	entirely clear, but we do know it wasn't because of any abuse himself?  A. Yes.  Q. It was because of the management of safeguarding allegations.  A. Yes.  Q. So yourself and Archbishop Justin Welby have reached different conclusions about whether or not the clergy whether or not suspension should be used in similar situations inasmuch as they both involve not any allegations of abuse, but about what may or may not have happened in respect of managing safeguarding generally.  It's just interesting that you have reached I mean, obviously we don't know the facts of the Lincoln case. It may well be they are very different?
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	someone. But obviously if he was certainly he had been in charge of safeguarding until a particular moment. He was still, and is still, the diocesan bishop, although I know he is due to retire very shortly. There is, at the very least, the theoretical possibility of risk in those circumstances, isn't there, if not the practical reality of risk, because he is still in charge?  A. You mean as a diocesan bishop?  Q. Yes.  A. But this rather important work of safeguarding, he hasn't got at all any at all, it's all been taken away, and that's, for me, the thing which concerns me. And the fact that he wasn't an abuser had he been found there's evidence about him abusing, then he would have been suspended pretty quickly, but because he	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	entirely clear, but we do know it wasn't because of any abuse himself?  A. Yes.  Q. It was because of the management of safeguarding allegations.  A. Yes.  Q. So yourself and Archbishop Justin Welby have reached different conclusions about whether or not the clergy whether or not suspension should be used in similar situations inasmuch as they both involve not any allegations of abuse, but about what may or may not have happened in respect of managing safeguarding generally.  It's just interesting that you have reached I mean, obviously we don't know the facts of the Lincoln case. It may well be they are very different?  A. Well, had I the same facts as those in Lincoln, you can
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	someone. But obviously if he was certainly he had been in charge of safeguarding until a particular moment. He was still, and is still, the diocesan bishop, although I know he is due to retire very shortly. There is, at the very least, the theoretical possibility of risk in those circumstances, isn't there, if not the practical reality of risk, because he is still in charge?  A. You mean as a diocesan bishop?  Q. Yes.  A. But this rather important work of safeguarding, he hasn't got at all any at all, it's all been taken away, and that's, for me, the thing which concerns me. And the fact that he wasn't an abuser had he been found there's evidence about him abusing, then he would have been suspended pretty quickly, but because he mishandled, misjudged, this particular PTO question, the	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	entirely clear, but we do know it wasn't because of any abuse himself?  A. Yes.  Q. It was because of the management of safeguarding allegations.  A. Yes.  Q. So yourself and Archbishop Justin Welby have reached different conclusions about whether or not the clergy whether or not suspension should be used in similar situations inasmuch as they both involve not any allegations of abuse, but about what may or may not have happened in respect of managing safeguarding generally.  It's just interesting that you have reached I mean, obviously we don't know the facts of the Lincoln case. It may well be they are very different?
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	someone. But obviously if he was certainly he had been in charge of safeguarding until a particular moment. He was still, and is still, the diocesan bishop, although I know he is due to retire very shortly. There is, at the very least, the theoretical possibility of risk in those circumstances, isn't there, if not the practical reality of risk, because he is still in charge?  A. You mean as a diocesan bishop?  Q. Yes.  A. But this rather important work of safeguarding, he hasn't got at all any at all, it's all been taken away, and that's, for me, the thing which concerns me. And the fact that he wasn't an abuser had he been found there's evidence about him abusing, then he would have been suspended pretty quickly, but because he mishandled, misjudged, this particular PTO question, the advice is very clear, and in fact, the Vicar General	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	entirely clear, but we do know it wasn't because of any abuse himself?  A. Yes.  Q. It was because of the management of safeguarding allegations.  A. Yes.  Q. So yourself and Archbishop Justin Welby have reached different conclusions about whether or not the clergy whether or not suspension should be used in similar situations inasmuch as they both involve not any allegations of abuse, but about what may or may not have happened in respect of managing safeguarding generally.  It's just interesting that you have reached I mean, obviously we don't know the facts of the Lincoln case. It may well be they are very different?  A. Well, had I the same facts as those in Lincoln, you can rest assured he would have been suspended. But the facts of Lincoln are so different from this particular
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	someone. But obviously if he was certainly he had been in charge of safeguarding until a particular moment. He was still, and is still, the diocesan bishop, although I know he is due to retire very shortly. There is, at the very least, the theoretical possibility of risk in those circumstances, isn't there, if not the practical reality of risk, because he is still in charge?  A. You mean as a diocesan bishop?  Q. Yes.  A. But this rather important work of safeguarding, he hasn't got at all any at all, it's all been taken away, and that's, for me, the thing which concerns me. And the fact that he wasn't an abuser had he been found there's evidence about him abusing, then he would have been suspended pretty quickly, but because he mishandled, misjudged, this particular PTO question, the advice is very clear, and in fact, the Vicar General also looked at ACAS and what's their recommendation	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	entirely clear, but we do know it wasn't because of any abuse himself?  A. Yes.  Q. It was because of the management of safeguarding allegations.  A. Yes.  Q. So yourself and Archbishop Justin Welby have reached different conclusions about whether or not the clergy whether or not suspension should be used in similar situations inasmuch as they both involve not any allegations of abuse, but about what may or may not have happened in respect of managing safeguarding generally.  It's just interesting that you have reached I mean, obviously we don't know the facts of the Lincoln case. It may well be they are very different?  A. Well, had I the same facts as those in Lincoln, you can rest assured he would have been suspended. But the facts of Lincoln are so different from this particular case
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	someone. But obviously if he was certainly he had been in charge of safeguarding until a particular moment. He was still, and is still, the diocesan bishop, although I know he is due to retire very shortly. There is, at the very least, the theoretical possibility of risk in those circumstances, isn't there, if not the practical reality of risk, because he is still in charge?  A. You mean as a diocesan bishop?  Q. Yes.  A. But this rather important work of safeguarding, he hasn't got at all any at all, it's all been taken away, and that's, for me, the thing which concerns me. And the fact that he wasn't an abuser had he been found there's evidence about him abusing, then he would have been suspended pretty quickly, but because he mishandled, misjudged, this particular PTO question, the advice is very clear, and in fact, the Vicar General also looked at ACAS and what's their recommendation about suspension; that, actually, suspension should not	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	entirely clear, but we do know it wasn't because of any abuse himself?  A. Yes.  Q. It was because of the management of safeguarding allegations.  A. Yes.  Q. So yourself and Archbishop Justin Welby have reached different conclusions about whether or not the clergy whether or not suspension should be used in similar situations inasmuch as they both involve not any allegations of abuse, but about what may or may not have happened in respect of managing safeguarding generally.  It's just interesting that you have reached I mean, obviously we don't know the facts of the Lincoln case. It may well be they are very different?  A. Well, had I the same facts as those in Lincoln, you can rest assured he would have been suspended. But the facts of Lincoln are so different from this particular case
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	someone. But obviously if he was certainly he had been in charge of safeguarding until a particular moment. He was still, and is still, the diocesan bishop, although I know he is due to retire very shortly. There is, at the very least, the theoretical possibility of risk in those circumstances, isn't there, if not the practical reality of risk, because he is still in charge?  A. You mean as a diocesan bishop?  Q. Yes.  A. But this rather important work of safeguarding, he hasn't got at all any at all, it's all been taken away, and that's, for me, the thing which concerns me. And the fact that he wasn't an abuser had he been found there's evidence about him abusing, then he would have been suspended pretty quickly, but because he mishandled, misjudged, this particular PTO question, the advice is very clear, and in fact, the Vicar General also looked at ACAS and what's their recommendation about suspension; that, actually, suspension should not always be automatic, you have to explain, you have to	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	entirely clear, but we do know it wasn't because of any abuse himself?  A. Yes.  Q. It was because of the management of safeguarding allegations.  A. Yes.  Q. So yourself and Archbishop Justin Welby have reached different conclusions about whether or not the clergy whether or not suspension should be used in similar situations inasmuch as they both involve not any allegations of abuse, but about what may or may not have happened in respect of managing safeguarding generally.  It's just interesting that you have reached I mean, obviously we don't know the facts of the Lincoln case. It may well be they are very different?  A. Well, had I the same facts as those in Lincoln, you can rest assured he would have been suspended. But the facts of Lincoln are so different from this particular case  Q. Like comparing an apple to an orange then?  A. Yes, yes, yes. As I always say to people, if you have
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	someone. But obviously if he was certainly he had been in charge of safeguarding until a particular moment. He was still, and is still, the diocesan bishop, although I know he is due to retire very shortly. There is, at the very least, the theoretical possibility of risk in those circumstances, isn't there, if not the practical reality of risk, because he is still in charge?  A. You mean as a diocesan bishop?  Q. Yes.  A. But this rather important work of safeguarding, he hasn't got at all any at all, it's all been taken away, and that's, for me, the thing which concerns me. And the fact that he wasn't an abuser had he been found there's evidence about him abusing, then he would have been suspended pretty quickly, but because he mishandled, misjudged, this particular PTO question, the advice is very clear, and in fact, the Vicar General also looked at ACAS and what's their recommendation about suspension; that, actually, suspension should not	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	entirely clear, but we do know it wasn't because of any abuse himself?  A. Yes.  Q. It was because of the management of safeguarding allegations.  A. Yes.  Q. So yourself and Archbishop Justin Welby have reached different conclusions about whether or not the clergy whether or not suspension should be used in similar situations inasmuch as they both involve not any allegations of abuse, but about what may or may not have happened in respect of managing safeguarding generally.  It's just interesting that you have reached I mean, obviously we don't know the facts of the Lincoln case. It may well be they are very different?  A. Well, had I the same facts as those in Lincoln, you can rest assured he would have been suspended. But the facts of Lincoln are so different from this particular case
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	someone. But obviously if he was certainly he had been in charge of safeguarding until a particular moment. He was still, and is still, the diocesan bishop, although I know he is due to retire very shortly. There is, at the very least, the theoretical possibility of risk in those circumstances, isn't there, if not the practical reality of risk, because he is still in charge?  A. You mean as a diocesan bishop?  Q. Yes.  A. But this rather important work of safeguarding, he hasn't got at all any at all, it's all been taken away, and that's, for me, the thing which concerns me. And the fact that he wasn't an abuser had he been found there's evidence about him abusing, then he would have been suspended pretty quickly, but because he mishandled, misjudged, this particular PTO question, the advice is very clear, and in fact, the Vicar General also looked at ACAS and what's their recommendation about suspension; that, actually, suspension should not always be automatic, you have to explain, you have to	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	entirely clear, but we do know it wasn't because of any abuse himself?  A. Yes.  Q. It was because of the management of safeguarding allegations.  A. Yes.  Q. So yourself and Archbishop Justin Welby have reached different conclusions about whether or not the clergy whether or not suspension should be used in similar situations inasmuch as they both involve not any allegations of abuse, but about what may or may not have happened in respect of managing safeguarding generally.  It's just interesting that you have reached I mean, obviously we don't know the facts of the Lincoln case. It may well be they are very different?  A. Well, had I the same facts as those in Lincoln, you can rest assured he would have been suspended. But the facts of Lincoln are so different from this particular case  Q. Like comparing an apple to an orange then?  A. Yes, yes, yes. As I always say to people, if you have

1 1 won't get it. So I wouldn't -- the facts are so, so safeguarding to another bishop by instrument, not by 2 different, and if the Archbishop of Canterbury is asked 2 words, I would have suspended him. 3 why he did the suspension -- of course, suspension is 3 Q. I suppose the other question is, at the moment, the 4 always a very neutral act, but the facts are so, so 4 processes one has to undergo -- and one completely 5 different, and if you can distinguish -- as you know, in 5 understands why there has to be a process of appropriate 6 law, things may look alike, but actually what matters justice, although the length of that justice might be 7 are the facts themselves. difficult. But should there not be some kind of summary 8 Q. Like cases must be treated alike, different cases must 8 mechanism in cases of obvious -- a bit like gross 9 be treated differently? 9 misconduct? I mean, at the moment, one can have a gross 10 A. Yes. 10 misconduct process, but that process can take quite 11 Q. But I suppose, even if Bishop Forster had obviously had 11 a considerable period of time. There are sort of 12 a discussion with you and you had indicated to him that 12 swifter processes which can take place in other 13 he had to legally delegate safeguarding 13 jurisdictions. Do you think that you should have 14 responsibilities, you could at least have considered 14 different or more extended powers? And I'm asked to ask 15 suspending him in order as a sort of mark of "This sort 15 this question on behalf of Switalskis and 16 of behaviour will not be tolerated", to send a message? 16 Mr David Greenwood, just to indicate that. 17 A. Yes, I did contemplate. I did contemplate suspension, 17 18 hence the getting all the law very clearly lined up to 18 Q. I mean, shouldn't there be the equivalent of being 19 see where the powers to suspend were and, unfortunately, 19 20 the facts of this case being so different from Lincoln, 20 A. The question of -- the question of suspension, because it's a neutral act, the police who did carry out the 21 to just suspend, ACAS would have said to me, if I read 21 22 22 their law properly, that anything which looks like you investigation --23 must always automatically suspend actually could go 23 Q. Yes, they did. 24 against natural justice. But in this particular case, 24 A. -- they decided to take it no further because they did 25 I was absolutely sure -- had he not delegated 25 not have evidence of abuse of authority -- abuse of Page 161 Page 162 1 power. I mean, that's what they came to the conclusion. 1 recused myself because of my dealing with the Whitsey 2 2 Though they end up their report, which is given to the 3 3 church through the National Safeguarding Team, that if O. Of course 4 4 A. That CDM is going to be determined by the Archbishop of further evidence comes, they will pursue it again. 5 So if the police actually also say they haven't got 5 Canterbury once he's got his reports -- scrutiny report 6 the facts that he has abused power, for me then to just on what the Provincial Registrar judges to be the case, 6 7 simply say, "This is what the police have come to the 7 and it will be adjudicated and, should the bishop decide 8 conclusion to, but I actually think I need to suspend", 8 to appeal, then that will go to a tribunal at some 9 point, but also, that's why the National Safeguarding 10 Q. There is a difference -- if I am going to dance on the 10 Team have also set up an enquiry, an investigation, into 11 head of a pin, there is a difference between proving 11 this particular thing, apart from the CDM. 12 allegations of misconduct in public office which is 12 So all the power -- so the law in this case being 13 beyond a reasonable doubt, one would have to demonstrate 13 applied, and in my book he cannot have that CDM decided 14 beyond a reasonable doubt misconduct in the public 14 and then the investigation, his handling of it, by 15 office, and there are various ingredients which have to 15 a very experienced person. So those are in place at the 16 be identified, and a situation of conduct unbecoming, 16 moment. 17 which is what the test is likely to be under CDM, the 17 Q. Can I ask, in respect of CDM more generally, is the 18 relevant threshold, which is decided on the balance of 18 issue of suspending clergy from office always a very 19 probabilities and which is a much broader test, conduct 19 difficult one? I mean, how often have you suspended 20 unbecoming. You could easily fall within conduct 20 a cleric from his ministry? 21 unbecoming and not fall within misconduct in public 21 A. Where there was a very clear risk, I have done it, and 22 office, particularly in respect of a failure in respect 22 there is no -- I mean, there are no -- there is no 23 of risk management, rather than any abusive behaviour 23 question of -- even of a conversation, because you 24 personally? 24 simply follow what is laid down in the Clergy Discipline 25 A. Well, that's why the CDM has been sent, and I have 25 Measure that in section 37, "I'm suspending you on Page 164 Page 163

1 1 ground this, this, this". Of course, once suspended, particular person lives in the Archdeaconry of Cleveland 2 2 they can appeal to the President of the Tribunal and, as or East Riding or Selby. The bishop responsible for 3 I know, in one particular case where somebody appealed 3 that particular archdeaconry immediately becomes the 4 the President of the Tribunal, the President of 4 pastor and, as far as I am concerned, I'm the judge, 5 the Tribunal dismissed it. So there is always a safety 5 because of doing -- fulfilling that quasi-judicial. 6 net at some point. So I am absolutely sure that the I have not found that difficult, because the pastoral 6 7 7 threshold is not that very high, but the facts have got matters are taken on by the other suffragan bishops. So 8 to tell me there would be real hurt and real trouble if 8 there should be no conflict in a diocese where there are 9 this person is not suspended. 9 some suffragan bishops. 10 Q. Can I just ask, we have seen earlier in the week, and we 10 Q. I suppose the issue in terms of the conflict -- I mean, 11 have had various forms of evidence from bishops, about 11 firstly, you're in a very fortunate position because 12 obviously you have held judicial office and you've 12 sometimes the challenges they feel in balancing the 13 pastoral and disciplinary role, and we have seen 13 trained as a lawyer and, therefore, probably, the 14 14 administration of discipline is more -- you're more a report -- we saw it this morning with Adrian Iles who 15 15 came to give us evidence -- about bishops identifying naturally able to use the skills of forensic analysis 16 that they found that quite challenging and they didn't 16 than maybe some of the other bishops who don't have your 17 really like being, what they said, prosecutor, judge and 17 qualifications and training would have. 18 jury in respect of Clergy Discipline Measure complaints. 18 Secondly, is there not, however, an inherent 19 Do you see there being any tension between the two 19 tension, even if you're not directly responsible for 20 roles, and is that something which you find a challenge? 20 pastoral care during the process of any clerical 21 A. No. The thing is this: there were only two dioceses 21 discipline, in terms of the fact that you are 22 until recently where there wasn't a suffragan bishop. 22 disciplining one of your own, so to speak, and that 23 23 there is an inherent difficulty in -- they're one of That was Leicester and Newcastle. They have now 24 got suffragan bishops. In my case, as soon as a CDM 24 your tribe, for want of a better word, they are one of 25 25 your gang, and therefore you have to -- you know, it may arises and I get a copy of it, I know immediately that Page 165 Page 166 1 well be difficult for you to administer discipline in 1 I did those particular courses. 2 2 those sorts of circumstances? So I actually think that if the bishops are still 3 A. The Ordinal spells it out very carefully, that the 3 finding a conflict being the one who exercises 4 4 bishop's duty is to exercise discipline with mercy. So discipline but with mercy and, therefore, they want to 5 be pastor at the same time, well, I'm afraid they have 5 discipline is part of being a bishop. We, in York, with 6 my four suffragans, have all had to go on training of got suffragan bishops. They should do the pastoral 6 7 what is required for a bishop distinguished between 7 matter and you should be sticking -- after all, the 8 pastoral responsibility and discipline under the Clergy 8 registrar of any diocese does a scrutiny report and the Discipline Measure. And we never cross the line at all. grounds on which this can be taken, so the registrar has 10 They are kept quite separately. And I just think that 10 given -- although you're the judge in the end, 11 11 if bishops are finding it difficult to exercise nevertheless, you're not just starting doing it 12 discipline, which is already one of their duties in the 12 yourself, the registrar actually provides you the 13 13 reasons why this case is going this way or that way, so Ordinal, they should go on a course. 14 14 they should acquaint themselves with a little bit of Q. One of the issues that's been raised by the House of 15 15 training, and that actually would -- I didn't know Bishops is the need for better guidance and training. 16 I could get to grips with safeguarding until I've gone 16 Do you have any particular views about the adequacy of 17 17 the guidance and training for non-legally qualified to the courses that I've been put on. 18 Q. How about the relationship between the diocesan 18 individuals? 19 19 registrar and the bishop? Do you think the diocesan A. Yes, there should be another guide. We should produce 20 registrar, it is a bit too cosy a relationship or there 20 some -- this is between all the walks of life. In any 2.1 are issues to do with apparent bias because of the role 21 work that you are doing and you are not comfortable 22 22 that the diocesan registrar plays in providing a range within it, I actually believe that training gives you 23 slightly more confidence, and because I have completed 23 of advice to the bishop on a day-to-day basis and 24 therefore it could be felt that, you know, it's all 24 all the raft of training that's required, I'm slightly more confident about safeguarding than I was before 25 a bit too chummy and cosy? 25

Page 167

1 A. Well, all I can say, that the three registrars I've 1 necessarily create a cosy sort of relationship. 2 had -- Lionel was the first and he's retired, 2 Q. Can I ask your views about a slightly separate topic 3 Caroline Mockford came on and then she died. I've got 3 before I move sort of back to the culture of the church 4 Louise now. Neither of them ever gave advice which they 4 and clericalism. Could I ask your views about the seal 5 didn't stand by and I would be foolish to disregard. So 5 of the confessional. We heard some evidence last week. 6 I don't actually want to have a very cosy relationship We know that there is not agreement, shall we say, 6 7 7 with the lawyer who is advising me. I have got to allow within the church about what should happen in respect of 8 them to say -- and, of course, in the end, there was one 8 either its abolition entirely or there to be some kind Q particular case I was dealing with, I was advised one 9 of qualified exception, as there has been in Australia, 10 way and, before I made my judgment, some more evidence 10 in respect of, if there is likely, or the possibility 11 came in and then I had a conversation with the 11 of, serious harm to the individual, then the seal of 12 registrar, "By the way, did you ever notice this piece 12 the confessional can be broken. 13 of evidence in the" -- he hadn't noticed it. In the 13 Do you have any particular views about that from end, he said, "Yes, it should go this way". a theological or doctrinal standpoint? 14 14 15 15 A. In my preface to the Cahill Report, I actually advised If the safeguarding adviser really is respected, is 16 treated with respect that they are professionals, then 16 that the seal of the confessional should actually be 17 the relationship between the bishop, the registrar and 17 looked at very seriously by the church, because one 18 the advisor, who always gets their advice from the core 18 young man, who was still in Australia when I got in 19 group that actually advises, I think the matters would 19 touch with them, was abused. The only thing he wanted 20 be very -- could be very different. So I don't regard, 20 us to do was really not to make the seal of 21 21 for example, the advice I was given about whether to the confessional so watertight that some survivors 22 suspend the Bishop of Chester by the Vicar General, he's 22 really may find it difficult then to disclose, and so, 23 been a judge and his judgment often is right. If 23 out of Cahill, when we were looking at the National I didn't agree with him, I've got to find reasons why 24 24 Safeguarding Team, that was one of the advice I put on 25 I'm disagreeing with him. So I don't think that should 25 the table, that this has got to be looked at and there Page 169 Page 170 1 has been a paper that has gone into it. survivors can then be confident that you are not using 2 2 I, for myself, have been thrown into areas I never something else to cover up some abuse. 3 3 wanted to go into of offering pastoral support to Q. When you say mandatory reporting, I think we have to be 4 4 quite careful. The chair and panel have listened to survivors of sexual abuse. You go away absolutely --5 5 you know, almost punch drunk because of what you have a lot of evidence from a number of jurisdictions and 6 heard. It's just so horrendous that, if there's 6 undertaken very many seminars, and I know different 7 anything that stands in the way of disclosure, it should 7 people have different views about it. Are you talking 8 be removed. So I am one of those on the side, like 8 about clergy having a duty to report to statutory Bursell, I think you heard his evidence here -authorities or to their own authority, who are then 10 Q. Yes, we did? 10 under a duty to report to statutory authorities, or are 11 11 A. -- on the side that the seal of the confessional really you talking about there being a general piece of statute 12 cannot be left watertight, and maybe if people don't 12 law, not just Canon law, but passed through 13 want to change -- because the confessional comes into 13 UK Parliament with a criminal sanction if you don't 14 the parish, that is the pastoral concern, somebody comes 14 report disclosures or allegations of abuse? 15 15 and talks to you and wants to get a bit of advice, and A. Well, at the moment, in the Church of England, when 16 then there is your confessional bit of it, which is 16 a child discloses, you've got a duty to report. And 17 a penitent --17 I want to extend it that, actually, structures -- the 18 18 structures -- for example, if a child discloses sexual O. Yes, the sacrament of --19 19 A. -- who comes and wants to get absolution. Now, I'm not abuse in a Sunday school, you know, Scouting, whatever, 20 so sure that I would give absolution to somebody if they 20 those kinds of groups where there are very clear 21 don't take responsibility for their actions and they 21 structures that are in there, my view is that 22 22 don't want to go to the police. I would find that very structurally, when those do exist, reporting must be 23 difficult. 23 mandatory, and how you work it out and resolve it and 24 So maybe the way around this is mandatory reporting, 24 find a way of putting it in statute, I think that's 25 because that is more likely to ensure that, actually, 25 a secondary matter. The first, primary one is this

Page 171

- 1 mandatory reporting. I mean, I -- and I would like to 2 encourage Sunday school classes, you know, young 3 children in the choir, so wherever there are structures 4 of people gathering, I think that's where the mandatory
- 5 reporting must be paramount, as far as I'm concerned.
- 6 Q. And any situation where children are involved or 7 engaged --
- 8 A. Yes.

25

1

2

13

- 9 Q. -- whether it is a religious organisation or any other 10 form of organisation?
- 11 A. Exactly, exactly.
- 12 Q. Should that be backed by disciplinary sanctions or by 13 criminal sanctions? You are obviously a member of 14 the Lords Spiritual, so at some point you may well have
- 15 to debate this issue?
- 16 A. I think that is a matter for debate but there is no 17 doubt in my mind that mandatory reporting could give 18 more confidence to survivors that the matter will not be 19 swept under the carpet or people think there are no 20 sanctions if they didn't report. Sometimes, you know, 21 tough law can help change a culture. I mean, isn't it 22 true that, for example, smoking, banning smoking, we 23 suddenly get fresher air than we were getting before. 24 Plastic, not dropping it, you know, and if you do, you
  - Page 173

else, because, again, in the letter of the Philippians

Paul says, "Regard other people better than yourself",

are going to be fined. So there are certain sanctions

3 and Jesus is saying, "I am among you as one who serves". 4 So the service element should be what characterises 5 the church, but for so long there has been this thing, 6 "Father knows best", and I actually think that does not 7 give confidence. I hope, the way I carry out my 8 ministry, people realise I'm a vulnerable person like anybody else. I am not a saint. I am -- while I'm 10 still on earth, I am capable of doing something wrong 11 I will regret, I -- and as long as people are told, 12 "Don't put too much confidence in people because they

are wearing clerical garb. They are just -- in fact,

- 14 they wear those clothes in order to tell everybody how 15 weak they are, not how powerful they are". But 16 unfortunately, for some, it gives a bit of confidence
- 17 and, you know, raising your nose and all that kind of 18
- 19 Q. What do you think the church can do to try and educate 20 its clerics about the perils of the abuse of power,
- 21 about the elevated nose, as you have just identified?
- 22 A. The Church of England has set in motion Setting God's 23 People Free, which is about the partnership between the
- 24 clergy and the laity but concentrating more on letting 25 the gifts of the laity bubble up to the top. Often,
  - Page 175

- 1 that are put in for the common good of everybody, and I,
- 2 for myself, think that if you are going to keep the seal
- 3 of the confessional in organisations and groups wherever
- 4 they are, there must be a duty mandatorily to report.
- 5 Q. Can I move on to something which is not about the seal
- 6 of the confessional but is about maybe something that
- 7 the seal of the confessional represents, which is the
- 8 idea of clericalism in the church, ie, that, you know,
- 9 as people of God, those who are clerics are above lay
- 10 people, and you talked just earlier about the abuse of
- 11 power and about the issue of corruption. Do you think
- 12 that clericalism is still a big problem in the
- 13 Church of England?
- 14 A. In my statement, I actually think that the words
- "clericalism" and "deference", they definitely do exist, 15
- 16 the trouble with it, if you do not explain it carefully,
- 17 you could go out thinking this characteristic is only
- with the clergy. What I see all around -- you know, 18
- 19 Jimmy Savile was a celebrity, so nobody ever anticipated
- 20 he would abuse. Okay? That would be the equivalent of
- 21 clericalism really. So, for me, it is to look out for
  - abuse of power and question authority and misplaced --
- 23 and mistrust.

22

24

25

- I am a sinner, and I know that I can do things that
- are not right, and I should not put myself above anybody

### Page 174

- 1 somebody has said, when things don't work in the parish,
- 2 either the churchwarden is being quite difficult, but
- 3 most of the time some of the clergy could actually be
- 4 the cork in the bottle. And the only way you could ever
- 5 change the culture is again by training, and it's got to
- be consistent, it's going to be of the highest quality 6
- 7 and you've got to persuade everybody, "Please do not
- 8 regard yourself" -- because we are not. Whatever it is

you wear, whatever it is you are doing in church, you're

- 10 supposed to be a servant of everybody else, and,
- 11 therefore, do not luxuriate about vourself because "I'm
- 12 Reverend this", "Reverend the other". I'm Sentamu, and
- 13
- therefore I constantly have to watch that I'm also
- 14 capable of falling pretty, pretty heavily down
- 15 somewhere.
- 16 Q. Can I ask about the culture of the church in terms of,
- 17 has having more women in senior roles within the church
- 18 made a difference in terms of the culture of clericalism
- 19 or tribalism or whatever you want to call it?
- 20 A. In my statement, I actually talk about the ordination of 21 women to the priesthood and the Episcopacy has been
- 22 a great, great asset. You notice this when we are in
- 23 the House of Lords, now that we have five women bishops
- 24 among the 26, it's very difficult to quantify or to
  - explain why this is, but even in the House of Bishops,

Page 176

25

1 1 some of our rather outrageous language is beginning to organise all our conferences for potential ordinands. 2 2 cease, really. So I think there is tremendous --And she went through what they call a safeguarding 3 3 something to celebrate about the ministry of women in screening by that particular body. They had to be 4 the church. But already there were some who, too, were 4 confident, before she went to a panel, that actually she 5 not liking the culture of deference, really, and 5 understood the policy of the Church of England on 6 6 safeguarding, particularly that report on promoting therefore my hope is that we will, as a church, emerge 7 7 out of all this unfortunate, really terrible pain that a safe church, and then had to sign a confidential 8 some of our people have suffered through sexual abuse, declaration form to ensure that she has no criminal Q that we will be a church which is watching, looking, record, no reprimand, no warning from the police, and 10 purposeful and that, as I said earlier on, safeguarding 10 that she's safe to work with children and vulnerable 11 is at the heart of the gospel because everybody must 11 adults. So that was done. 12 12 flourish. And then she went to a panel and they recommended 13 Q. Now, in respect of the role of women in clergy, I'm 13 that she should begin her training post ordination, so 14 14 asked to ask you this question on behalf of the training was going to happen post ordination. 15 David Greenwood, because very recently your wife has 15 Q. So she's had the vetting but not the training? 16 16 been ordained by yourself. A. The training is going to begin at Cranmer. She's 17 A. Yes. 17 already got her Masters in Theology and Leadership and 18 Q. Has your wife undergone the relevant training and 18 that her training will begin in September with Cranmer 19 vetting requirements that are required of prospective 19 and will do a two-year course, attending there one day 20 ordinands, or is there -- and if she hasn't, is there 20 a week. 21 any particular explanation of that? 21 But in the background is just to say to the inquiry 22 A. Margaret, before she went to -- she went to 22 that her work with the Leeds and Yorkshire mental 23 23 a candidates' panel to determine her vocation. And health, which she's been doing for six years, she's had 24 24 before she went there, she went through the Ministry training in dealing with safeguarding questions in her 25 25 leadership first of all in -- on the board itself, but Division. That's the body in Church House that tries to Page 177 Page 178 1 also what they call a health manager when she goes and 1 would usually take place prior to ordination, is going 2 2 visits patients who are in dispute of their doctors to take place post ordination. Is that something which 3 whether they should be discharged or not. 3 is unusual and special because she is the 4 Q. An approved mental health professional? 4 Reverend Sentamu, wife of the Archbishop of York, or is 5 5 A. Yes. So she's got all that training. And she -- all it something which you have known happen in other cases? 6 the ordinands who go through training, before they are 6 A. Never anything because she happens to be married to me. 7 put in a parish placement, normally about, you know, 7 It is just that the Ministry Division were satisfied 8 sometimes three months or two months, however long, they 8 with her safeguarding screening, because that had to have got to do a C1 to start with before they go out 9 happen first before she went to the candidates' panel. 10 into parishes, and by the time they finish their 10 The candidates' panel recommends that training should 11 training, they should have done C2 and then they get 11 begin post ordination and then she completes C1, which 12 ordained. And the assumption of the guidance is 12 is online, and then C2 on the 2nd of this month. 13 13 assuming that everybody -- whoever gets ordained is Q. Can I pass now to ask a question on behalf of 14 going to go through the college, but they haven't 14 Slater & Gordon, which they are entitled to ask under 15 15 actually catered for what happens when the candidates' rule 10 of the Inquiry Rules. These are some questions 16 panel has recommended, get ordained and then do your 16 about Victor Whitsey's clergy file. They identify that 17 training. And in fact she completed a C1, which is done 17 Dr Peter Forster, in his witness statement, identifies 18 online, and her C2 on the Tuesday after her ordination, 18 that Victor Whitsey's clergy file was not -- has not been present, for example, in Bishopthorpe Palace, which 19 but before she began and accepted to be 19 20 a non-stipendiary curate at St Chad's, which was on the 20 is where it would usually be, because he was Bishop of 2.1 21 the York Province, as I understand it. Can I just 22 22 Q. Can I just identify therefore, the Safer Recruitment identify why that file doesn't exist? 23 process as identified in the church's guidance has 23 A. We have been looking for it everywhere and then suddenly 24 therefore been followed, as far as I understand your 24 realised why we didn't find it. Clergy blue files were 25 evidence. However, the training, the C1 and C2, which 25 created in 1986 by Graham James, who was the senior Page 179

- selection secretary in the Ministry Division and was also chaplain to Robert Runcie. So they were created in 1986, they didn't exist before.
- 4 Q. Is that Graham James who is now the Bishop of Norwich?
- 5 A. Who was the Bishop of Norwich, he is now retired.
- 6 Q. Right?
- 7 A. He is now retired. So he's responsible for the blue
- 8 file and its creation, but it didn't come into being
- 9 until 1986. Victor Whitsey resigned or retired in 1981.
- Q. Yes. He died in -- sorry, I think he retired in 1981
   and I think he died --
- 12 A. And then died in 1987 --
- 13 Q. Yes.

24

1

2

7

- 14 A. -- before the blue form was -- a file actually created
- 15 for him. And from 1986, the House of Bishops took
- a decision that when a clergy person moves from one
- 17 diocese or one parish -- one diocese to another, the
- 18 blue file should follow that priest. The same is true
- of a bishop. If a bishop changes provinces, that file
- should be sent to the appropriate archbishop.
- 21 So if at all there is a file on Victor Whitsey,
- 22 there would have been probably a little paper thing
- 23 about his ordination certificate and his training and
- as deacon. So there was no blue file until 1986.
  - Page 181

all of that in the diocese where he was first ordained

- I'm turning to Mr O'Donnell and Mr Scorer. Am
  - I correct in that assumption? Oh, Peter Forster said
- 3 it. Sorry, I do apologise. I wasn't -- I'm afraid
- 4 I obviously haven't been scrutinising Dr Peter Forster's
- 5 evidence. But he says that they were lost in a flood.
- 6 So he's given a completely different explanation to your
  - explanation. So Slater & Gordon have provided a whole
- 8 load of questions about flood risk, but I'm not going to
- 9 ask you them unless it is relevant. Did you think they
- 10 were lost in a flood? Has that been a previous
- 11 explanation? Do you know anything about this?
- 12 A. There were floods. Some wonderful books were lost in
- 13 the basement in 1992. But before the flood got anywhere
- 14 near -- in fact, Victor Whitsey's file would have
- been -- this is 1992? His file, if it existed, would
- 16 have been in the Borthwick Institute where all those
- 17 retired clergy files go. So I don't -- I think the
- 18 bishop -- because he knew there was a flood in 1992,
- 19 I think that's more of guesswork on his part, not actual20 reality.
- 20 reality.
- Q. Had you ever told him, or have you ever said to anyone,
- that the file got lost in a flood?
- 23 A. Never. Not me. I don't -- by nature, I don't try to
- 24 speculate about things that I can't substantiate.
- 25 Q. I think, at the very least, I don't have to ask you

Page 183

- 1 Q. Why is it, then, that we do have files -- because within
- 2 the context of this investigation we have looked at
- 3 quite a lot of matters which date back to the 1960s and
- 4 the 1970s, and we do have the blue files, for example,
- 5 from the late Bishop Ball. We have his blue file. We
  - had his blue file, which had everything back to the
- 7 early 1950s. Even though he was, I think, first
- 8 ordained a bishop in 1977. So that preceded the
- 9 introduction of the blue files, as you identify them?
- 10 A. The creation of the blue file in '86 demanded that all
- dioceses, wherever their clergy file were, must create
- 12 a blue file. So later in life, when he becomes
- a bishop, the papers, wherever they were -- so the
- digging we have got to do is, where did Victor Whitsey
- 15 first of all get ordained as a deacon and then a priest,
- 16 those little flimsy, little things, still in that
- 17 diocese. Had he lived on, let's say, and he didn't
- retire in '81, let's say he retired in --
- 19 Q. '87 or '88?
- 20 A. -- '88, there would have been a desire to actually find
- 21 where his papers are and turn them into a blue file.
- 22 Q. Slater & Gordon have asked me some questions about
- a flood. I believe at some point somebody has said that
- the Victor Whitsey files have got lost in a flood. So
  - they have given a different explanation.

# Page 182

- 1 about your knowledge of flood risk in York in the next
- 2 few questions, but thank you very much for clarifying
- 3 that.

25

10

15

- 4 You famously removed your dog collar for a long
- 5 period of time because of what was the obvious lack of
- 6 justice and democracy in Zimbabwe. Do you feel
- 7 a similar sense of outrage and shame and should you
- 8 symbolically remove your dog collar now about the way
- 9 the Church of England has behaved to victims and
  - the Charen of England has behaved to victims and
  - survivors of sexual abuse?
- 11 A. Prophetic arts, if they are repeatedly being given, lose
- 12 their significance and importance. So if I cut up my
- 13 dog collar because of the abuses in the church, they
- 14 will simply say, "Here he goes again", and I don't think
  - they will take any notice.
- 16 What will be important, as I said at the beginning,
- is that this inquiry wanting us to give evidence and
- look at four cases which they determined has largely
- 19 been an asset for us. So I actually think that
- 20 somehow -- yes, I know SCIE is going to come to us
- 21 in March next year, but the only way we are going to
- really show, first of all, that our sorrow and sadness
- 23 and repentance and asking for forgiveness from those
- 24 that the church has harmed will be more actions like
  - quickly creating the safe space, being willing to set up

Page 184

25

		Т	
1	an Ombudsman-type body for the survivors who feel they	1	it leaves you in some parts numb; other parts, saying,
2	have not been properly treated to go and seek redress	2	"Why? Why, oh, my, when you're supposed to be
3	from that particular side. So actually, it is	3	a church of Jesus Christ, we didn't follow what he says
4	a collective action we have got to do. An individual	4	about children?"
5	person, I think said to me, "I can hear it coming,	5	MS SCOLDING: Thank you very much, Archbishop Sentamu.
6	Sentamu. Look at him again".	6	Chair and panel, I now pass to you.
7	Q. Is there anything else you would like to say to this	7	THE CHAIR: Ms Sharpling?
8	inquiry before I pass over to the chair and panel for	8	Questions by THE PANEL
9	any questions?	9	MS SHARPLING: Thank you, Archbishop Sentamu. Could you
10	A. No. All I just want to say from the Diocese of York and	10	just clarify something for me: we heard evidence from
11	the Province of York, is just to thank you people,	11	Mr Ineson today, and if the church accept that he was
12	because you have been able to probe, able to ask	12	abused as a young lad whilst under the care of
13	questions, and your first report with its five	13	the church, is there now any impediment for an apology
14	recommendations, which were important, is hard hitting,	14	to be given for that abuse? Leaving aside anything that
15	but, again, when you read the report I'm not	15	might have happened subsequently, is there any
16	patronising you people, but all I can say, it is what	16	impediment in the collective church mind that prevents
17	I call lays everything bare but there is some kind of	17	an apology to Mr Ineson for that original abuse?
18	fairness within it. And, therefore, already, for	18	A. I think the real problem comes because the evidence is
19	example, the whole question about religious institutions	19	contested.
20	during General Synod this week we have now passed	20	MS SHARPLING: I see.
21	a Canon that also takes into account one of your	21	A. And the review hasn't happened. And I'm hoping that
22	recommendations about religious institutions.	22	that review will be swift and quick. It's still,
23	So and that was passed awaiting the Royal assent.	23	I think, waiting on Mr Ineson agreeing the terms of
24	So I and I think this inquiry, if anybody watches or	24	reference for this particular review. So hopefully, it
25	sees the writing up and particularly your first report,	25	will be swift. I hope it will happen. I actually think
	Page 185		Page 186
	C		
1	that I mean, it is a very difficult one, because you	1	Examination by MS McNEILL1
2	do not want to either be flippant about what kind of	2	
3	apology you are giving. For it to be substantive,	3	MR ADRIAN ILES (sworn)62
4	actually, you have got to get all the facts out and the	4	
5	review should take place, I hope as soon as possible,	5	Examination by MS SCOLDING62
6	because in one CDM my understanding is that the evidence	6	
7	was completely contested.	7	Questions by THE PANEL108
8	MS SHARPLING: I see. Thank you.	8	
9	THE CHAIR: Thank you. We have no further questions. Thank	9	ARCHBISHOP JOHN SENTAMU (sworn)111
10	you very much, Archbishop.	10	
11	A. Thank you, chair.	11	Examination by MS SCOLDING111
12	MS SCOLDING: Thank you very much, Archbishop Sentamu.	12	
13	(The witness withdrew)	13	Questions by THE PANEL186
14	MS SCOLDING: Chair, this concludes proceedings for today.	14	
15	May we now adjourn until tomorrow morning at 10.00 am?	15	
16	THE CHAIR: Yes.	16	
17	MS SCOLDING: Thank you very much.	17	
18	(4.11 pm)	18	
19	(The hearing was adjourned to	19	
20	Thursday, 11 July 2019 at 10.00 am)	20	
21		21	
22	INDEX	22	
23		23	
24	REVEREND MATTHEW INESON (affirmed)1	24	
25		25	
	Page 187		Page 188

			1	<u> </u>
<b>A</b>	81:10,11,14	117:6 122:5	127:18 133:1	adults 83:1 178:11
A1 63:12 112:5	82:14,15,17,18	156:22	143:18 144:23,23	advance 155:4
ability 98:4 118:24	82:19,21,25,25	accepted 179:19	171:21 184:24	adversarial 95:5
able 6:1 8:13 9:4	83:2,13,15,19,25	accepting 145:11	active 51:17,23	adverse 74:10
9:14 26:15 35:12	90:3 98:18 103:5	accepts 70:15	52:1	adverted 105:21
35:14 37:17	103:22 104:13	access 16:23 41:4	activities 2:17,21	109:9
43:10 45:20	105:9,10 107:6	41:9 47:13,15	activity 145:1	advice 66:12 70:21
96:19 108:3	112:25 125:5	49:13 53:5 112:5	<b>Acton</b> 156:8	78:7 86:9,16
133:17,21 138:6	127:25 129:8,18	accommodation	acts 94:16 149:4	87:11 109:23
140:20 166:15	139:4,6 141:5	40:21	actual 26:2 27:13	110:11 116:24
185:12,12	142:1,12,15	accompanied 36:5	139:24 150:21	117:3,24,24
<b>abolished</b> 75:1	143:14 144:24	account 185:21	153:21 183:19	118:5,22,25
145:8,18	145:2,18 146:9	accountable 156:2	add 6:24 15:7	121:14,15 122:24
<b>abolishing</b> 144:14	146:14 148:3	accused 30:18	16:22 30:1 41:1	139:15 153:16,24
abolition 170:8	149:2 150:21	103:5 152:7	add-on 147:12	154:14,17,17
abortions 8:23	151:9,20,21	ACE025007_003	address 138:4,5	155:8,11 158:12
absence 96:11	152:7 156:21	127:13	140:6	159:21 168:23
122:23	157:16 160:5,14	ACE025283 65:21	addresses 137:24	169:4,18,21
absolute 156:12,13	162:25,25 171:4	ACE0267124	138:2,7	170:24 171:15
156:15	172:2,14,19	138:15	addressing 39:7	advise 66:15
absolutely 2:19	174:10,20,22	ACE026967 63:12	adequacy 41:19	109:13,15
16:9 25:9 34:7	175:20 177:8	ACE027659 80:7	167:16	advised 86:23
42:16 43:1 44:13	184:10 186:14,17	94:11	adequate 96:11	169:9 170:15
50:17,17 52:24	<b>abused</b> 3:8 4:9	ACE027685 84:13	97:9 122:5 127:7	adviser 78:7
95:9,14 107:15	11:12 13:1,24	ACE923700 112:6	127:7 128:24	169:15
146:10 150:17	15:1 57:8 67:5,6	ACE923700_002	adequately 139:2	advises 117:18
156:12,13 161:25	76:3 124:6	143:9	adjourn 187:15	169:19
165:6 171:4	125:10 137:24	achieved 139:5	adjourned 187:19	advising 87:13
<b>absolution</b> 171:19	151:11,12,24	acknowledge	adjournment	109:12 169:7
171:20	163:6 170:19	19:15	110:25	<b>advisor</b> 17:15 50:5
<b>absorb</b> 23:6	186:12	acknowledged	adjudicate 85:19	78:9 84:9 86:6
abuse 2:3 4:13	<b>abuser</b> 25:15	16:15 31:18	adjudicated 164:7	96:15 109:18
8:16 9:5,15 11:2	43:12 54:18 61:2	acknowledges	adjudicating	110:7 115:18
12:20 17:2,3	159:17	41:7 143:21	85:19	116:1,3,10
19:25 20:8 25:17	abusers 124:13	acquaint 168:14	administer 111:4	117:16 118:3,9
26:23 28:22,25	138:23	act 26:5 30:25	167:1	120:4 121:5,24
29:3,6 30:12,18	<b>abuses</b> 184:13	31:16 32:23	administration	123:8 148:15
31:10 32:14	abusing 150:16	41:13 42:6 82:22	71:7 166:14	153:10,15,23
33:13 34:1,16	159:18	91:21,22 92:5,12	admission 71:6	154:25 155:7,22
38:1,10,13 39:7	abusive 105:8	144:16 151:13	admit 58:15	169:18
40:6,7,8,15 41:8	107:5 151:13	161:4 162:21	<b>admits</b> 70:14	Advisors 154:22
41:21 42:4,12	163:23	acted 38:3 119:15	admitted 35:4	Advisory 117:9
45:8 53:23 54:18	<b>ACAS</b> 159:22	acting 72:6 73:7	<b>Adrian</b> 25:2 62:16	118:8,14
54:19 55:17	161:21	action 31:21 32:11	62:17 165:14	advocate 64:20
56:11,14 57:4	accept 70:16 85:9	32:15 35:11	188:3	advocates 65:7,8
58:17,18 59:5,20	90:20 117:24	36:10 37:14 42:1	adult 77:4	105:4
60:9,10,22,25	153:2 154:17,17	42:3,6,8 61:4,5,5	adultery 106:20	affirmed 1:8
66:22 71:19,20	186:11	143:22 185:4	106:21,22,24	187:24
76:15 77:1,5,14	acceptable 30:10	actions 42:9 55:9	107:1	<b>afoot</b> 96:7
	-	-	-	-

				1 480 170
<b>afraid</b> 32:9 117:5	136:22 169:7	53:10 55:10 60:9	86:2 121:25	12:16 13:13 15:1
127:6 147:10	allowed 21:13	68:16 120:10	appointing 33:6	25:16 28:10 40:3
168:5 183:3	40:24 49:7 105:5	128:9 134:3,3	apportion 51:10	67:7,7,10 68:22
afternoon 111:2,3	153:24	154:3 174:25	approach 151:6	73:5,6,7 97:1
111:7,22	allowing 95:23	175:9 185:24	153:5	104:4 114:23
agencies 88:7,17	alongside 88:16	<b>anymore</b> 6:2,13	approached 131:7	115:20 148:16
ages 48:1	altar 2:17	8:2 120:19	132:14	archdeacon's 97:3
ago 55:2 57:25	amateur 118:18	anyone's 73:14	appropriate 44:7	archdeaconry
58:3 60:5 95:17	amazing 149:12	anyway 36:11	62:8 75:3 93:11	166:1,3
95:18 124:13	amended 30:16	apart 3:17 50:12	94:19 105:17	archdeacons 97:7
156:11	76:11 90:13	164:11	106:24 112:1	archiepiscopal
agree 70:10 71:13	97:15,18 154:21	apologies 55:3	130:22 133:4	122:6 137:19
91:2 92:3 94:7	amendments	132:22	135:6 162:5	archiepiscopate
106:10 111:12	80:25	apologise 2:23	181:20	140:12
126:6,17 134:5,8	Amin 112:24,25	43:2 54:16,17	approval 125:19	area 12:7 62:21
139:8 146:6,6	amount 60:11	133:16,16,16	approved 179:4	68:12 155:12
169:24	84:15 107:11	142:19 143:2	approximately	areas 2:8 64:7
agreed 44:11	AN-A88 137:4	183:3	81:25	86:12 95:25
46:17 125:22	analysis 127:16	apologised 58:16	<b>April</b> 138:13	97:23 147:10
158:13	128:3 166:15	apology 57:18,18	arbitrariness	171:2
agreeing 186:23	and/or 49:1 71:19	57:23 58:2,4,6,7	100:20	arguably 81:4
agreement 170:6	99:20	58:10,12,13,17	archbishop 16:11	arises 165:25
agrees 32:12 37:15	<b>Andrew</b> 150:25	132:22 137:7,10	16:17 17:2 20:4	armchair 137:12
70:11	151:1	137:11,12,13,21	29:5 31:20 32:10	army 121:12
ahead 18:10 47:11	ANG000584_042	186:13,17 187:3	32:12 33:25 34:5	arose 107:22
51:16 52:1	23:8	apparent 110:4,4	34:6,12 35:9,19	arranged 11:19
aimed 96:4	<b>ANG000603</b> 37:19	168:21	36:9,16 37:13,20	53:22
air 173:23	ANG000605_006	appeal 27:7 73:10	41:11 42:3,7	arrangements
<b>Alan</b> 47:25 48:2	36:14	92:2 115:5	46:5,12 47:4	96:1
<b>alarm</b> 131:15,17	ANG000648_004	136:21,23,24	49:21 50:4 53:17	arrest 22:18
alert 155:1	49:25	164:8 165:2	59:10 60:14,15	arrested 112:24
alerted 23:13	<b>angle</b> 87:6 97:2	appealed 27:7	61:4 102:6 111:3	arrived 117:2
alike 161:6,8	Anglican 12:21	35:25 165:3	111:5,8 112:4,8	arrogant 55:19
<b>Alison</b> 21:3,17,18	144:10	appear 22:11,12	113:13,17 114:8	<b>article</b> 101:5,15,19
21:25 22:9,17,24	<b>angry</b> 11:6 14:1	appearance 22:7	114:17 122:21	102:11,21
alive 142:23	anonymity 32:1	appearing 24:2	123:15 125:17,17	articulate 99:18
152:24	anonymous 137:5	151:23	131:16,20 132:3	99:18
allegation 33:12	<b>answer</b> 7:8 12:21	<b>apple</b> 160:23	132:15 138:24	<b>arts</b> 184:11
38:7 127:20	33:20 34:22,23	application 136:1	139:11 147:14	<b>ashamed</b> 6:1 60:6
allegations 15:20	39:17 55:9,10	136:11 144:5	156:5 157:6,14	aside 136:10,11,14
38:13 56:10	73:16 89:19,22	applications 83:5	160:10 161:2	186:14
87:20 88:15	103:3 133:1	applied 60:14	164:4 180:4	asked 7:22 10:14
106:6,9 160:8,14	answerable 55:10	100:21 164:13	181:20 186:5,9	12:14 18:5 19:11
163:12 172:14	answered 55:3	apply 30:17	187:10,12 188:9	20:11,23 21:1
allege 38:4	answers 128:16	applying 33:2	archbishops 32:6	22:24 24:22 26:1
alleged 36:18	anticipated 174:19	60:13	60:12 61:19,22	27:13 30:3 31:14
71:19	anybody 5:24 8:12	appoint 33:9 51:5	Archbishops'	33:19 36:3 40:3
Allerton 48:8	10:20 21:20 22:4	51:6 116:11	122:8	40:4 59:10,19
<b>allow</b> 97:19 99:7	39:13 51:10,12	appointed 46:18	archdeacon 12:6,7	64:10,21 84:6

		_		1 age 171
85:17 97:10,11	<b>assure</b> 126:21	<b>baby</b> 2:19	35:24	100:23 119:21
98:1,3 101:12	assured 16:19	back 6:16 8:14 9:2	bearing 132:2	124:11 136:6
105:14 109:4,11	160:20	16:18 18:15,21	becoming 3:5	139:22 166:24
132:21 150:6	astronomical	19:12 21:1 22:19	<b>bed</b> 4:19,20 5:11	167:15 175:2
152:1,10 161:2	95:10,14	27:16 35:8,8,19	<b>bedroom</b> 4:17,19	<b>Beverley</b> 16:11,16
162:14 177:14	attempting 123:21	36:6,9 44:1	6:8	beyond 163:13,14
182:22	attend 97:22	46:10 47:5 54:4	<b>beefed-up</b> 76:12	bias 56:23 110:4
asking 18:23 30:19	attended 123:15	55:16 65:19 66:3	beg 148:1	168:21
38:5 40:12 80:21	attending 178:19	89:18,19 102:6,8	<b>began</b> 179:19	<b>Bichard</b> 148:23
91:5 130:24	attention 96:25	116:21 121:15	beginning 22:11	big 142:25 174:12
132:4,6 154:8	143:3 154:4	124:2 125:15	47:18 89:14	<b>bigger</b> 4:18
184:23	attitude 148:10	126:4 130:4	99:23 132:5	<b>bill</b> 122:7
asks 136:9	151:6	132:5 138:3	141:5 147:25	Birkenhead
asleep 5:18	attitudes 143:23	142:22 156:11	177:1 184:16	154:19 158:17
aspect 86:23	146:23 147:1	158:20 170:3	behalf 36:15 37:20	Birmingham
aspects 76:14	148:11 149:19	182:3,6	73:1,5 86:24	113:11
91:17	audit 17:14	backed 173:12	102:19 130:25	birthday 16:3
<b>Asplin</b> 72:16	August 33:4	background 2:13	132:7 134:23	bis 143:22
assent 185:23	Australia 170:9,18	112:20 178:21	162:15 177:14	<b>bishop</b> 7:21,23 8:6
assessment 37:8	authorities 154:2	bad 17:17 128:20	180:13	9:8,19,20 10:1,11
90:22 92:22,24	172:9,10	<b>badgered</b> 45:10,10	behaved 133:9	11:25 12:19,25
93:2,6,15,16,24	<b>authority</b> 9:9 47:6	45:11	134:19 184:9	13:5,15 14:25
93:24 94:2 134:8	48:16 113:19	<b>badly</b> 129:9	behaviour 77:6	16:10,16 26:16
152:14	146:1 156:16,21	134:19	105:9 106:19	26:18 27:21 28:1
assessments 92:20	162:25 172:9	bag 8:3	107:10,11 133:5	28:6,9,12,13,14
asset 176:22	174:22	balance 85:16	161:16 163:23	28:15,18,20,24
184:19	automatic 72:8,8	163:18	behaviours 107:5	30:24 31:7 32:4
assist 2:9 57:14	72:10 82:16	balancing 165:12	<b>belief</b> 63:22 99:10	32:22,24 33:6,8
assistance 62:21	103:7 159:24	<b>Ball</b> 60:24 182:5	112:14	33:11 34:15 35:2
<b>assistant</b> 38:11,19	automatically	<b>banning</b> 173:22	beliefs 101:7	35:15,21 36:13
40:5,18 87:8	82:13 161:23	<b>bar</b> 76:21	<b>believe</b> 7:18 9:8,9	37:22 39:20,24
101:22	available 114:20	<b>bare</b> 185:17	10:13 14:22,22	41:7,12,15,22,23
<b>assume</b> 63:14	150:13	barring 72:8	15:2 30:16 34:7	42:9,17,18 43:5
71:25 120:13	avoid 154:24	barrister 63:24	56:25 59:22 60:3	45:11 46:5,11
<b>assumed</b> 130:5,12	awaiting 79:7	107:22	71:1,3 74:20	47:25 48:13,14
156:23	185:23	<b>based</b> 37:25 48:24	81:24 135:23	66:6,10 69:8,11
assumes 79:5	aware 30:15 38:10	basement 183:13	146:12 167:22	69:14,16 70:3,6
assuming 69:7,9	40:4,14 83:15	basically 5:11	182:23	70:11,14 71:23
71:19 73:21	117:7 155:6	13:11 30:9	<b>believed</b> 20:5 26:4	72:3,5,10,11,12
83:17 87:10	156:14 157:18	153:22	26:6 136:25	72:13 77:15 79:2
92:21 94:6,22,25	awareness 18:25	basics 25:22	believes 20:6	79:17 85:11,13
107:25 115:13	19:1	basis 30:23 52:18	Bench 65:13	86:11,13 87:5,7,7
120:23 122:19	awful 6:16 8:20	81:7 86:16 89:8	best 16:20 63:21	87:8 88:22 91:9
125:18 179:13	40:23	94:6,17 98:24	99:10 112:14,15	91:23 92:1 93:1
assumption 37:25	awkward 117:5	101:2 107:6	123:2 141:10	93:4,13,15,23
104:25 130:8	B	135:19 136:5	142:20 148:19	96:18,20 101:16
179:12 183:2		150:25 168:23	175:6	101:22,22,24
assumptions	<b>B1</b> 36:14	bath 42:17 54:24	better 12:15 19:4	102:2,2 103:17
147:15,16,17	<b>B14</b> 37:19	<b>BBC</b> 15:9 33:14,15	29:13 43:7 56:10	106:14 109:13,13
	<b>B15</b> 37:18			

				1 486 172
109:18 110:8	156:14 165:11,15	Borthwick 183:16	120:12 135:21	14:5 59:1 64:3
113:6,11,15	165:24 166:7,9	<b>bottle</b> 176:4	<b>bubble</b> 175:25	66:11 69:10
114:17,18 115:11	166:16 167:11,15	<b>bottom</b> 6:8 34:14	<b>bubbling</b> 116:20	117:9 124:16
115:21 116:4	168:2,6 176:23	39:5 47:7 50:1,1	building 56:8	126:2 156:9
121:17 128:25	176:25 181:15	97:15 141:18	131:18	calling 75:17,19,24
130:1,5,12 134:5	bishops' 36:22	143:20	buildings 64:5	Cambridge 113:2
137:6,7,25	58:15 77:22	bottomless 45:19	<b>bullet</b> 37:24 38:9	candidates' 177:23
147:14 148:15	114:9	<b>boulder</b> 55:5,6	38:21	179:15 180:9,10
149:21 151:5	Bishopthorpe	132:24 133:24	<b>bully</b> 55:19 61:12	candy 137:13
152:1,9 153:18	121:14 180:19	box 4:15	<b>bundle</b> 36:14	cane 6:8,8,9
153:25 154:10,15	bit 2:2,4 13:23	<b>boy</b> 40:2,13 57:8	63:13 112:5	<b>Canon</b> 102:5
154:19 155:17,20	17:4 26:9,13	<b>boyfriend</b> 5:21,23	bundles 63:2	113:4 172:12
155:23 156:10	30:22 34:14,24	boys 54:22	111:20	185:21
157:15 158:2,17	37:18 42:13 86:1	Bradford 7:21	burglary 12:13	Canterbury 31:20
159:7,12 160:3	90:7,8 93:18	21:21 22:11,19	burgled 12:3	32:6,10,12 34:12
161:11 162:1	100:15 109:16	28:1 39:20 40:1	<b>buried</b> 124:13	35:10,19 36:10
164:7 165:22	112:19 117:5	breach 28:22	Burrows 9:20	36:16 37:14,20
166:2 167:5,7	119:10,12 122:17	31:16,19 46:23	13:21,24 26:16	41:11 42:3,7
168:19,23 169:17	125:15 162:8	breached 30:25	27:16 28:18	46:12 58:9 59:10
169:22 180:20	168:14,20,25	42:5	30:24 31:23 42:3	60:14 61:4,22
181:4,5,19,19	171:15,16 175:16	break 3:22 62:9,13	Bursell 103:1	86:6 125:17
182:5,8,13	<b>blacked</b> 41:5 53:3	110:17,20 111:15	171:9	161:2 164:5
183:18	blame 5:25 32:3	111:18 131:23	<b>business</b> 68:15,15	capable 175:10
<b>bishop's</b> 69:19	51:10	132:3 157:8,12	busybodies 68:11	176:14
85:7 88:24	<b>blamed</b> 31:23,24	breakdown 3:13	busybody 68:14	car 4:3
100:13 102:1,19	blindingly 70:1	3:16		care 3:15 15:12,15
109:17,20 144:3	blocked 33:21	bricks 19:7	C	23:18 24:13,17
167:4	<b>blood</b> 5:20	<b>brief</b> 127:17 157:8	<b>C1</b> 179:9,17,25	24:23 28:5 35:7
bishops 14:25	<b>blow</b> 63:7	briefly 41:24	180:11	35:13,17 41:16
17:23 20:3 24:4	<b>blue</b> 180:24 181:7	64:13 65:24	<b>C2</b> 179:11,18,25	42:1 44:16,20
24:20,21 25:16	181:14,18,25	127:8	180:12	87:2 128:22
27:10,15 32:13	182:4,5,6,9,10,12	<b>bring</b> 1:21 8:22	<b>cafe</b> 31:1,7,11	130:11 166:20
33:18,20 37:15	182:21	18:1 26:13 29:22	32:13,14 42:4,10	186:12
42:11 47:8 49:20	<b>board</b> 115:1	32:19 49:23	Cahill 122:18,25	<b>career</b> 140:11
50:7 52:13 60:12	122:12 149:16	56:12 104:13	123:5,12,21,25	142:13
60:15,16 61:1,3,9	178:25	106:8,24 139:22	127:11 139:16	careful 172:4
61:19 64:16 67:9	<b>bodies</b> 114:21	<b>bringing</b> 9:1 43:16	140:17 143:15	carefully 120:18
71:4 79:13 80:2	<b>body</b> 5:15 22:25	82:13 84:20 95:7	146:25 170:15,23	127:5 167:3
80:2 81:22 84:12	100:24 102:14,17	107:13	call 1:13 12:21	174:16
84:15 85:20,23	107:24 114:14,22	broadcast 15:9	13:10 15:4 19:10	Carew-Jones
86:14,19 87:13	114:24 115:20	broader 41:17	23:21,22 24:13	46:18 47:2,20
91:2,15 93:17	119:17,18 177:25	163:19	24:13 31:5 47:24	Caroline 169:3
96:4 97:7,19	178:3 185:1	<b>broadly</b> 2:7 82:9	47:25 68:2 73:13	<b>carpet</b> 142:16,17
100:9 101:8,9	<b>bold</b> 23:11	<b>broken</b> 170:12	75:13,14,16 76:8	173:19
102:20,24 113:20	book 65:13 102:5	brother 125:7	81:6 83:23 111:7	carried 6:5 50:22
113:21 114:12,12	102:7 164:13	brought 8:25	124:1 126:23	50:25 101:23,24
124:10,24 125:8	books 183:12	22:19 24:21	153:14 176:19	127:2
125:22 129:21	borders 114:5	39:10 77:3 78:8	178:2 179:1	carry 61:2 87:3
144:1 149:20	<b>borne</b> 94:25	79:10 81:21	185:17	162:21 175:7
			<b>called</b> 10:12 12:5	

carrying 89:11	cause 101:10	<b>chairs</b> 105:24	checking 141:15	16:13,23 20:14
108:19	caused 16:8 32:7	challenge 55:18	checks 107:8	21:9,12,19,20
case 17:21 27:18	132:1	104:24 165:20	Cheshire 137:9	22:4 23:10,23
31:1 33:20 39:10	caution 71:8	challenged 51:19	Chester 153:19,21	24:10 25:3,21
41:13 48:20 49:2	<b>CDM</b> 31:19 77:18	challenges 121:1	153:25 169:22	27:5,8 29:12
50:21 58:2,6	79:11 80:21,23	128:16 165:12	Chichester 106:7	30:2,9,14 31:17
59:12 60:7 65:2	84:12,19 85:10	challenging	Chief 115:19	32:7 33:5 36:2
69:21 71:20	86:12,15 87:4,9	139:19,20,20	child 2:16 20:8	43:6,18 44:2,10
73:15,16,18	91:17 94:15,16	165:16	26:23 28:22	44:14,15 45:24
75:21 77:16,21	97:15,18 135:1	chance 52:8	30:12 40:24,25	46:17 47:19
78:10,21 79:18	163:17,25 164:4	137:21 138:9	56:11 67:5,6	50:10 51:1,4,21
81:16 82:14,14	164:11,13,17	chancellor 64:3	76:25 77:3,14	52:10,12 56:6,10
83:9 87:14 93:13	165:24 187:6	158:9	90:3 103:24	56:12,13,16,20
95:22 96:20,22	CDMs 51:23 52:1	<b>change</b> 2:8 11:4	143:14 144:24	56:21 57:1,7
105:16 108:14,16	cease 177:2	56:5 59:25 96:7	145:2 146:8	58:2,22 59:1,22
108:18,20 117:3	celebrate 177:3	139:17 171:13	150:10,15,17,21	60:3,6,8,18 61:1
119:15,23 121:20	celebrity 174:19	173:21 176:5	150:22 151:13,20	61:20 63:25 64:5
130:16 135:13,14	cent 118:2	changed 45:9	172:16,18	64:6 75:2,15
139:12,16,16	central 94:25	143:25 148:11	childhood 2:16	80:14 95:1,1
140:17 148:6,22	centre 135:10	152:25	children 10:23	102:8,12,14,17
150:14,18 155:21	151:17	<b>changes</b> 56:5,7,9	76:16 82:22 83:1	122:9 123:8,14
158:7 160:18,22	ceremonial 74:24	66:1 123:22	144:16 145:9,13	126:10,21 130:19
161:20,24 164:2	certain 80:17	144:13,20 181:19	145:17 149:25	134:7,23 139:1,7
164:6,12 165:3	117:23 173:25	<b>chap</b> 3:21	150:2,3 151:7,9	139:21 140:13
165:24 168:13	certainly 37:2	chaplain 50:4	151:11,12,23	141:4 142:5
169:9	40:17 43:16	88:24 121:5,10	173:3,6 178:10	143:13 144:11
cases 64:15 67:22	89:25 100:17	121:18,22 123:3	186:4	145:10,12,12,19
74:7 76:19 77:2	155:8 156:23	152:15 153:10,14	<b>choir</b> 2:18 173:3	145:23 146:1,7
77:13 78:1,4	157:18 159:4	181:2	choose 17:12	146:24 147:16,19
79:8,10 80:22,22	certificate 181:23	characterisation	chooses 12:23	147:24 148:12,13
81:2,3,3,5,8 82:5	cetera 2:18 107:8	88:2	choosing 98:12	148:16 149:6,19
83:21,22 84:5	107:9	characterise	<b>chose</b> 119:12	151:5 157:2
85:11,12 87:12	Chad's 179:20	156:20	136:17	163:3 170:3,7,17
87:14,19 95:8,11	<b>chair</b> 1:3,5 56:3	characterises	<b>chosen</b> 44:10	172:15 174:8,13
98:17 105:8	57:14 62:3,5,8,11	175:4	135:24	175:5,19,22
119:11,12 120:17	62:15 63:12	characteristic	<b>Christ</b> 186:3	176:9,16,17
123:5 124:20	105:14,16 108:7	174:17	Christian 137:12	177:4,6,9,25
125:19,25 126:6	108:9 109:7	<b>charge</b> 48:9 159:5	147:13,18	178:5,7 184:9,13
126:10 128:2	110:14,16,20	159:11	Christmas 13:10	184:24 186:3,11
141:8 145:18	111:2 112:4	<b>charged</b> 20:1 21:5	45:12	186:13,16
146:8 147:1	115:2,6 118:1,7	22:10 24:1,3	chronology 15:19	<b>church's</b> 50:12
161:8,8 162:8	118:13 122:12	54:23	15:20,25	136:20 179:23
180:5 184:18	149:16 151:1	charges 24:20	<b>chummy</b> 168:25	church-related
casual 35:23	157:3,7,9,10	54:24	<b>church</b> 2:4,5,8,17	139:4
categorise 150:2	172:4 185:8	<b>chase</b> 58:10	2:17,19,20,20	churches 148:19
category 74:7	186:6,7 187:9,11	<b>chat</b> 12:18	3:18 4:16 10:1,2	churchwarden
catered 179:15	187:14,16	<b>cheap</b> 45:2	10:25 11:1,22	38:12,20 176:2
Cathedral 113:5	chaired 114:23	check 91:22 120:2	12:6 13:18 14:15	churchwardens
caught 12:5	115:1 117:10	138:3,9	14:21 15:18	40:5

				1 480 171
churchyards 64:8	134:21 135:3	120:24,25	commissioned	39:9,24 44:5
<b>Circuit</b> 106:4,5	136:18 140:2	collaboratively	51:2	46:5,8,16 64:18
circumstances	141:12 147:5	118:22 120:2,21	Commissioner	64:20 66:4,7,8,13
12:2 13:17 14:3	149:13 158:3	collapsed 145:19	31:15 47:14	66:16,18 67:2,4
70:11 71:13	159:2 160:11	collar 156:17	Commissioners	67:10,23 69:9,12
72:11 104:3	164:18,24 165:18	184:4,8,13	95:1 122:9	70:1,3,14 72:5,22
108:18 159:9	167:8 172:8	colleagues 83:18	committed 106:21	72:23,24,25 73:3
167:2	174:18 175:24	collective 185:4	106:22	73:5 76:23 77:7
civil 58:6 64:1 99:6	176:3 177:13	186:16	committee 114:23	77:18 78:8 82:13
146:16	180:16,18,24	collectively 148:18	120:14	83:6 84:19,21
<b>claim</b> 20:13	181:16 182:11	college 179:14	<b>common</b> 59:1 77:1	88:21 90:16
claims 99:6	183:17	come 2:13 5:22	174:1	92:18 93:12,22
clarification 103:4	clergyman 25:15	6:23 7:8 15:7	commonsense	95:8 99:24
<b>clarify</b> 94:3 186:10	60:2	17:4 19:6,12	67:21	100:14 101:23,25
clarifying 184:2	cleric 66:22 70:8	20:19,21 21:1	comms 36:5 50:10	103:7,8,13,25
class 18:24	70:11 74:10	22:24,24 24:6	communicate 96:8	104:5,9,14 106:8
classes 151:19	91:25 106:12	32:18 41:11 51:1	communication	106:17,24 107:13
173:2	164:20	54:10 74:7 77:2	96:2,6 98:7,17	127:25 134:14
clean 62:10	clerical 74:20	81:8 84:24 89:6	communications	135:8 136:1,5,7
clear 13:20 27:19	78:25 80:5,10	104:25 105:25	19:21	141:6 145:7
38:25 71:8,10	84:16 85:4 94:4	107:9 116:2	Communion	complaints 17:5
83:2 90:11	103:22 130:20	120:20 121:13	144:10	25:6 26:2,7,10
136:24 154:15	135:7,21 140:11	123:23 125:5	comparing 160:23	27:3,6,14,21
159:21 160:4	142:12 151:2	128:19 131:11	comparison 95:3	30:23,24 31:3
164:21 172:20	155:16 166:20	132:19 137:17	complain 25:15	32:18,21 33:17
clearer 90:7	175:13	139:14,18 142:2	47:14 61:3 84:20	34:4,22,25 35:2
clearly 36:18	clericalism 170:4	147:2,4 148:1	complainant 43:10	43:16 46:2,20,22
38:23 67:22	174:8,12,15,21	163:7 181:8	44:5 66:17 73:4	47:3,8,22 51:16
70:22 84:6 88:17	176:18	184:20	77:5 95:5,6 97:2	66:21 68:10,20
138:23,24 158:4	clericals 31:8	comes 58:22 60:21	97:3 103:8,13,17	69:22 70:5 76:15
161:18	<b>clerics</b> 102:15	70:24 71:15	103:18,20,24	76:21 79:16
<b>clergy</b> 2:6 17:6,10	117:15 135:12	89:18,19 100:3	104:8,10,14	81:13,22 82:1
20:3 25:1,3,7,8	146:3 152:3	117:17 121:8	110:11 137:5	83:11 84:21 85:9
25:10,14 27:3,7	174:9 175:20	163:4 171:13,14	complainants	89:3 99:3,20
36:20 37:3 41:17	<b>clerk</b> 37:4	171:19 186:18	41:21 76:22 89:7	103:6 104:13
41:19 42:15	Cleveland 166:1	<b>comfort</b> 126:23,24	105:3	134:11,21 135:22
43:16 45:25	<b>client</b> 22:16 46:17	comfortable 4:12	complained 27:10	165:18
46:24 51:17 60:8	<b>climbs</b> 54:24	4:22 167:21	29:20,23,24 34:9	complete 3:15
61:6 62:21 64:12	<b>clock</b> 10:23	<b>coming</b> 5:6 12:8	34:11 35:18	27:20 61:5
65:18 66:5 69:10	<b>close</b> 54:6 109:21	39:6 79:14	43:13 48:16	149:14
70:9,22 72:25	133:14	105:12 112:24	49:20 50:7	completed 25:14
90:20 91:11,12	<b>closed</b> 21:23 45:22	122:8 185:5	108:17	149:18 167:23
93:19,20 94:10	<b>clothes</b> 175:14	comment 27:13	complaint 18:7	179:17
95:2 106:8,18	co-chair 114:9	52:20 53:7 82:8	26:16,20 28:21	completely 76:5
117:4 120:20	co-operation	97:8 137:21	29:5,14,16,21,22	150:17 162:4
124:1,6,7,17,25	52:22	comments 43:6	31:19 32:11,22	183:6 187:7
125:4,8,12,24	<b>code</b> 36:19 67:20	commission 42:5	33:10,12 34:10	completeness 14:4
126:12,13 127:2	69:19,20,25	70:22 91:11	35:20 36:13,24	completes 180:11
127:9,23 134:10	collaborative	100:14 151:2	37:6,9,11,21,25	<b>comply</b> 27:22
L				

	-	i	-	
compounded	173:18 175:7,12	constructed	158:23 160:1	101:2 157:15
145:6	175:16	115:12	165:25	coupled 74:14
comprehensive	confident 167:25	consult 29:15,22	copying 16:18	courageous 59:15
65:22	172:1 178:4	72:13	core 16:24 41:10	course 6:25 39:9
compromise	confidential 152:2	consultation 80:2	48:19 49:2,3,7,14	46:1 104:6 110:2
116:17	152:3,5 178:7	consulted 30:18	49:15 51:7	110:15 126:7
concentrating	confirm 1:10	47:17 50:24	117:19 118:20,21	132:10 142:12
175:24	<b>conflict</b> 34:9 46:15	158:9	119:2,10,16	151:22 152:23
concern 40:2	50:3,8 56:24	contact 35:16	169:18	161:3 164:3
80:23 86:19	86:25 144:3	43:18 53:16	cork 176:4	165:1 167:13
90:16 101:3	166:8,10 168:3	98:13 135:18	<b>correct</b> 3:7 11:24	169:8 178:19
106:6 171:14	conflicted 41:23	contacted 21:12	12:1 13:16 14:10	<b>courses</b> 149:12
concerned 8:13	85:7	35:23 47:2	14:12 15:19,21	168:1,17
24:18 27:10	conflicts 108:12	contained 37:8	16:14 20:2 25:9	court 22:8 23:25
29:18 42:9,10	110:4,6	contemplate 144:7	29:17 74:13	24:2,8 29:13
70:7 93:9 96:3	conjunction 83:17	161:17,17	111:8 113:13	64:5,5 95:9
112:21 115:8	connected 108:16	contested 186:19	114:4 147:15	99:12 106:2
118:23 119:2	connection 109:19	187:7	157:8 183:2	135:15 148:2
124:24 127:1	conscientised	context 66:20,24	correspondence	courts 77:15 99:6
128:25 152:6	147:22	91:18 106:6	39:16	145:8,19 148:5
154:19 166:4	consecrated 64:8	119:6 129:21	corroboration	150:9
173:5	86:11	133:5 182:2	144:15 145:7,17	cover 25:25 63:16
concerning 76:15	consecration	continue 103:8	146:12	86:3,12 172:2
concerns 34:4 46:2	113:20	141:10 157:14	corroborative	Coverage 137:8
80:17,18,20	<b>consent</b> 70:12 71:5	contribution 45:10	146:20	covered 67:20
91:15 93:17	71:14 90:20	contributions	<b>corrupt</b> 156:13,15	105:15,18 112:10
139:6 142:2	97:20,25	139:3	corruption 174:11	crabs 7:3
153:23 159:16	consequences 84:3	controlling 52:24	corrupts 156:12	Cranmer 178:16
concludes 57:12	consider 34:5	controls 154:12	156:13	178:18
187:14	36:24 72:11	Convention 101:5	<b>cost</b> 45:1 61:11	Cranmer's 102:6
conclusion 37:7	107:13 127:22	conversation 13:8	94:20,23 95:22	create 170:1
39:6 163:1,8	142:10 157:23	14:2 15:11 35:6	costs 94:24 95:6,7	182:11
conclusions 57:15	considerable	154:16 164:23	95:9,14	created 119:24
138:17 160:11	162:11	169:11	<b>cosy</b> 109:16	135:16 180:25
conditional 102:21	consideration	convicted 71:21	168:20,25 169:6	181:2,14
condones 42:8	37:10 94:21,23	90:3 147:5,8	170:1	creating 184:25
conduct 34:16	97:18 158:1	148:2 149:24	<b>council</b> 10:1 65:7	creation 181:8
37:3 52:6 74:6	considered 56:7	150:10 152:20	114:9 122:8,13	182:10
106:11,11 107:12	66:24 67:15 70:4	conviction 71:22	Councillor 113:22	Creighton 156:9
157:21 163:16,19	107:12 127:21	72:2,6 77:15,23	counsel 111:9	criminal 39:10
163:20	161:14	81:12 106:13,15	counselling 15:6	75:17 77:14,23
conferences 178:1	consistent 176:6	107:21 108:5	21:22 44:8,11,22	87:19 104:12
confessing 107:17	consistently 42:7	convictions 81:4	45:16,17 140:23	105:2 107:11
confessional	consistory 64:4	cooperate 104:7	<b>counsellor</b> 21:19	108:4 144:13,20
123:12 170:5,12	95:9	104:10	22:3 45:23	144:25 145:24
170:16,21 171:11	consists 114:1	cope 58:23,25	<b>country</b> 3:14	146:16 172:13
171:13,16 174:3	constant 141:14	<b>copied</b> 16:9 121:12	114:4 145:16	173:13 178:8
174:6,7	constantly 9:10	130:11	couple 4:16 6:6	<b>criteria</b> 66:12
confidence 167:23	127:3 176:13	<b>copy</b> 16:24 130:4	57:17 77:19	73:20

criticises 122:18	damaged 129:9	178:24	177:5	<b>designed</b> 68:9 74:2
Crockfords 48:6	dance 163:10	dealings 82:7	<b>define</b> 82:21	desire 56:12
Croft 11:23,25	data 28:22 30:25	deals 31:17 64:5	defined 68:18	150:19 182:20
12:12 13:5,25	31:16 42:6	dealt 20:8 69:14	defines 83:18	desired 141:17
15:8,14 16:2,5,14	date 89:5 117:23	69:14 77:14 79:2	defining 84:1	desk 20:22
27:15 28:6,8,14	139:9 157:24	97:13,14 100:22	definitely 39:12	despite 35:11
32:22,24 33:6	182:3	100:23 104:12	174:15	destroys 61:8
35:11 41:25	<b>dated</b> 16:5 63:10	130:7 134:12	definition 83:2	detail 26:15 32:21
46:14 47:9 50:4	63:11	<b>Dear</b> 43:1	<b>degree</b> 100:20	99:25 100:1,3
54:16	dates 47:3,4	death 23:10 54:25	102:18	127:14
Croft's 49:22	<b>David</b> 25:13 26:7	<b>debate</b> 173:15,16	delay 26:3,4 97:14	detailed 65:16
cross 10:14,19	31:12,12 33:2	deceased 124:16	119:10,13 134:22	determination
167:9	53:13 58:21 59:3	125:12 126:12,13	135:16	36:23
cross-examination	59:4 130:25	127:9,23	<b>delayed</b> 47:9 87:23	determine 177:23
105:1,7	132:7 162:16	December 12:3	<b>delays</b> 87:22	determined 92:18
cross-examine	177:15	deception 75:23	delegate 87:6	164:4 184:18
104:22	day 1:3 7:2,9	decide 73:15 164:7	101:16,20,21	Devanamanikka
cross-examined	12:13 16:15	decided 31:21	154:18 158:16	3:9,12 4:2,5,13
98:25	17:15 20:10	32:10 35:10	161:13	6:20 8:7 13:1,20
cross-jurisdictio	22:12 54:8,12	36:10 73:12	delegated 100:11	13:21 19:25 21:8
144:9	55:10 131:9	79:21 102:17	155:3 161:25	22:5 23:14 25:20
cross-reference	132:17 133:1,17	141:15 162:24	delegating 153:25	30:2 38:2,14
48:9	133:21,23 178:19	163:18 164:13	158:18	39:8 40:19 48:10
<b>cruel</b> 60:18	day's 85:24	decides 64:17	delivers 94:19	49:9 50:15 52:12
crux 100:7	day-to-day 115:10	93:14 136:22	demanded 136:13	54:21 58:3,17,18
cultural 149:19	115:17 168:23	deciding 73:19	182:10	129:19,19
culturally 148:11	days 5:16 18:8	154:1	democracy 184:6	Devanamanikka
culture 138:21	20:6 22:21 78:11	decision 29:14	demonstrate	23:10 28:3,4
141:22,23 145:11	81:24 84:18 85:2	33:5 69:8,13	163:13	50:14 60:23
170:3 173:21	85:23 112:18	73:13,14 77:17	denied' 87:24	developed 97:5
176:5,16,18	135:23 152:23	87:8 92:14 116:8	<b>denies</b> 38:10,18	devious 149:4
177:5	<b>DC</b> 21:3,10 24:1	116:10 118:3	39:2 70:2	<b>Dewsbury</b> 20:8,21
<b>cup</b> 55:15	25:18 30:6	119:6 154:3	department 18:12	diarised 89:13
<b>curate</b> 3:3 38:11	<b>deacon</b> 48:7 66:7	181:16	18:17 19:19,20	Dickenson 152:16
38:19 40:5,18	66:22 74:10	decision-making	depending 84:18	152:19
48:8 179:20	181:25 182:15	101:21	<b>depose</b> 74:18 75:1	<b>Dickson</b> 157:21
curate's 126:2	dead 23:14 124:6,7	decisions 85:22,25	98:4	dictating 51:11
current 17:18	125:4,8 127:2	100:12 110:8,9	deposed 76:8	died 58:4 124:4,25
90:11 95:25 97:9	140:2 141:12	116:8 145:14	deposition 75:10	158:11 169:3
currently 79:22	deal 35:10 69:25	154:1 155:24	deputy 64:2	181:10,11,12
84:19 89:9 93:5	76:24 77:16,20	declaration 178:8	described 88:14	difference 70:20
94:17 105:19	77:20 78:1,3,21	declared 48:10	131:6 134:6	75:9 99:5 116:23
cut 79:18 184:12	123:4 130:5,10	dedicated 122:2	137:11	144:16 150:21
<b>cycle</b> 61:6	144:2 150:9	deep 147:22	designated 64:12	163:10,11 176:18
D	157:2	defective 94:18	64:14 65:1,4	different 55:3,4
$\mathbf{D}$ 187:22	dealing 27:6 64:23	<b>defence</b> 94:16	69:17,23 70:17	57:7 75:24 82:25
daddy 6:18	65:5 71:23 79:13	defending 150:23	71:15 76:25 79:1	83:19 93:8
damage 56:12	79:17 136:18	defensive 142:4	80:19 82:15	106:18 109:4
158:6	164:1 169:9	deference 174:15	87:20 88:15	115:24 116:16,20
150.0				

				1 age 177
128:15 132:23,23	129:25 139:20	100:12 101:17	discrimination	document 37:18
139:11 145:3	147:4 149:11	102:3,9,11,15,19	65:13	documents 36:12
146:18 150:9	155:4 158:10	102:25 106:8	discuss 14:8 39:13	43:22 47:16
160:11,18,21	166:8 168:8	109:15 113:20	59:11	62:25 63:4
161:2,5,8,20	181:17,17,24	130:20 134:11,21	discussed 152:15	111:13,21,24,25
162:14 169:20	182:17 185:10	135:3,8,21	discussing 14:5	<b>DOFA</b> 87:22 88:6
172:6,7 182:25	dioceses 94:24	136:18 151:2	31:1 158:25	88:10,14
183:6	114:1 117:9	155:16 158:3	discussion 39:12	DOFAs 88:7
differently 161:9	123:6 124:9,15	159:3 164:24	75:6,6 96:6	dog 156:17 184:4,8
difficult 43:11	124:16 126:4	165:18 166:14,21	161:12	184:13
63:6 85:15 96:21	144:7 165:21	167:1,4,5,8,9,12	discussions 38:23	doing 7:6 9:12
99:17 108:2	182:11	168:4	disgraceful 23:21	15:2 16:8 21:25
146:10 149:5,7	direct 61:25 93:1	disciplining	42:16	40:13 44:24
162:7 164:19	93:15	166:22	disgust 142:7	48:14 59:22
166:6 167:1,11	directions 105:13	disclose 8:16 9:4	dismiss 35:20	60:21 79:16
170:22 171:23	105:17	9:15,18 13:17	dismissed 93:13	122:20 128:12
176:2,24 187:1	directive 118:14	15:10 16:1	130:20 165:5	130:12 140:15
difficulties 8:18	directly 17:11	170:22	dismissing 37:21	166:5 167:21
100:22 101:11	38:23 76:16	disclosed 9:16,22	dispensation 99:19	168:11 175:10
difficulty 104:6,19	166:19	11:2,10,23 13:13	display 23:7	176:9 178:23
166:23	<b>Director</b> 115:3	19:25 26:17 35:4	dispute 117:14	domestic 104:13
digging 182:14	disagreed 117:25	55:1 130:20	179:2	Doncaster 9:19
diocesan 17:10,13	118:5	discloses 128:10	disqualified	12:6 28:20 31:7
17:15 21:11 66:5	disagreeing	172:16,18	149:23	door 3:20 8:8,9,9
66:11 78:6 81:22	169:25	disclosing 29:3	<b>disquiet</b> 92:4	10:25 12:10,17
85:10 96:15,15	<b>disappear</b> 103:14	139:6	disregard 155:11	22:23
100:9 101:16	103:16	disclosure 12:2,20	169:5	doorbell 7:12
102:19 109:3,11	discernment	17:1,3 26:20,23	disregarding	double-check
109:13,13,17,21	107:16	28:11,21,24 29:6	117:3	73:10 86:5 103:1
114:17,18 115:11	discharged 179:3	34:1,16 39:3	dissolved 134:12	doubt 139:12
115:11,17,19	disciplinary 36:19	54:18 57:5 69:2	distinct 150:21	163:13,14 173:17
116:1,4 117:9,16	36:22 85:15	130:9 142:15,22	distinction 151:15	download 150:19
118:7,8,13 120:4	86:20,21 94:19	146:14 152:2,5	151:21	downloading
124:10 137:19	101:9 102:1	153:13 171:7	distinguish 161:5	150:10
149:15 153:10,14	135:11 144:4	disclosures 14:6	distinguished	<b>Dr</b> 103:1 180:17
153:23 154:22	165:13 173:12	14:14 15:17,22	140:11 167:7	183:4
155:20,21,23	<b>discipline</b> 2:7 17:6	16:13 25:17 28:8	distracted 9:3	<b>drafted</b> 94:17,22
159:6,12 168:18	25:1,3,7,14 27:3	28:9,15 33:13	distraction 61:16	dramatically
168:19,22	37:3 41:18,19	52:11 61:2	district 64:2	143:25
diocese 17:16,22	42:15 45:25	129:21 141:10	158:10	drastically 90:14
32:5 40:1 45:7	46:24 51:17 61:7	142:1,12,19	<b>Division</b> 72:18	draw 151:14,21
45:20 87:7 102:3	62:22 64:12	152:4 172:14	177:25 180:7	154:3
102:25 109:4,20	65:18 66:5 69:10	discover 49:4 57:3	181:1	drawn 96:25
113:15 115:7,8	70:9,22 71:9	124:12	<b>DNA</b> 147:23	150:18 158:19
119:7,22 120:6	73:10 74:20	discovered 28:2	<b>Doctor</b> 75:19	dream 150:16
121:8,13,16	78:25 80:5,10	30:6 33:1,1,5	doctors 179:2	<b>drill</b> 147:16
122:10 123:6	84:16 85:4 90:25	46:4,11 48:3	doctrinal 101:10	drive 7:10 20:10
124:17,18 125:2	91:11 93:19,20	49:12 54:21,25	102:7,24 170:14	61:16 123:22
125:14 128:1,5	94:5 95:2 96:8	discrete 48:24	doctrine 74:23	<b>drop</b> 140:15
, .				
	I	I	I	I

				8
dropped 35:5	39:4 49:10 71:2	164:10	48:24 62:16	84:2
dropping 15:10	72:23 76:16	ensure 87:2 98:11	64:11 70:3 73:8	excuse 78:24 145:1
173:24	79:19 82:18	105:17 114:20	81:21 94:4,6	145:15
drunk 171:5	84:23 86:6 88:24	115:2,6,21	98:21,22,23,24	excusing 145:4
<b>DSA</b> 17:18,19	89:21 91:8 106:2	127:18 171:25	99:1,22 100:18	Executive 115:19
21:11,14 46:20	115:4 156:5	178:8	103:2 104:9,15	exercise 102:18
49:22 50:2	170:8 176:2	ensuring 87:1	104:20 105:11,17	167:4,11
due 12:8,14 22:6,7	187:2	enthrone 33:7	111:3 119:16,24	exercises 168:3
22:12 23:25	element 175:4	enthronement	129:17 131:6	exercising 75:12
45:22 67:8 77:21	elevated 175:21	32:25	136:13,23 137:4	85:18
83:14 159:7	em 61:12	entirely 91:23 93:8	137:11,22 146:21	exhibits 63:4
<b>Durham</b> 64:4	email 18:11 19:17	96:17 102:11	153:9 159:18	exist 74:21 92:25
duties 109:23	42:23 51:4 53:2	160:4 170:8	162:25 163:4	172:22 174:15
167:12	53:8 88:25 89:22	entitled 76:3	165:11,15 169:10	180:22 181:3
duty 148:13,17,17	<b>embedded</b> 115:7	180:14	169:13 170:5	existed 183:15
148:18 167:4	emerge 100:3	<b>entrance</b> 20:22,24	171:9 172:5	exists 82:13
172:8,10,16	177:6	entry 48:7	179:25 183:5	expand 90:6
174:4	emphasised 29:18	Episcopacy 176:21	184:17 186:10,18	expect 89:15
duvet 4:23	employed 49:22	Equal 65:13	187:6	expected 11:20
	50:3,5,6,7 63:24	equals 113:18	evolving 150:11	expecting 135:14
E	employees 49:19	equated 45:13	exact 53:25	expedite 130:14
<b>E</b> 187:22	employing 123:7	equivalent 45:13	exactly 5:2 74:5	experience 7:1
ear 86:17	encourage 90:20	162:18 174:20	173:11,11	58:23 84:12
earlier 46:7 76:17	173:2	erection 5:14	Examination 1:9	106:3 139:21
77:25 101:20	ended 5:11 13:23	erroneous 147:15	62:18 111:6	142:3
110:19 137:4	124:22	escalated 115:13	188:1,5,11	experienced
165:10 174:10	engage 17:9	essentially 39:11	examine 80:15	105:24 124:8
177:10	engaged 173:7	estate 50:14	examined 136:8	164:15
early 77:7 78:4,11	engagement 98:6	estimation 81:25	example 66:23	experiences 2:6
110:17 182:7	engaging 139:17	et 2:18 107:8,9	67:4,6 68:21,23	138:11
earned 156:24,24	<b>England</b> 25:3 27:5	European 101:5	70:8 71:7 72:25	<b>expert</b> 155:12
earth 61:11 175:10	27:8 29:12 36:2	evacuate 131:18	75:18,19 76:17	experts 114:25
easiest 76:13	43:6 50:10 51:1	<b>event</b> 53:14,19	77:10,12 78:22	<b>explain</b> 43:21,21
easily 67:24	51:4 56:20 57:7	55:21,23 111:17	82:23 84:25 90:2	64:13 80:11
150:15 163:20	60:3,8 61:1,20	133:5	90:8 97:22 99:5	89:15 98:10
<b>East</b> 114:24 166:2	63:25 75:15	events 38:24 53:14	101:17 103:23	154:10 159:24
easy 20:17 41:20	113:16 123:14	everybody 2:25	104:12 105:2,11	174:16 176:25
71:22	136:19,20 139:21	5:7 27:19 30:23	106:20 107:3,19	explained 44:2
<b>Ecclesiastical</b>	143:13 144:11	31:23 52:13 66:1	117:17,20 122:13	93:18 99:21
45:17 74:21 95:4	147:19 151:5	101:6 120:17	144:14 145:5	100:7 158:24
educate 175:19	172:15 174:13	122:9 127:1	169:21 172:18	explanation 65:17
<b>effect</b> 31:13 68:11	175:22 178:5	135:14 138:23	173:22 180:19	177:21 182:25
69:6 74:18 98:25	184:9	142:8 148:13	182:4 185:19	183:6,7,11
120:4 128:4	English 99:17	174:1 175:14	examples 70:18	explored 110:6
153:24	engrained 148:11	176:7,10 177:11	79:8	express 84:9
effectively 20:12	<b>enjoy</b> 6:10	179:13	<b>excellent</b> 44:13,13	expressed 80:17
<b>effort</b> 141:8	enlarge 111:25	<b>evidence</b> 1:14,19	exception 91:12	92:4 100:19
egg 126:2	enquirer 51:5	2:1 8:11 15:14	170:9	106:6
eight 16:13	enquiry 52:15	33:19 35:12 38:7	<b>exclude</b> 68:19 84:2	extend 81:23
either 21:9 22:2,14				
	•	•	-	•

				1 480 177
172:17	163:22	<b>feet</b> 35:22 36:7	<b>finish</b> 179:10	186:3
extended 27:17	failures 77:24 81:6	fell 3:17 5:18	finished 89:16	<b>followed</b> 116:24
33:4 34:20 82:17	139:14 141:24	145:23	fire 25:19 131:15	179:24
84:5 162:14	153:17,18,18	fellow 34:11	131:17,18 157:5	following 13:8
extending 83:3	fair 12:14 42:14	felt 8:12,19 33:13	<b>firm</b> 46:19	16:1 18:22 23:9
extension 82:12,16	49:11,11 87:25	42:22 168:24	<b>first</b> 1:5 4:14 9:15	27:20 127:23
extensive 97:6	88:11 90:22	fewer 85:12	17:24,25 18:2	141:11
extra 147:12	<b>fairly</b> 68:6 77:2,11	figures 95:18	20:20 22:25	follows 132:12
extremely 140:10	79:18 90:13	<b>file</b> 124:1,4 180:16	23:22 26:17 34:8	<b>font</b> 63:6,7 112:1
eye 127:5	94:20 153:1	180:18,22 181:8	35:4,20 37:24	<b>foolish</b> 169:5
eyes 54:4 60:5	156:8	181:14,18,19,21	58:9 93:23 99:17	force 52:18 119:14
	fairness 185:18	181:25 182:5,6	100:9 102:6	forced 5:14
<b>F</b>	faith 42:14 43:8	182:10,11,12,21	111:10 113:18	forefront 139:19
fabric 64:6	147:13,18	183:14,15,22	114:22 115:5	forensic 85:18
face 54:6 61:22	faith-based 101:11	<b>filed</b> 26:7 31:19	127:17 128:3,3	166:15
131:9 132:16	<b>fall</b> 119:18 163:20	files 120:20 124:2	133:7 138:16,20	forever 47:5
146:15	163:21	124:3,7,12 125:4	153:13 155:7	forgiveness 184:23
<b>fact</b> 14:24 29:19	<b>falling</b> 176:14	125:9,12,24	169:2 172:25	<b>form</b> 44:1 59:24
34:4 35:11 38:22	<b>family</b> 2:14 3:13	126:8,25 127:2,3	178:25 180:9	82:18 98:23 99:3
73:18,24 91:3	3:16,17,23 72:18	140:2 141:12	181:24 182:7,15	99:24 173:10
92:17 101:13	103:23,24 104:2	180:24 182:1,4,9	184:22 185:13,25	178:8 181:14
106:7 109:10	<b>famous</b> 75:21	182:24 183:17	<b>firstly</b> 57:20 96:1	<b>formal</b> 15:6 18:7
112:10 116:25	famously 184:4	<b>final</b> 45:25 56:8	111:11 154:3	58:1,5,7,13,16
117:8 122:18	fantastic 148:4	138:10	157:19 166:11	59:13 97:19,24
123:5 124:19	fantasy 148:9	<b>finally</b> 2:7 26:7	<b>Fish</b> 55:24	formality 99:14
126:3,12 141:13	<b>far</b> 14:17 57:10	34:14 58:19	fishing 24:6	formally 81:20
145:4,25 146:7	61:18 79:4 83:15	<b>Finance</b> 149:16	<b>fit</b> 62:1 94:10	former 112:22
147:7 148:9	96:2 112:19	<b>find</b> 22:21 40:21	109:24	forms 25:14 43:23
150:12 151:4	115:8 117:7,13	43:9 63:5 76:2	<b>five</b> 7:17 16:13	43:25 82:14,25
154:20 155:19	118:22 119:2	99:17 118:2	43:3 54:18 55:1	83:19 105:9
159:17,21 166:21	127:1 154:18	119:3 145:14	127:15 152:12	165:11
175:13 179:17	156:22 166:4	146:10 151:8	176:23 185:13	Forster 137:7
183:14	173:5 179:24	165:20 169:24	<b>flag</b> 142:3	149:21 152:1
facts 73:12,21,22	fashion 130:6	170:22 171:22	<b>flagged</b> 105:21	155:17 157:15
112:13 126:25	<b>Father</b> 175:6	172:24 180:24	123:5,12	158:2 161:11
136:15,21 160:17	<b>fault</b> 9:12 12:9	182:20	flagging 145:16	180:17 183:2
160:19,21 161:1	32:3 84:15	<b>finding</b> 24:19	flesh 32:20	Forster's 183:4
161:4,7,20 163:6	February 13:9	81:18 93:11	flimsy 182:16	forth 35:8,8
165:7 187:4	18:22	167:11 168:3	flippant 187:2	fortunate 115:23
factual 79:20	feel 5:14 9:4,14	<b>findings</b> 73:18	<b>flood</b> 182:23,24	166:11
<b>failed</b> 19:16 27:22	12:15 20:5 26:5	74:10 138:18	183:5,8,10,13,18	forward 8:15
34:16 68:22	54:4 62:24 75:2	finds 93:10	183:22 184:1	67:23 69:10
77:21	80:15 92:11	fine 1:15 22:22	floods 183:12	93:24 125:5
failing 32:23 76:18	111:11 120:5	23:4 42:21,21,21	floss 137:13	139:15 142:3
<b>failings</b> 58:15 143:13 156:3	130:18 155:25	46:18 61:10 69:5	flourish 177:12	found 5:25 6:16
failure 67:8 68:24	165:12 184:6	158:24	focus 152:13	8:11 16:22 22:14
78:22 97:22	185:1	fined 173:25	<b>follow</b> 26:11 30:24	22:25 23:14 26:6
122:19 135:10	feeling 4:22 14:20	finest 61:10	65:21 78:6	33:8 42:5 43:11
142:25 145:1	92:5	<b>finger</b> 61:14	164:24 181:18	65:21 68:24
174.43 143.1				

				Page 200
85:15 91:8 92:21	108:6,19 109:7	175:7 184:17	169:14 171:3,4	goodbye 7:19
148:5 159:18	144:4 162:24	given 7:3 37:10	171:22 174:17	Googling 20:7
165:16 166:6	163:4 187:9	38:22 39:11	179:6,9,14	Gordon 180:14
four 28:8 51:1	furthermore 41:9	47:17 52:19 78:7	183:17 185:2	182:22 183:7
78:17,18 84:18	future 127:18	79:5 83:8,14	God 174:9	gospel 155:11
85:2 119:4,23		87:2 94:3,7	God's 175:22	177:11
120:17 124:23	G	100:5,18 105:13	goes 24:11 48:6	gossiping 42:4,10
125:5 139:17,18	galling 76:2	105:18 112:1,2	69:9 70:21 73:11	grabbed 54:6
141:12 152:16	gang 166:25	118:4,25 120:6	74:9 98:19 99:22	131:8 132:15
167:6 184:18	gap 122:23 158:12	129:4 131:3	143:19 159:1	Graham 57:22
fourth 24:5,8,14	gaps 122:20 159:2	134:15,24 137:7	160:1 179:1	79:9 180:25
frail 41:15	garb 175:13	138:5 140:22	184:14	181:4
frank 107:15	garden 6:9	153:7,8 158:1	going 2:1,2 7:11	gran 3:16
frankly 46:21 49:8	garments 61:11	163:2 168:10	8:13 10:2,4,4,6	grandma 8:25
frankness 107:16	gathered 58:21	169:21 182:25	10:21 11:7 13:25	grandmother 8:25
free 62:24 87:3	104:16 121:18	183:6 184:11	17:4 19:4 22:3	grandmother's
89:20 175:23	gathering 119:15	186:14	24:20,25 27:19	8:14
freehold 27:24	173:4	gives 167:22	28:17 29:25	grandparents 3:15
fresh 116:20	<b>GDPR</b> 31:17	175:16	30:22 32:15,18	9:1
fresher 173:23	<b>general</b> 37:4 53:23	giving 107:3 187:3	32:19 35:20 40:9	grant 29:15 153:7
Friday 23:25	54:1 55:21 81:6	glass 8:8	45:5 48:17 50:22	153:8 157:19
friend 3:24 31:5	86:9 91:12	Glyn 27:16 28:24	51:6,8 59:25	granted 83:11
31:12	115:18 132:10	34:15	63:4,14,14 65:19	granting 29:20
fringe 53:14,22	155:19 158:9	<b>go</b> 4:1 5:10,13 6:2	65:24 66:2,3	153:5
55:21	159:21 169:22	6:3,4 7:16 8:2,3	85:10,11,13 89:1	grateful 103:4
front 55:7 63:2	172:11 185:20	8:4,5,14 9:2 13:2	97:12 104:24	121:2
111:21 132:25	generally 64:9	13:3 18:10,23	107:18 116:1	gratefully 62:20
fulfilling 166:5	65:3 74:7 89:3	19:2 20:19 21:2	120:19 122:10	great 29:24 143:3
<b>full</b> 15:12 31:8	107:23 160:15	22:1,4 26:8 28:5	124:19 126:4	152:25 176:22,22
35:7 44:16,20	164:17	30:22 37:17	130:5,9,12	greater 52:22
55:17 73:11	geographically	41:24 42:21	135:15 136:9,22	Greenwood 25:13
full-time 123:7	114:3	45:23 47:11	142:22 143:20	31:12 53:13
<b>fully</b> 40:4	<b>getting</b> 9:2 52:22	51:13,16 52:1	150:4 156:11	58:21 130:25
function 86:24	80:7 138:15,19	55:2 57:6 58:24	158:5,15 163:10	132:7 162:16
87:4	161:18 173:23	64:18,19 65:25	164:4 168:13	177:15
functions 75:12	<b>ghastly</b> 139:22	67:23 73:19,20	173:25 174:2	grew 2:20
85:18 154:18	gift 91:23 136:2,4	75:17,19 78:5	176:6 178:14,16	grievance 36:25
157:25	gifts 175:25	84:11 85:5 89:23	179:14 180:1	37:5
<b>funds</b> 45:23	girl 57:8	97:12,15 99:24	183:8 184:20,21	grievances 36:24
<b>funny</b> 24:5	give 12:13 30:12	99:25 100:14	<b>good</b> 1:3,10 23:2	<b>grips</b> 168:16
furious 48:2	61:14 64:11	103:9 116:19	62:15,19 68:6	gross 162:8,9
further 15:22	85:20 87:25	117:25 118:9	83:7 90:5 91:1	<b>ground</b> 147:10
31:21 32:11,15	88:12 98:23	125:13 126:4	97:1 107:7 111:2	165:1
35:11 36:10	104:20 105:16	127:14 132:5	111:7 116:12	grounds 146:17
37:10,14 40:18	106:20 109:23	133:1 135:15	120:8 126:2	158:4 159:25
41:2,12 42:1,2,6	119:24 121:14	138:3,16 144:6	127:4 129:7	168:9
42:8 61:4,5,5	136:13 137:21	144:12 145:5,11	139:5,18 155:10	<b>group</b> 16:24 41:10
69:9,23 79:15	153:16 154:14	151:18 161:23	174:1	48:20 49:2,7,14
90:21 97:12,18	159:25,25 165:15	164:8 167:6,13	good-looking 6:17	49:16 51:7 80:9
	171:20 173:17			
	-	-	-	-

				1 agc 201
94:13 96:10	117:18 121:15,20	32:14 43:25	highlight 129:3	40:24
114:21 115:11	131:13 132:20	62:16 111:3	hint 152:17	houses 40:20
117:19 118:20,21	147:25 154:14	140:3,4,20 185:5	historic 30:12	58:24 61:10
119:2,10,17	156:17 158:13	heard 11:17,20	hitting 185:14	huge 149:14
120:14 123:19	170:7 178:14	15:13,16 18:16	hold 25:19 55:17	Hugh 156:9
169:19	180:5,9 186:25	18:18,20 19:13	94:10 117:22	Human 101:5
groups 49:3	happened 5:2,23	33:17 35:13	141:25	humiliation 90:21
172:20 174:3	8:19 9:16 10:19	48:25 56:1 84:21	holding 54:14	hundreds 95:15
guarantee 149:1	12:24 14:17	88:14 117:2	92:17 141:23	hurdle 83:24
guards 124:3	17:24 18:6 19:8	129:17 135:20	Holy 37:4 74:19	hurt 16:8 30:20,21
guesswork 183:19	19:11 21:16	136:23 137:3	75:1 76:3 98:5	165:8
guidance 67:9,18	39:14,21,24 40:8	140:6 149:20	106:12	hymns 74:3
69:21 77:22	51:14,15 55:14	170:5 171:6,9	home 4:22 6:2,3	hypocrites 61:23
83:14,16 84:17	55:20 57:21	186:10	6:19 8:5 14:1	hypothetical 154:8
85:21 90:7,11	93:25 99:8	hearing 1:4 25:2	23:1	nypoincical 134.6
91:21 97:6,9	127:10 130:11	128:20 187:19	honest 21:10 23:4	I
105:19,22 114:13	134:14 145:23	hearings 78:14	52:7	idea 44:18 45:1
144:8 167:15,17	146:15 148:6	heart 57:2 128:6	honestly 20:2	50:13 78:16 90:5
179:12,23	154:21 160:15	129:14 142:18	honorary 113:4	97:1 174:8
guide 83:4 167:19	186:15,21	145:13 147:13	honourable	ideas 116:20
guidelines 27:22	happening 17:20	151:16 159:2	133:20	identified 64:24
45:17 90:1	40:16 49:3,5	177:11	hope 59:22 132:25	77:25 81:20
	57:4 116:13	heated 14:2	133:17,21 154:16	95:25 96:21
guilt 92:6 guilty 42:22 92:21	154:24	Heather 55:14	175:7 177:6	101:3 117:11
148:6		133:2	186:25 187:5	129:20 132:9
	happens 19:6			146:19 149:21
guy 124:4	56:14 77:11 87:5	heavily 176:14	hopeful 126:23	152:6 163:16
H	93:20 103:14	<b>held</b> 5:15,16 53:14	hopefully 126:24	175:21 179:23
hair 7:3	105:20 116:6	54:7 113:14	186:24	identifies 91:21
half 15:13 44:12	179:15 180:6	146:3 148:8	hoping 186:21	96:5 112:10
54:9 114:3	happy 18:15 32:9	156:2 166:12 <b>hello</b> 7:13 133:15	horrendous 124:23 125:6	180:17
132:18 138:10	131:10,11,14			identify 10:5 63:24
hall 20:24 113:1	132:17,19,21	help 3:19 8:18	171:6 <b>horrified</b> 60:10	81:19 83:15
Hancock 134:5	hard 10:5 120:8	20:15 49:23		88:20 90:2 97:5
hand 4:25 47:12	185:14	56:10,14 100:5	horse 70:8,13,18	99:1 112:7
48:3 52:3 55:11	harm 158:6	125:10 135:5	70:23 71:1	115:25 129:16
63:1 108:24	170:11	173:21	hour 45:2,4 54:9	138:22 143:7,12
133:20 142:18	harmed 184:24	helped 146:14	132:18	138.22 143.7,12
handle 34:10	harmful 151:22	helpful 11:15 26:9	hours 47:7	155:18 179:22
handling 164:14	harrowing 96:21	helping 139:13	house 12:6 13:18	180:16,22 182:9
hands 4:23 56:20	148:22	helps 18:1	20:20 22:18 28:3	identifying 165:15
141:23,25	Hartlepool 3:3	hesitate 1:24	30:9 31:17 38:5	<b>Idi</b> 112:24,25
handwritten 17:19	hate 31:9	hiatus 157:5	51:21 60:15,18	ignore 61:2
Hang 48:5	he'll 11:11	hide 34:21,21	67:9 77:22 80:2	ignored 25:16
Hanson 21:3,10	head 54:4 116:21	hierarchy 60:4	91:2 113:21	26:20,23 28:21
24:1 25:18 30:6	142:14 163:11	<b>high</b> 99:12 106:2	114:12 125:22	28:24 29:6 33:12
happen 9:10 10:22	headed 25:25	149:10 165:7	128:23 156:18	34:1,15 54:17
11:8 50:18 54:13	health 178:23	higher 145:22	167:14 176:23,25	78:6 130:19
	179:1,4	146:4	177:25 181:15	
59:20,20 69:21	hear 2:1,25 18:12	highest 176:6	housekeeper 40:19	ignoring 32:23
70:19 89:12				<b>II</b> 21:22 44:12,23

				1 age 202
45:12,22	inappropriate	170:11 185:4	184:17 185:8,24	investigating 21:4
Iles 25:2 62:16,17	74:6 133:9,10	individualising	inside 20:11 110:1	24:19 51:7 61:7
62:19 63:9,24	134:3	156:9	insight 113:9	89:9 120:10
109:8 110:14,22	inasmuch 86:22	individually	installation 125:16	investigation
165:14 188:3	160:13	137:16	installed 113:12	19:17 21:12
illegible 17:20	incident 13:18	individuals 10:5	instance 106:20	25:12,21,22,23
image 151:13,20	include 76:11	14:15 15:18 16:1	158:8	26:25 28:25 29:9
imagery 150:4	106:11 126:9,12	23:23 27:20	instigated 125:18	30:11 34:17
images 149:25	152:4	29:19 65:8 68:2	institute 124:2	48:17 51:9 52:16
150:2,3,22 151:6	included 126:11	72:24 80:1,3	183:16	69:17,24 70:5,25
151:9,23	126:13	100:8,17,18	institutions 95:1	71:16 79:15
<b>imagine</b> 79:18	includes 115:20	167:18	185:19,22	118:2 119:14
96:9	including 80:4	<b>Ineson</b> 1:6,8,11,14	instrument 158:19	129:15 137:8
immediately 22:6	124:17 135:22	41:7 62:3 81:19	158:19 162:1	144:17 157:22
31:11 82:20	inconsistency	81:20 83:8	Insurance 45:17	162:22 164:10,14
121:9 124:3	100:19	129:17,25 130:8	integrity 107:23	182:2
128:24 165:25	incorrect 126:22	130:15 131:1,3	intelligible 35:23	investigation's
166:3	increased 123:9	131:13 132:5,7,9	intend 84:2	63:11
immemorial	increasing 78:20	133:5 134:7,18	interdiocese 144:8	investigations 24:3
144:25	incredible 33:8	135:18,21 136:11	interest 46:16 50:3	54:20
impact 104:1	indecent 149:24	141:1 186:11,17	50:8 56:24 66:17	investigatory
impediment	150:2,3,22 151:6	186:23 187:24	66:20 68:1,4,10	72:20
186:13,16	151:9,12,20	Inevitably 109:21	68:17,18,25 69:3	invited 154:10
implement 93:4	independence	inflation 95:23	78:14 83:22	invites 69:11
implemented	102:18 116:18	influence 118:15	108:12 110:4,6	inviting 119:22
115:3	independent 17:14	influenced 22:1	interested 42:21	involve 81:5,14
imply 152:24	22:1,2 44:11	inform 89:16	46:9 158:25	97:21 119:11
importance 128:8	50:23 51:6	information 24:7	interesting 160:16	160:13
184:12	100:23 109:12,19	24:22 31:15	interests 34:10	involved 2:20
important 7:23	115:1,6 117:10	32:23 41:12 42:5	interfering 68:14	38:23 68:17
76:6 94:21,23	118:1,7,13	47:7,14 67:8,13	intermediaries	72:20 80:1,3
139:25 143:16,21	122:12	68:22 114:13	105:7	83:10 87:13 88:4
159:14 184:16	independently	120:15 121:8,18	internal 25:3 41:6	103:19 115:12
185:14	123:24	155:23	50:22	116:7 117:13
importantly 113:6	<b>indicate</b> 1:24 63:1	informed 135:17	interview 36:1	119:25 125:19
impose 70:12	63:7 111:16	ingredients 163:15	72:21	147:2 148:25
71:23 72:11,12	131:20 152:19	inherent 166:18	interviewed 15:8	173:6
93:11 97:19,24	162:16	166:23	35:24 58:8	involvement 87:10
102:14 103:9,12	indicated 84:17	initial 11:6,9 79:3	introduction	87:20 152:25
106:14	101:20 161:12	108:15	144:15 182:9	involving 98:18
imposed 70:16	indicates 129:20	inner 8:9	invaluable 139:15	105:8 135:12
74:11 91:9 93:21	indicating 53:4	inordinate 87:21	investigate 11:19	irrespective
impossible 8:12	indirectly 76:17	<b>input</b> 52:19,20	40:4 46:16 52:10	144:24
impressed 30:7	individual 70:7	inquiry 1:17 59:21	56:23 64:15	<b>Isle</b> 114:5
improved 96:5	72:22 74:18 76:2	68:13 80:23	76:15	isolated 85:14
improvement 96:1	77:21 87:14	111:9 113:8,10	investigated 30:4	issue 10:8,8 14:9
119:5 139:2	116:7 129:18	119:22 120:25	30:13,20 34:18	66:23 71:10,14
inadequacies	144:7 149:23	129:7 134:20	121:21	73:21 84:24 85:3
123:13	152:6 156:2	178:21 180:15	investigates 41:22	89:4 90:12 94:23
	I	I	I	1

				8
97:14 98:4 100:7	188:9	keep 2:24 97:1	129:10,16 131:21	laughing 31:10
100:25,25 101:1	John's 48:8	140:21 174:2	131:21 133:14	law 68:12 84:3
101:15 104:11	joined 115:23	kept 10:16 17:19	134:16 135:7	102:5 104:12
110:5 126:14	joint 120:5 137:7	44:14 89:4	136:25 138:4	136:19,20,20
137:19,19 146:19	137:20	124:25 141:13	139:10 140:11	137:1 144:13,20
149:22 154:23	Jordans 20:10	167:10	141:7 145:5	145:17,24 156:10
155:1,14,19	26:6	kettle 12:10 54:9	148:21 150:1,9	161:6,18,22
164:18 166:10	journalist 35:24	key 57:13	150:11 154:8	164:12 172:12,12
173:15 174:11	58:8	killed 135:15	158:11,17 159:7	173:21
issued 22:17 23:10	<b>journey</b> 139:2	kind 56:17 77:23	160:2,4,17 161:5	<b>Lawrence</b> 113:8
23:20 126:18	JSB 65:10	140:6 153:6	165:3,25 166:25	lawyer 82:20
135:8	judge 22:17 33:18	155:17 156:18	168:15,24 170:6	85:17 112:22
issues 10:1,3 65:11	64:2,4 85:8	162:7 170:8	171:5 172:6,19	166:13 169:7
76:25 79:11	105:4 112:22	175:17 185:17	171.3 172.0,19	lawyer's 100:25
80:15 82:10,18	122:18 136:21	187:2	173.2,20,24	lawyers 68:3 73:13
89:2 97:21	143:17,22 144:22	kinds 116:16,20	174.8,18,24	lawyers' 68:1
	,	128:15 150:4		•
101:18 102:10	146:22 158:10		183:11 184:20	laxer 146:7 lay 60:8 68:3
103:2,2 104:1	165:17 166:4	172:20	knowing 40:6 59:6	•
107:21 109:14	168:10 169:23	Kingdom 112:23	knowledge 38:6,13	106:19 130:11
117:16 129:13	judges 106:2,3,4,5	kiss 61:13	39:3 50:11 63:22	149:13,13 174:9
135:11 138:21	164:6	<b>kitchen</b> 7:10,16,16	99:10 112:14,15	layers 57:7 58:24
143:24 144:8,10	judgment 31:25	kneel 61:13	125:18 184:1	layman's 67:1
144:18 157:22	32:8 153:1	knew 5:24 14:23	known 3:20 40:7	lays 158:3 185:17
167:14 168:21	159:25 169:10,23	20:9 38:7 39:2	64:11 70:18	lead 21:11 42:18
it?' 35:17	judgments 86:1	40:6,9 152:15,16	117:8 180:5	43:5 87:21
itching 7:2	judicial 64:25	183:18	knows 175:6	leaders 149:13
J	65:14 86:23 87:4	know 5:10 7:11,14		leadership 116:15
<b>j</b> 97:16	166:12	8:1,14 10:18	lack 45:22 89:25	116:15,22 117:1
James 180:25	judiciary 64:2	11:8,14 15:17	141:20,24 184:5	117:15 138:21
181:4	Julie 115:23	16:3,6,7 18:4,24	lad 6:17 9:8	141:20,22,24
	117:17	19:14 20:2,13	186:12	178:17,25
<b>January</b> 59:12	July 1:1 9:17	21:17 22:5 24:2		learned 60:6
155:5	57:22 131:5	24:7,11,20 26:11	lady 20:11 31:17 55:13 72:16	127:14,16
Jenny 21:15,15,16	187:20	29:11 30:1,7		learning 141:22
<b>Jesus</b> 60:20 61:22	jump 8:15	31:9 39:21 41:3	laicize 74:18	leave 6:19,23 7:9
61:24 175:3	June 16:5 22:11	41:24 44:21 48:4	laid 97:11 164:24	8:10 18:13 19:9
186:3	jurisdiction 74:21	48:5 49:7 52:20	lain 5:12	28:3,4 29:12,15
Jimmy 147:21	95:4 99:6	53:24 54:5 61:11	laity 175:24,25	29:20 38:5,17
174:19	jurisdictions 85:20	67:2 70:19,21	land 64:8	61:2 140:12
<b>Jo</b> 140:6	162:13 172:5	74:25 79:5 82:6	language 99:17	155:18
<b>job</b> 44:24 116:12	<b>jury</b> 85:8 165:18	83:9,20 84:8	177:1	leaves 141:17
149:2,3,4	<b>justice</b> 72:16,17	85:1 88:8,19,22	lapse 31:25 32:8	186:1
jobs 106:1	87:23,23 110:2	89:6 90:9,24	large 25:1 63:7	Leaving 186:14
John 29:5 33:25	161:24 162:6,6	92:6 98:13 103:3	147:1	led 17:5 72:24
34:5 46:14,19	184:6	107:17 108:25	largely 56:6	119:5 123:6
47:12,16 48:3,4	<b>justify</b> 37:10	110:16 115:4	104:12 184:18	142:24
48:17 50:5 52:2	<b>Justin</b> 54:1 58:8	117:17 119:1,10	larger 63:6	<b>Leeds</b> 45:7,11 48:8
53:17,20 54:1,3	60:4 160:10	122:17 125:12	late 182:5	178:22
60:23 111:5		126:20 128:22,23	latest 80:25	<b>left</b> 3:13,14 5:8,22
131:8 132:15	K		laugh 19:5	
	-	-	-	•

				1 age 204
16:4 32:5 40:20	90:4 104:2 129:5	locally 21:9	136:21 138:20	140:24 145:15
54:18 133:22	129:8 150:7	lodged 72:22	146:8 170:23	154:2 155:23
171:12	167:20 182:12	<b>London</b> 113:4	177:9 180:23	man 6:17 12:9
legal 8:23 30:8	light 4:21 107:9	156:10	looks 66:10 129:11	52:14 114:5
34:21 51:21	122:25	long 3:20 9:5	161:22	133:20 140:17
52:14 58:2 63:25	liked 6:10	15:11 35:5 46:22	loopholes 120:19	170:18
66:12 75:4 83:18	likewise 29:7	52:7 89:15,17	Lord 72:17 156:8	manage 124:15
86:6,9 95:6,7	liking 177:5	95:23 99:8	Lords 113:22	managed 48:21
96:17 109:17,20	limit 29:10 97:14	116:19 124:13	173:14 176:23	56:21
158:19,23,24	136:10,10	125:16 134:13,19	lose 128:23 184:11	management 14:8
158.17,23,24	limitation 76:20	140:10,18,19	lost 19:20 182:24	66:23 67:3 77:24
legalistic 99:4	82:2,11 83:3	142:6 149:22	183:5,10,12,22	89:3 94:6,9
legally 161:13	84:4	175:5,11 179:8	lot 2:16 3:16 8:20	98:16 105:16
legitimate 103:25	limits 46:24 47:1	184:4	9:1 12:15 19:1	160:7 163:23
Leicester 28:12,14	Lincoln 160:3,17	longer 74:19	20:24 40:23	manager 179:1
33:8 50:6 165:23	160:19,21 161:20	156:22 157:25	43:11 59:16	managing 64:23
lemonade 160:25	line 41:5 45:16	longest-serving	60:17 75:5 85:2	65:6 122:6
length 11:1 88:2	167:9	151:5	85:3 99:2 100:3	160:15
162:6	lined 161:18	look 1:22 19:12	122:20 124:5	mandatorily 174:4
lesser 97:19	link 156:4	36:12,17 37:18	125:9,10,10	mandatory 56:25
lessons 127:13,16	Lionel 169:2	40:21 41:15 48:6	134:17 141:8,17	57:10 171:24
151:19	list 24:6,9,14,18	52:8,10 54:10	143:15 172:5	172:3,23 173:1,4
let's 45:2,15 71:25	27:20 65:23 90:6	55:16 73:15	182:3	173:17
85:9 101:6	109:10	85:25 96:20	lots 3:17 105:2	manipulate 52:25
182:17,18	listen 20:17	107:24 108:3	loud 2:24	manner 100:21
letter 16:2,5,6,9,16	listened 115:4	111:22 119:23	Louise 169:4	March 16:2 64:21
16:19,22 17:1	172:4	120:18 125:8	lovely 12:10,11	184:21
19:15 25:25 27:4	listening 31:11	128:25 129:8,25	147:9 156:18	Margaret 177:22
27:12 29:2,3	literacy 99:16	138:12 141:21	low 83:23	mark 161:15
35:15 37:19	literally 19:9	145:25,25 153:15	lunch 110:17,20	married 141:16
59:12 99:8 130:4	61:13	160:25 161:6	luxuriate 176:11	180:6
137:25 175:1	litigant's 136:3	174:21 184:18	lying 35:18 37:15	<b>Martyn</b> 13:15,22
letters 138:6	little 2:2,4 4:15	185:6	42:2,2,11	13:23 28:9,14
letting 10:22 11:8	5:16 17:4 20:25	looked 17:14 23:1		33:7,11 35:18
175:24	26:9,13 30:22	49:18 77:17	M	36:13 42:1 50:6
level 48:22 52:22	34:24 37:18	79:25 84:6 86:15	machineries	Masters 178:17
80:18 94:9 99:14	42:13,23 57:8	96:9 100:15	154:12	material 100:5
115:14 149:10	112:19 168:14	104:11 107:18	magistrate's 22:8	104:15,17,21,22
150:1	181:22 182:16,16	110:5 124:7	magistrates 22:11	104:23,23 134:20
levels 99:16	live 35:21 36:1	136:7 140:2	22:13,20	Matt 43:1
lie 35:7 44:19	54:9 61:9 131:10	159:22 170:17,25	main 8:18 64:15	matter 10:12 18:5
91:23 130:1	156:18	182:2	97:4 104:7	19:12 21:13
lied 33:13,15,24	lived 132:18	looking 6:15 10:16	<b>majority</b> 60:8,10	67:21 73:3 74:9
36:7 37:1,1,4	182:17	26:21 28:18	60:16 63:3 85:9	87:22 88:10
42:1	lives 140:20	40:20 41:17	148:20	92:17 96:18 98:6
lies 118:24	145:11 166:1	48:19 54:21	maker 84:7 91:5	102:24 103:14
life 22:5 23:2	load 183:8	73:18 93:24	making 29:14 46:9	130:7 168:7
59:18 74:12,16	local 10:2,3,6	120:17 125:4	68:9,10,20 72:25	172:25 173:16,18
75:10,11 77:9	132:1	126:8,14 127:3,5	73:5,17 87:8	matters 37:8 63:21
		, , .	119:6 127:20	
	I	I	I	I

	_	_		
64:6 67:24 79:20	measure 2:7 17:6	membership 49:15	36:18,21 37:2	money 20:14
84:16 86:4 99:20	25:1,4,7,14 27:4	memories 128:20	73:23,24,24,25	45:19,21 122:7
101:8,9,15 107:9	36:16 37:3 41:18	memory 62:24	74:2 78:9 91:8	149:17
115:13 128:19	41:19 42:15	111:11,12 112:17	92:15 93:9,10,12	month 17:15 58:7
154:1 158:17	45:25 46:24	mental 178:22	93:25 94:1	84:18 85:2 89:13
161:6 166:7	51:17 61:7 62:22	179:4	106:14,16,22,23	180:12
169:19 182:3	64:12 65:18 66:5	mentioned 7:20	162:9,10 163:12	monthly 89:7
<b>Matthew</b> 1:6,8,11	72:2 74:2,5,20,22	83:8	163:14,21	months 46:23
7:13,24 21:16	76:11,16 78:11	mercy 167:4 168:4	mishandled	80:14 129:11
35:16 41:7 44:16	80:5,10 81:15	merits-based	159:20	179:8,8
48:1,15,15 58:10	84:16 85:4 93:19	73:13	misinterpreted	Moor 48:8
81:19,20 187:24	93:20 94:5 95:2	mess 5:19	101:14	moral 146:1
maximum 134:24	95:4 106:8	message 147:11	misjudged 159:20	morning 1:3,10
McFarlane 72:17	134:11,21 135:4	155:11 161:16	misjudgment	7:21 22:20 39:19
151:1	135:8,22 136:19	messages 18:9	153:2	62:15,19 81:21
<b>McNeill</b> 1:4,5,9,10	155:16 158:3,14	met 1:13 3:11	misleading 84:10	129:17 131:6
62:3,6,8 109:9	159:3 164:25	20:25 25:13 41:3	misled 150:15	135:20 165:14
188:1	165:18 167:9	59:15 117:19	misplaced 93:18	187:15
mean 19:7 21:19	Measures 130:20	Metropolitan	174:22	Mosaic 21:22
54:5 55:3 67:1,2	mechanism 44:4	113:19,23	misread 105:22	44:12,23 45:12
67:10 68:4 69:19	117:12 162:8	Michael 23:16	missed 57:13	45:22
70:21 71:1 77:13	meddling 68:15	24:16	127:6	motion 175:22
78:12 80:20 81:3	media 36:5 50:10	mid-morning 62:9	missing 156:4	motive 56:14
81:3 82:22 90:22	meet 39:13 41:7	middle 99:11	mistake 142:10	move 4:17 5:4 17:8
92:14 93:3 94:24	53:23 59:11	132:4 137:3	147:9	24:25 38:17
96:13,19 99:4	71:18 73:6,8	milling 54:2	mistaken 156:17	87:23 88:11
106:20 107:25	89:14 98:9 100:2	mind 6:7 9:11 15:3	mistaken 130.17 mistakes 56:17	139:14 170:3
109:25 113:16	133:22	29:25 80:7 94:11	141:25 142:3,11	174:5
118:11,12,16	meeting 9:24,25	97:12 138:15,19	mistrust 174:23	moved 28:16
119:3 122:11	10:11,14 13:2,3	143:9,19 150:12	mitre 116:4	101:16 152:8
128:8,16 130:13	13:18,22 14:4	150:14,17 152:13	Mmm 14:19 23:12	moves 96:7 181:16
132:23 133:6	16:24 41:10	173:17 186:16	<b>Mockford</b> 169:3	moving 15:19
135:13 137:18	53:22 54:2,3	minds 30:10	models 141:20,24	MP 59:7
139:12 142:21	86:11 124:9	mine 31:5	modest 94:20	mum 3:13 8:21,21
144:22 151:8	131:7 132:14	minimal 152:22	Moira 23:22,24	8:22
152:22,24 154:8	148:7	153:1	44:17 48:12,12	Munn 82:10
155:13 157:1,23	meetings 40:1	minimum 45:15	49:5 51:3,15,25	murders 148:22
159:12 160:2,17	123:16	ministry 128:12	58:1,5 134:16	Murray 23:24
162:9,18 163:1,9	meets 66:12 69:7	152:18,22,25	135:17	44:17 48:12 49:5
164:19,22 166:10	Meg 82:10	153:1 164:20	moment 8:15	51:3 58:1
173:1,21 187:1	member 2:3 64:1	175:8 177:3,24	28:17 32:19	must' 45:19
meaning 52:12	72:25 103:24	180:7 181:1	48:18 62:9 82:12	mustn't 144:22
means 7:19 37:15	113:21 114:11	minute 48:6	97:8 100:17	
43:19 64:4,14	116:3,14,22,25	125:13	106:7 108:1	N
68:7 113:18,19	117:14 148:16	minutes 7:17 8:1	120:19 157:8	N 187:22
131:21 137:13	173:13	10:15 16:24 19:9	159:6 162:3,9	name 13:20,21
158:20	members 53:23,25	41:10,14 49:6	164:16 172:15	18:5 21:13 23:23
meant 47:11 68:1	81:23 107:20	111:18	momentary 31:25	46:12 101:24
94:8 95:3 146:3	113:7	misconduct 26:25	32:8	102:2 124:1
110,0.0 110.0				138:3
	l	l	1	l

				1 486 200
named 13:1	111:15 125:10	<b>night</b> 4:14,19 5:2	148:3	offences 144:17
names 49:19	128:21 131:17	12:15 22:16,22	Nye 53:7 60:17	offending 146:21
137:23	133:16 138:2	night's 12:16		152:21
nan 3:18 5:25 6:3	153:21 163:8	night-time 40:9	0	offer 33:14 35:16
7:9,10,15 8:20,24	167:15	nights 4:16	<b>O'Donnell</b> 183:1	45:9 71:5 93:5
9:7 39:19	needed 3:22	<b>nod</b> 5:13 59:23	<b>O'Hara</b> 115:23,25	96:14
nan's 7:18	105:18 115:13	non-legally 167:17	118:12	offered 15:3 23:16
nans 7:14	123:3	non-stipendiary	oath 111:4 131:21	24:16 137:17
narratives 139:1	needs 35:17 60:13	179:20	<b>object</b> 26:24 29:25	offering 44:21
<b>nasty</b> 81:17	69:14 70:4 73:16	noncurrent 126:7	30:13 34:19	171:3
national 16:25	73:19 96:5	nonexistent	136:3,5	offhand 7:13
23:24 41:6 44:17	121:15 127:19,20	151:15	objected 27:17	<b>office</b> 17:16 30:8
48:21 79:24 80:8	128:2 129:23	normal 108:17	28:25 29:7,20	34:7 36:3 51:21
83:16 94:13,14	130:18,18 138:22	normally 142:7	34:18 45:14	62:1 63:25 72:4
95:1 114:11	neither 16:16	179:7	objection 27:2	74:14,15,16 75:4
123:10,16,17,18	32:17 118:12	<b>North</b> 32:4	29:1 32:25	76:3 77:9 83:18
134:16 135:17	169:4	northern 114:3	obligations 110:2	90:4 92:23 94:10
144:9 146:13	net 165:6	122:3	observation	94:10 96:12,17
155:1 156:6	neutral 91:21,22	northerner 59:2	143:16	103:10 121:13
163:3 164:9	92:5,12 161:4	<b>Norwich</b> 181:4,5	observations 35:1	124:5 163:12,15
170:23	162:21	nose 175:17,21	obtained 75:23	163:22 164:18
nationally 21:9	never 6:3,13,19	<b>note</b> 59:24 143:16	obvious 41:24	166:12
114:9 122:8	10:20 11:17,20	<b>noted</b> 51:24 145:6	58:14 70:1 83:20	officer 18:4 20:25
123:14	12:22 15:13,15	notes 17:19 62:24	83:25 156:1	21:4 32:17 64:13
natural 161:24	16:6,7,14,15	111:12	157:17 162:8	64:14 65:1,4
naturally 166:15	18:16,18,20	<b>notice</b> 157:3	184:5	69:17,23 70:17
nature 104:4	19:13 20:9 35:13	169:12 176:22	obviously 21:11	71:15 76:25 79:1
183:23	41:3 47:1 48:10	184:15	32:9 69:19 85:17	80:19 82:16
naughty 6:11	48:11 49:3 53:20	<b>noticed</b> 169:13	115:25 122:21	87:20 88:15
<b>navigate</b> 43:10,19	53:21 54:13	Nottingham 114:6	123:15 124:17	154:11
near 131:11	57:25 58:4,7,11	<b>nought</b> 84:18	129:13 135:5	officers 30:8
183:14	58:13,16 59:18	November 15:9	137:18 140:10	126:10
necessarily 79:14	60:9 88:14 96:23	31:4 35:3 63:10	144:20 146:24	officiate 152:11,12
103:16 105:20	118:5 131:13	<b>NST</b> 41:10,14	152:3 157:5	157:20
109:18 142:17	132:20 139:18	48:12 52:13 53:8	159:4 160:2,17	<b>oh</b> 6:11 20:17
170:1	140:1 149:1,9	55:13 60:17	161:11 166:12	116:10 183:2
necessary 90:24	151:21 152:17	133:3	173:13 183:4	186:2
96:24	160:25 167:9	<b>numb</b> 186:1	occasion 59:11	okay 1:23,24,25
necessity 90:23	171:2 180:6	<b>number</b> 19:2 25:7	96:25 134:6	2:10 26:12 33:16
need 1:19 7:15,24	183:23	28:7 53:5,25	occasions 13:6	51:18 84:11 93:7
8:2,3 12:18	nevertheless 37:9	69:16 76:12	43:24	118:6 122:11,17
21:16 23:2,3	168:11	78:20,20 81:21	occupied 133:12	174:20
24:4,23 43:2	new 90:15 97:6	94:3 95:25	142:25	old 4:4 60:22
63:8 69:25 72:5	102:7,8	123:15 126:4,20	October 105:12	older 3:17 10:21
73:7 80:15 83:5	Newcastle 165:23	129:20 134:10	ocular 112:1	Ombudsman-type
94:2 96:1,22	newly 86:11	135:12 141:19	off-the-record	185:1
97:5 98:20 99:2	news 23:15 89:6	143:13 147:1	87:11	omission 124:20
99:3,25 103:10	89:10 120:8	149:12 172:5	<b>offence</b> 72:2,3 75:17 127:19	128:7
104:17 105:23	nice 2:24 71:22	numbers 123:9	145:7	omissions 126:3
			143.7	

110.11	100015	11110	1	105010504
omitting 110:14	182:8,15	oversee 114:10	paragraphs 23:8	185:3 186:24
once 8:22 23:4	order 92:22	overview 138:10	65:22 85:5	particularly 76:10
46:4 69:5 70:24	103:19 122:14	Owen 46:18 47:2	paramount 127:19	81:17 103:21
71:5 75:8 93:20	123:4 139:14	47:20	128:2 129:24	105:2,9 107:15
93:21 98:6,19	140:20 154:24	<b>Oxford</b> 22:18	173:5	120:16 135:11
106:18 125:1	161:15 175:14	28:13,16 33:6	pardon 148:2	139:11 154:22
135:19 164:5	<b>Orders</b> 37:4 74:19	35:2 46:15 50:2	<b>parish</b> 3:20 13:19	163:22 178:6
165:1	75:1,7,12 76:3	140:20	14:11 16:5 27:24	185:25
one's 101:7	98:5 106:12	P	40:20 48:10	partner 6:9
one-year 27:6,11	<b>Ordinal</b> 167:3,13		68:23 152:8	partners 120:6,9
27:14,17 29:10	ordinands 177:20	paedophiles 129:4	171:14 176:1	partnership
30:3,17 33:3,21	178:1 179:6	page 23:7 26:14	179:7 181:17	119:25 175:23
34:20 43:14,15	ordination 106:10	32:19,20 34:14	parishes 113:3	parts 47:23 126:2
46:25 82:12	106:13,21,22,25	34:15 38:8,9	147:5 152:16	186:1,1
ones 126:7 154:14	107:10 113:1	41:4 53:2 84:13	179:10	<b>party</b> 46:9
ongoing 135:11	176:20 178:13,14	84:14 85:6 89:24	parishioners 148:8	pass 45:7 46:5,10
153:2	179:18 180:1,2	91:14 97:13	parity 89:25	67:7 68:22 83:22
<b>online</b> 48:6 54:22	180:11 181:23	127:15 138:16	Parliament 172:13	180:13 185:8
179:18 180:12	organisation 173:9	141:18 143:20	parochial 9:25	186:6
onwards 91:15	173:10	144:6 148:23	<b>part</b> 17:5 47:24	passage 153:21
open 79:18 141:22	organisations	paid 45:16 95:6	51:24 52:21	passed 32:24
<b>openly</b> 110:12	174:3	pain 177:7	54:20 55:23	52:18 69:5
operate 65:18	organise 178:1	Palace 180:19	86:21 93:17	172:12 185:20,23
operates 65:19	original 134:14	palaces 61:10	105:16 114:14	<b>passes</b> 66:10
79:22 108:12	186:17	panel 57:14 62:4	116:18 120:13,14	passing 47:10
operating 146:7	ought 4:17 151:18	62:15 63:12	136:19,20 147:23	67:12
operation 119:17	outburst 42:24	108:8,10 110:14	154:4 167:5	<b>pastor</b> 166:4 168:5
137:8	outcome 32:18	111:2 112:4	183:19	pastoral 15:4,12
operational	34:24 51:11	113:8 117:10	part-time 64:1	23:18 24:17
114:22,24	53:10 91:7 94:15	118:8,14 123:16	particular 2:6	33:14 35:7,13,16
<b>opinion</b> 27:11,14	123:20 135:3	157:4,10 172:4	40:12 41:20	41:25 44:4,16,20
30:3 43:13 47:17	outcomes 42:15	177:23 178:4,12	64:22 66:15	47:25 85:14
53:22 155:8	43:8 94:20	179:16 180:9,10	69:21 71:10 76:1	86:20,22,23 87:2
opportunity 30:12	outer 8:9	185:8 186:6,8	77:16 84:23	87:6 96:11,12,13
63:19 87:25	outlined 127:16	188:7,13	90:16 97:6 99:3	96:14,17,23 97:2
88:12 112:16	outrage 184:7	paper 26:1 80:8	101:3 107:6	100:13 130:10,22
120:6 138:12	outrageous 177:1	84:11 111:20	114:24 117:3,19	135:1 140:22
option 5:9	<b>outside</b> 1:13 55:13	171:1 181:22	120:25 121:20	141:16 144:3
optional 147:12	56:21 66:2 68:3	papers 32:1 39:15	122:7 125:21	165:13 166:6,20
options 69:16	82:1 102:14	79:23 125:3	132:3 135:13	167:8 168:6
oral 99:19 105:1	109:25 130:17	182:13,21	138:20 144:12	171:3,14
orally 65:17 99:19	133:3	paperwork 48:19	148:7 149:22,23	patch 10:23
99:21	outstanding	paragraph 36:17	154:3 158:8	paternal 8:25
orange 160:23,25	155:16	36:19 50:1 84:13	159:5,20 160:21	patients 179:2
<b>ordained</b> 3:1 48:4	overall 89:4	87:17 88:6,16	161:24 164:11	patronising
48:7 106:19	overdue 81:24,25	89:23,24 90:18	165:3 166:1,3	185:16
107:7 117:22,23	overheard 31:1	91:3,14 92:19	167:16 168:1	<b>Paul</b> 175:2
177:16 179:12,13	overlooked 4:15	94:12 95:24	169:9 170:13	pause 10:4
179:16 181:24	overriding 56:13	143:7,12 144:18	177:21 178:3	pay 44:22,23,24
		148:23,24		

				1 486 200
45:9,23 94:24	perceived 158:21	137:7 180:17	37:19 38:9 39:18	114:10,15 115:2
95:2 143:3	perfect 80:24	183:2,4	44:9 62:24 63:7	115:6 143:24
paying 45:11	perform 87:8	Pharisees 61:23	84:14 85:5,6	144:2,4,9
pecuniary 75:23	153:24	Philip 32:4	89:23 91:14	<b>policy</b> 78:6 84:7,10
pen 51:12	<b>perils</b> 175:20	Philippians 175:1	97:13,16 111:4	91:5,6 100:25
penalties 74:11	period 6:21 76:20	<b>phone</b> 13:3,4	111:11,16 113:17	101:1 144:1
89:25 90:6	78:12 83:3 84:4	19:10 23:21,22	125:5,8,8 128:18	178:5
100:21	95:23 162:11	30:5 31:5 33:2	128:21 129:3	<b>poor</b> 96:1 99:16
penalty 70:12,15	184:5	42:20,22 47:20	131:18 138:17	142:4
70:16 71:5,13,24	permission 76:22	47:24 57:5,9	141:19 143:9	pornography
72:8,12,14 75:3	83:6,7,11 152:10	89:22	144:6 147:8	150:10,13,16
79:3 90:19,20	152:12 157:20	phrase 16:12	176:7	position 33:9
91:9 93:5,6,11,21	permitted 92:23	34:19 35:5 37:2	<b>plus</b> 114:5	45:20 56:15
97:20 106:15	perpetrator	physical 151:12,22	<b>pm</b> 110:18,21,24	108:2 118:4
penitent 171:17	135:15	physically 55:17	111:1,18 131:22	139:9 149:6
<b>people</b> 5:6 7:5 12:5	person 11:22	pick 57:5,9 135:4	131:24 157:4,9	166:11
16:13 19:1 20:24	16:17 26:17 46:8	135:4	157:11,13 187:18	positions 9:9
27:10 34:8,11	51:7 69:2 71:10	picked 4:2 51:12	point 1:19 7:2 10:7	positive 120:3
36:5 43:13 48:25	72:23 73:2	153:19	14:13,21 37:24	possessing 149:24
50:6,9,10 54:2	104:19 108:17,25	picture 41:17	38:9,21 46:9,15	possession 41:12
55:4 56:15 59:4	116:11 117:4,11	<b>piece</b> 169:12	52:8,9 78:12	possibility 55:8
59:15 60:11 61:8	117:22 118:8	172:11	82:23,24 83:13	101:4 120:12
61:12,13,16,18	121:11 123:4	<b>pin</b> 163:11	92:10 115:5	123:7,9,10 159:9
61:23 62:1 65:7	124:8,25 127:20	<b>pit</b> 45:19	123:20 135:24,25	170:10
68:3,9,19 73:2	129:1,10 135:6	<b>place</b> 10:11 30:2	150:24 153:14	possible 130:14
75:13 79:6,7	138:1 142:20	38:24 45:8 66:22	164:9 165:6	156:3 187:5
83:19 90:24,24	143:4,5 147:9	70:19 91:4 93:23	173:14 182:23	possibly 23:1
90:25 92:8 94:3	148:6 156:9	96:23 103:22	points 19:3 39:17	39:23 57:4
99:7 104:10	158:8 164:15	106:9,25 111:17	157:18	104:24
106:19 109:14	165:9 166:1	115:24 119:4	<b>police</b> 10:12 12:4	post 106:13,21
120:13 124:6	175:8 181:16	124:5 126:21	12:11 15:20,23	113:13 178:13,14
125:9,24 126:24	185:5	132:11 139:22	15:24 17:8,24,25	180:2,11
128:13 130:13,21	personal 80:18	143:1 144:13	18:2,3,4,19 19:11	postdate 107:10
132:23 133:12,13	141:25 142:11	146:4,18 148:7	19:15,17,18,19	postdating 128:1
133:14 135:7	personally 56:25	155:5,9 162:12	19:22,23 20:4,15	potential 110:6
138:7 139:5,17	96:13 137:25	164:15 180:1,2	20:19,21,25	153:18 155:1
140:14,24 141:9	138:6 141:4,23	187:5	21:20 22:18,23	178:1
141:11,13,15	163:24	placement 179:7	23:2,13 24:19	potentially 10:22
142:2,5 146:11	persons 147:5	<b>places</b> 148:18	25:12,12,25 26:5	11:8 36:21 54:19
146:19 147:7,17	perspective 11:14	Plainly 91:21	30:11 32:17	87:11
148:25 149:13	25:4 82:2	planned 33:7	44:11 52:16	<b>pounds</b> 95:15,22
150:10,15,18	<b>persuade</b> 124:9,15	<b>Plastic</b> 173:24	54:20 57:5,9	power 60:22,23,25
155:10 156:16,25	176:7	<b>plate</b> 84:24,24	77:16 87:21 88:7	74:17 91:25
158:15 160:24	persuaded 158:16	play 84:19 122:6	89:10 119:11,14	92:22,25 93:3
171:12 172:7	<b>Peter</b> 9:20 12:19	140:1	137:9,23 152:7	102:19 112:24
173:4,19 174:9	12:25 13:21,24	<b>playing</b> 74:4 139:6	162:21 163:5,7	118:11,15,17,24
174:10 175:2,8	26:16 28:18	<b>plays</b> 168:22	171:22 178:9	136:16 156:12,12
175:11,12,23	31:23 42:3,20	<b>please</b> 1:6 16:19	<b>police's</b> 119:13	156:13,15,21
177:8 185:11,16	60:24 134:5,9	23:8,9 34:24	policies 11:14	157:16 163:1,6

				1 uge 20)
164:12 174:11,22	prepared 31:13	61:20,21 66:7	43:2 46:4 65:25	68:18 87:2 99:13
175:20	36:8 84:11 94:13	68:23 75:8,8,11	79:22 80:1 81:12	properly 122:10
powerful 158:5	140:15	75:16,20,22 77:8	92:9 98:10 99:4	122:15 161:22
175:15	present 127:4	78:5 79:19,20	100:10 103:6	185:2
powerfully 99:19	131:5 180:19	103:5 113:3	105:4 107:16	Prophetic 184:11
157:16	presentation 131:3	148:4 149:23	108:13 162:5,10	propitiously 130:8
powers 101:17	132:10	181:18 182:15	162:10 166:20	proposals 52:5,20
118:14 156:5	presented 80:8	priest' 13:1	179:23	<b>propose</b> 70:15
161:19 162:14	138:18	priest's 75:12	processes 25:4	proposed 51:1
<b>PPU</b> 18:11,17	presents 64:20	priesthood 176:21	43:21 66:3 77:24	prosecute 77:18
19:18,20	president 16:10	priestly 113:2	89:15 100:16	prosecution
practical 56:5,7,9	27:8 33:3,4,19	primary 172:25	162:4,12	142:24
75:9 76:5 139:25	35:25 36:8 47:10	<b>Primate</b> 113:16,18	Proctor 118:16	prosecutions
140:5,9 159:10	64:17,17 72:13	<b>prior</b> 38:17 106:9	produce 100:5	105:2
<b>practice</b> 67:20	72:15,17 73:15	121:24 122:2	114:13 167:19	prosecutor 165:17
69:20,20,25	73:17 76:22	125:15 180:1	produced 83:16	prospective
92:23 101:7	89:17,19 91:24	<b>privilege</b> 107:16	99:23	177:19
108:24 114:13	92:2 103:19	Privy 113:22	producing 98:22	protect 41:15
139:5 148:19	136:9,12,14,16	proactive 123:24	100:4	50:12 148:17
155:10	136:24 165:2,4,4	probabilities	profession 107:20	<b>protecting</b> 61:15
practices 143:24	press 36:3 83:13	163:19	professional 14:9	Protection 18:12
practise 68:12	126:18	probability 146:17	50:19 107:24	30:25 31:16 42:6
149:3	presumably 12:12	<b>probably</b> 6:14 8:5	109:23 110:2	prove 104:8
practising 112:22	37:15	58:20 78:13	115:24 116:12	proved 42:2 73:22
pray 54:12 131:12	presume 39:21	89:18 92:11	118:17,18 149:10	78:10 92:15 94:1
132:19	82:7	105:23 119:21	155:12 156:1	proven 71:20
prayer 102:5,7	presumed 11:18	124:25 128:11	179:4	81:11
133:18,22	presuming 92:6	133:11,19 136:24	professionalism	<b>provide</b> 43:18
prayers 16:20	pretend 6:10	136:25 149:17	116:17 118:25	62:20 69:20
23:15	pretended 75:20	166:13 181:22	professionals	85:21 86:9 96:12
pre-ordination	75:22	<b>probe</b> 185:12	126:8 127:4	96:12 152:3
106:5,14,16	pretty 83:1 99:7	<b>problem</b> 2:24 8:4	154:13 169:16	provided 1:16
pre-recorded 36:2	119:15 130:9	61:6 104:8 132:1	professions 75:18	15:11,14,15 35:6
pre-typed-out	159:19 176:14,14	147:19,20 152:17	91:10 110:1	35:12 44:5 45:18
36:4	prevalent 146:23	174:12 186:18	Professor 118:16	65:16 97:7
preceded 182:8	146:25	problems 3:23	progressing 88:22	130:22 183:7
predecessors	<b>prevent</b> 56:14 68:9	55:1 152:4	prohibit 72:4	provides 65:8
143:1	preventing 75:11	procedure 27:9	prohibited 77:9	66:11 168:12
<b>preface</b> 170:15	prevents 186:16	29:11 30:14 43:9	90:4 150:7	providing 44:15
<b>prefer</b> 1:13 87:6	<b>previous</b> 17:18,19	43:9	prohibition 74:12	44:20 87:11
preliminaries	73:14 94:17 95:4	procedures 91:17	74:16 75:10,11	96:13 168:22
62:23	121:11 127:15	127:18	103:10,12	province 113:24
preliminary 46:6	183:10	proceed 88:3	Project 21:21	121:4 122:3
66:14 67:21	previously 126:14	108:25	promised 18:20	129:22 149:20
108:21 110:9	<b>Price</b> 21:15	proceedings 36:20	19:11 58:10	180:21 185:11
111:10	<b>pride</b> 145:20	36:23 87:23 88:3	promoting 178:6	provinces 129:23
premeditated 36:7	<b>priest</b> 11:12,18,19	88:11 91:7,7	promptly 119:15	144:10 181:19
preparation 52:21	14:24 15:1 25:22	132:8 187:14	<b>proper</b> 40:21 52:8	provincial 36:15
prepare 64:16	30:11 48:9 60:2	<b>process</b> 33:15 35:1	66:17,19 68:1,4	47:9 86:3,5,10
	1	1	1	1

	I	I	I	Ī
116:3 121:4,5,6	122:11 125:3	62:4,5 64:22	<b>rape</b> 19:5	158:13,21 165:17
121:10,18,22,24	128:1,5 129:23	101:2,12 105:6	<b>raped</b> 6:21	169:15 170:20,22
122:23 123:2,5	131:19 132:24	105:14 108:6,8	<b>rapist</b> 30:19	171:11 174:21
154:25 155:6	133:20,24 135:10	108:10 109:7	rare 77:1,2 120:9	177:2,5,7 184:22
158:11 164:6	136:15 141:7	150:6 156:21	rate 90:8	reason 11:6 17:11
<b>proving</b> 163:11	145:13 149:12,17	157:7,15 178:24	re-abuse 59:20	51:22 58:14 63:1
provision 72:1	150:24 155:9	180:15 182:22	60:12	64:10 71:1,3
74:5 98:16	168:17 170:24	183:8 184:2	reached 73:14	83:7 111:16
pseudonym 23:17	174:1,25 175:12	185:9,13 186:8	160:10,16	139:12 153:7,8
<b>PTO</b> 152:23 153:6	179:7	187:9 188:7,13	reaching 85:25	reasonable 4:18
159:20	<b>puts</b> 41:2	quick 13:4 186:22	reaction 7:11	44:25 45:6 78:24
<b>public</b> 1:4 18:12	putting 43:22	<b>quickly</b> 130:14	read 16:19 36:4	163:13,14
37:4 139:1	44:14 108:24	159:19 184:25	63:19 85:1	reasoning 158:23
143:23 163:12,14	137:2 141:7	quiet 124:25	112:16 132:12	158:25 159:1
163:21	143:9 172:24	quite 2:22 13:11	134:2 137:16	reasons 29:10
publication 91:4		18:15 46:21 49:8	138:9,12,23,24	39:11 91:1
138:13	Q	75:5 76:6 77:1	161:21 185:15	136:10 168:13
publicise 125:2	qualifications	81:12 85:2,3,15	reading 63:5	169:24
publicised 130:17	166:17	99:16 108:2	real 113:19 115:23	rebuke 97:19,24
publicity 126:18	qualified 102:22	110:12 134:17	115:23 119:13	recalls 132:12
<b>publish</b> 90:19	102:23 167:17	140:19 152:22	129:3 154:13	recap 65:24
published 63:11	170:9	162:10 165:16	165:8,8 186:18	receive 17:2 21:8
91:10 137:9,10	quality 65:12	167:10 172:4	realise 122:25	57:4
153:20 154:5	176:6	176:2 182:3	140:2 151:9	received 2:5 27:4
<b>pull</b> 111:24	quantify 176:24		175:8	29:2 47:3 53:6
<b>pulled</b> 4:25 117:6	quarter 129:6	R	realised 123:25	53:12 62:20
pulling 32:4	<b>quasi</b> 86:22 87:4	<b>raft</b> 167:24	124:4 180:24	152:2
<b>punch</b> 171:5	quasi-judicial	raise 40:11 57:14	realistic 45:15	recognise 76:5
punishing 147:9	166:5	63:1 129:6 142:4	reality 159:10	88:15 125:25
purely 72:3	queries 89:21	155:14,19	183:20	137:20 139:3
<b>purple</b> 7:23 31:7	<b>question</b> 7:8 9:2,4	raised 32:25 34:3	really 5:16 6:15	148:13 149:1
156:25	40:11,13 45:25	34:8 46:2,15	24:23 30:21	155:15
purported 156:3	48:24 56:8 58:9	65:13 82:10,10	42:19,19,19,24	recognised 122:22
purpose 14:5	85:16 91:19	89:2 99:20 103:1	54:6 57:1 59:3	recognising 139:5
68:19	98:14 104:23	103:2 126:14	59:15 61:8,16,17	recognition 57:20
purposeful 177:10	108:11 109:10	154:23 167:14	67:20 69:25 81:5	57:20,21 152:23
purposes 65:20	110:15 123:11	raising 129:7,12	85:11 91:5,20	recommend 93:4
111:19 113:7	130:24 131:1,2	175:17	93:18,19 96:3,22	150:7
pursue 104:5	132:4,6,6 133:4,7	Ralph 23:7 26:14	102:4 105:6	recommendation
163:4	133:8 154:8	37:19 38:9 49:25	110:5 118:19	4:1 117:20,21
<b>put</b> 4:14,23 9:11	157:17 159:20	80:7 84:12,14	119:20 120:7	128:3 159:22
16:23 18:13	162:3,15,20,20	85:6 89:23 97:13	121:1 123:12	recommendations
22:20 26:2 27:23	164:23 174:22	127:13 138:15,17	124:24 130:11	46:10 56:9 57:15
32:2 41:1 42:22	177:14 180:13	138:19 141:18	131:2 139:13,15	125:13 127:8,15
43:7 44:1,15	185:19	143:8,19	139:19 141:7	185:14,22
45:20 47:13 50:2	questioned 51:22	rang 12:5,13 18:19	143:3 145:9,20	recommended
50:3 51:4 54:9	questioning	19:2 22:9 31:12	146:12,25 147:12	3:22,24 21:21,22
55:6 96:22 98:20	110:15	44:16	151:18 152:9	21:24 178:12
99:9 104:17	questions 20:12	range 74:11	154:15 158:6,7	179:16
	24:15 36:3 57:12	168:22		
L				

				1 480 211
recommends	108:14,16,18,22	13:11 26:17	18:17 19:8 31:14	65:3 66:20 69:18
180:10	108:23 109:3,4	27:11 56:4 78:13	47:6 133:2	70:7 74:23 76:13
record 16:25	109:17,21,22,24	83:5 95:18	reporting 15:19	79:10,11,22 80:3
120:3 178:9	110:7,8 121:6,12	105:23 133:24	20:23 56:25	82:11,17 91:3
recording 105:11	121:19,23 123:3	138:5 148:21	57:10 115:17	98:7 99:1 104:13
records 17:17	158:11 164:6	<b>remind</b> 101:6	171:24 172:3,22	107:5,14 109:15
Recruitment	168:8,9,12,19,20	reminded 1:20	173:1,5,17	114:19 116:6
107:8 179:22	168:22 169:12,17	remit 51:8,9 52:6	reports 47:4 123:1	119:2 121:4,6
recuse 108:19	registrar's 110:11	52:15,17	164:5	137:5,22 141:1
recused 164:1	registrars 46:3	remits 51:2	represent 59:5	142:11 143:14
redacted 53:6	109:11 169:1	removal 74:14,16	90:21	144:15 146:22
redress 185:2	regret 175:11	remove 72:4 76:20	representation	151:4 153:20
Rees 46:14,19	regular 135:19	103:10 184:8	49:8,9 50:13	154:21 155:19
47:12,16 48:3,17	regularly 77:11	removed 75:7 77:8	95:7	156:3 157:19,20
52:2	<b>Regulation</b> 47:6	90:4 101:8,9	representative	157:21 160:15
refer 62:24 69:17	48:16	102:11 171:8	49:1 53:13	163:22,22 164:17
70:9 81:16 95:3	regulations 154:21	184:4	123:18	165:18 169:16
111:12	reignite 128:20	removing 94:9	representatives	170:7,10 177:13
reference 50:25	<b>relate</b> 107:10	renewal 152:12	49:19	respected 169:15
88:6,7 125:20	<b>related</b> 71:14 77:5	rent 54:22	represented 50:16	respond 16:17
186:24	107:23	repeatedly 56:16	50:20	56:10 69:11
referral 36:22	<b>relates</b> 106:13	184:11	represents 130:25	87:25
referrals 126:20	relating 36:12	repentance 184:23	132:7 174:7	responded 52:11
<b>referred</b> 34:5 36:9	94:1	replied 18:11	reprimand 178:9	131:10 132:17
43:3 64:16 69:23	relation 27:24	reply 16:14 30:5	reputation 50:12	respondent 29:15
70:4,17 78:2	28:23 32:22,24	30:13 31:22	repute 107:7	38:1,3,10,16,18
79:4 81:13 82:6	48:20 50:21	39:24 42:25	request 16:23 36:2	39:2 69:11 70:2
87:22 88:10,21	143:24 144:9	45:18	41:4,10 47:13,15	70:13,15,16 73:9
101:25 108:14	relationship	report 17:8,17	49:13 53:12	73:16 95:6
121:9 154:2	109:16,22 130:7	19:5 20:15,16,18	requests 53:5	110:10
referring 88:8,9	168:18,20 169:6	25:12 36:15 60:9	require 93:23	respondent's
refers 88:5	169:17 170:1	64:16 69:6 89:16	required 38:17	92:10
reflection 11:10	relatively 10:6	89:18 94:12	99:14 115:22	respondents 92:16
reform 80:9	release 41:13	108:22 110:10	134:25 167:7,24	responding 142:1
refresh 111:12	releases 126:18	121:19 122:12,13	177:19	142:11
112:17	relevant 63:3 73:2	122:25 123:21	requirement 90:19	<b>response</b> 2:5 9:23
<b>refuse</b> 78:23	74:5 86:10 98:22	127:11 137:9	requirements	11:15,20 20:5
refused 45:21	100:16 111:21	138:10 143:15,15	177:19	26:8 38:8 59:13
regard 67:9 77:21	131:19 163:18	143:17,21 146:25	requires 154:13	154:7
83:14 128:8	177:18 183:9	148:23 153:19	requiring 145:6	responses 53:6
150:12 153:19	reliable 143:5	154:4,23 163:2	resign 70:10	142:4,4
169:20 175:2	reliably 135:17	164:5 165:14	resignation 103:11	responsibilities
176:8	reliant 108:23	168:8 170:15	resigned 181:9	114:7 144:4
regarding 13:18	religion 101:7	172:8,10,14,16	resigns 103:5	155:3 161:14
regime 112:25	religious 2:14	173:20 174:4	resolve 172:23	responsibility
registrar 36:15	173:9 185:19,22	178:6 185:13,15	resolved 85:10	115:10 130:1,13
46:6,11,14,20	remember 5:5,18	185:25	resources 114:20	141:6 167:8
47:10 66:11,15	6:14 8:8 12:14	reported 3:8 4:9	122:3,11,16	171:21
69:6 86:3,5,10	12:21,22 13:10	11:18 17:24,25	respect 64:25 65:1	responsible 87:1
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				8
100:9 102:2,9,24	Ridley 113:1	85:7,14 86:20,21	-S	160:7,15 161:13
114:14 166:2,19	right 2:11,13,19	86:21,22,23	sacked 162:19	162:1 163:3
181:7	5:8,24 13:7 20:1	88:14 100:13	sacrament 171:18	164:9 167:25
rest 98:14 124:9	21:25 23:9 25:6	114:16,18,18,20	sad 23:15	168:16 169:15
125:7 140:13	30:1,10 31:2	115:2,8 116:2,2	sadly 145:16 149:1	170:24 177:10
146:5 149:6	32:15 34:3,13	117:13 118:6	154:6	178:2,6,24 180:8
160:20	40:22 43:22,23	121:3,11 122:5,6	sadness 184:22	safeguarding-rel
restoration 98:4	43:23 47:18,18	140:1 141:20,24	safe 126:21 148:18	67:24
result 96:6 112:23	51:20 53:9 55:15	147:14 165:13	148:20,20 178:7	Safer 107:8 179:22
124:22 125:14	65:5 66:6,13	168:21 177:13	178:10 184:25	safety 165:5
141:14	67:14 69:15	roles 64:15 85:15	safeguarding 10:5	Sainsburys 132:1
retire 159:7	71:16 74:1,23	87:1 114:7 115:9	10:8 14:8 16:25	saint 175:9
182:18	75:1 81:7 84:9	165:20 176:17	17:10,13,15,16	sanction 172:13
retired 158:10	92:1 98:19 101:6	rolled 5:17	17:10,13,13,10	sanctions 173:12
169:2 181:5,7,9	102:21,22,23	room 4:15,15 5:5,6	27:22 33:10 41:6	173:13,20,25
181:10 182:18	105:21,23 108:4	20:25 55:17 60:5	42:18 43:5 44:17	sat 4:20 22:22 31:6
183:17	108:15 111:23	66:2 68:3 133:3	48:21 50:5,11	31:8 40:1 42:9
return 62:11	115:16 117:25	133:10,11,12	56:18,19 59:2	60:4 61:12
110:18,19,20	118:6 119:9	Rotherham 3:5	66:20,24 67:9	satisfied 180:7
157:9	124:18 131:9	12:4 13:13 18:3	69:18,22 70:7	satisfy 67:24
returning 62:20	132:16 134:9	31:6	71:14 74:7 76:12	<b>Savile</b> 147:21
<b>Reverend</b> 1:6,8,11	136:5 141:15,21	roughly 66:25	76:14 77:22 78:6	174:19
3:8,11 6:20 38:2	169:23 174:25	67:18 76:24 90:2	78:7,8,15 79:11	saw 6:17 20:11
75:14,15,16,18	181:6	90:9,10	79:24 80:4,9	55:13 139:15
75:25 76:8 81:20	rightly 5:5	round 136:22	81:6 83:17,21	165:14
129:19 134:7	<b>rights</b> 101:5	153:15	87:19 89:4 91:18	<b>saying</b> 6:18 7:19
152:19 157:20	155:15	routinely 89:12	94:2,13,14 96:15	12:14 18:19 26:1
176:12,12 180:4	ring 20:17 24:12	94:19	97:22,23 100:22	27:4 35:15 39:14
187:24	42:18 61:13	row 13:23	114:7,11,15,19	41:25 42:20
<b>revert</b> 59:24	ringing 48:1	<b>Roy</b> 27:21 37:22	114:21,22,25	44:15 67:4 69:6
review 50:22,23,24	<b>rise</b> 110:17 141:6	39:24 41:2,7,12	115:3,18 116:1,3	70:8 71:11 80:24
51:2,16,23,24	risk 66:23 67:2	<b>Royal</b> 185:23	116:6,7 117:9,16	85:1 99:8,9
52:1,6,10 73:14	77:24 92:19,22	rude 55:19	117:16 118:3,7,9	101:14 102:4,10
124:7,17,20,22	92:24 93:2,6,14	rule 27:6,11,15,17	118:13 119:6,17	105:5 108:15,25
125:19,21,25	93:16,23,24 94:2	30:3,17 33:3,22	120:1,4,7 121:5,7	129:1 131:10
126:10 127:2,9	94:5,8 152:14	34:20 43:14,15	121:9,11,24	132:17 133:24
127:23 186:21,22	153:2 158:5,15	46:25 53:12	122:2,23 123:3,8	142:9 144:21
186:24 187:5	158:21 159:3,9	91:13 137:1	123:10,16,17,19	145:2,23 146:20
reviewed 90:13	159:10 163:23	144:14 145:6,7	123:22 130:7	175:3 186:1
152:11	164:21 183:8	180:15	134:16 135:18	says 17:18 24:8,16
reviewer 51:10	184:1	ruled 31:15 33:20	139:2 142:1	27:12 32:12
reviewing 93:13	<b>ritual</b> 74:23	<b>Rules</b> 180:15	146:13 147:11	36:17 37:12,24
123:11	Robert 181:2	run 96:14 115:11	148:14,14,25	39:1,13 41:11
revisit 140:24,24	robes 61:10	116:19	153:10,15,23,25	48:7 53:8 58:21
revisiting 125:24	robust 83:2	run-up 21:7	154:11,13,18,22	79:9 87:18 90:18
<b>Richard</b> 59:5	Rochester 46:20	<b>Runcie</b> 181:2	154:25 155:3,7	91:2 120:10
rid 75:3	Roger 126:1	rung 7:12 24:6	155:22,24 156:4	122:18 131:13
Riding 114:24	role 34:6 46:2 49:2	running 52:23	156:6 157:25	148:24 153:22
166:2	64:19,25 65:1,14	95:2	158:16 159:5,14	175:2 183:5

				1 age 213
186:3	166:18	sensibly 100:11	serving 2:17 25:7	she/he 85:8
scenario 58:19	secretary 49:21	sent 18:11 19:18	25:10,11	<b>Sheffield</b> 17:16,22
scheduled 21:7	109:17,20 115:19	27:3 34:7,12	session 45:13 86:2	28:15 32:4 130:2
131:17	149:16 181:1	37:19 42:23	set 48:20 49:16	Sheila 55:24
school 6:8,12 10:1	secretly 110:12	43:24 45:8,12	63:21 65:22	shift 147:24
10:2,6,9 12:19,24	section 72:1 158:3	47:4 52:6 110:10	102:17 112:13	shirt 7:23 31:7
14:23 50:19	164:25	121:15 163:25	123:9 124:6	156:25
172:19 173:2	secular 105:25	181:20	134:19 136:10,11	shocked 124:12
schoolboy 6:11	see 3:19 14:18 21:4	Sentamu 27:15	136:13 144:18	shockers 147:25
schoolteacher	23:11 24:11,12	29:5 33:25 34:5	164:10 175:22	shocking 151:8
32:16	37:12 47:11	50:5 53:17,20	184:25	153:12
<b>SCI000005</b> 138:16	48:13 49:6 53:21	54:1,3 55:8	sets 127:15	shop 75:22
<b>SCIE</b> 17:14,17	57:10 61:21,23	111:3,5,8 112:4,8	setting 125:20	short 62:13 110:25
56:1 120:20	61:23 73:2,4	113:17 131:8,16	175:22	131:23 132:2
138:9 153:19	77:13 79:1 80:12	131:20 132:3,15	settled 58:6	157:12
154:4,23 184:20	83:20,25 84:14	132:15 138:24	severe 74:12	<b>shortly</b> 18:13 21:3
<b>SCOLDING</b> 62:15	85:12 89:20	139:11 157:6,14	sex 5:17 77:14	159:8
62:18,19 108:6	91:19 92:16,16	176:12 180:4	sexual 7:1 26:23	Should' 45:18
109:9 110:13,22	98:12 109:6	185:6 186:5,9	28:22 30:12	shoulder 54:7,7
111:2,6,7 131:16	110:11 111:23	187:12 188:9	32:14 56:11	55:11 131:8
131:25 157:3,10	116:13 118:1	sentence 129:5,6,8	76:15 77:1,5	132:16 133:21
157:14 186:5	126:9 139:18	142:6,7	81:10,11,14	<b>show</b> 15:14 35:12
187:12,14,17	158:14,23 160:1	sentences 87:17	82:14,17 90:3	53:3 153:11
188:5,11	161:19 165:19	sentencing 90:1,9	98:18 105:9	184:22
<b>Scorer</b> 183:1	174:18 186:20	separate 39:9	107:6 143:14	<b>showed</b> 73:22
Scottish 114:5	187:8	115:18 145:6	144:17,24 145:2	shows 146:25
Scouting 172:19	seeing 27:12 45:4	151:11,24 170:2	145:7 146:9,21	shrugged 133:1
scratching 142:14	79:12 124:22	separately 167:10	152:21 171:4	<b>shut</b> 8:9
screen 1:21 26:13	seek 155:7 185:2	September 17:1	172:18 177:8	sick 150:19
28:19 63:5	seen 46:7 53:9,20	51:3 178:18	184:10	side 5:12 8:7 22:2
111:23,25 143:9	89:25 91:20	sergeant 19:10	sexually 67:5,6	171:8,11 185:3
screening 83:23	110:3 128:13	serious 36:21	<b>shabby</b> 43:4 134:7	<b>sight</b> 65:11
100:16 178:3	139:13 144:25	37:16 42:11	shambolic 43:4	<b>sign</b> 63:17 112:11
180:8	165:10,13	43:17 54:23 70:5	134:8	178:7
scrutinies 46:6	sees 109:24 185:25	73:24 74:2 80:22	<b>shame</b> 7:7 8:20	signatory 137:20
scrutinising 183:4	<b>Selby</b> 166:2	81:2,3 150:1,3	60:13 184:7	signature 63:16
scrutiny 108:21	selection 181:1	170:11	<b>share</b> 42:17 58:19	112:10
110:9 117:12	<b>sell</b> 61:12	seriously 116:23	80:18	<b>signed</b> 63:15
164:5 168:8	seminars 86:14	118:19 128:11	<b>shared</b> 147:17	significance 76:5
seal 123:11 170:4	87:15 172:6	130:9,19 142:24	sharing 120:15	184:12
170:11,16,20	send 22:18 87:14	145:2 170:17	139:6	significant 101:10
171:11 174:2,5,7	161:16	<b>servant</b> 176:10	Sharpling 108:9	106:3 126:3,3
second 26:21	senior 20:3 25:10	served 147:6	108:11,23 109:2	signing 138:5
28:23 38:8 49:16	33:18 39:25 80:3	152:16	109:6 186:7,9,20	similar 71:7 89:9
64:19 132:9	81:23 116:4,25	serves 175:3	187:8	146:23 160:12
133:8 138:10	117:15 144:2	service 21:22	shaved 7:3	184:7
secondary 172:25	176:17 180:25	96:16 138:23	<b>she'd</b> 3:20 7:18	simple 57:6,10,11
secondly 62:25	sense 34:22 184:7	139:7 175:4	23:25 39:22	simply 67:22
111:15 157:21	<b>sensible</b> 56:7 98:1	services 68:23	51:15	71:23 73:7 89:21

				1 agc 214
98:15 99:22	<b>solicitor</b> 22:14,15	170:1,3	31:16 64:21	143:8 144:19
100:13 104:9	25:13 109:19,22	sorted 10:12	131:8 132:16	151:4 152:14
107:14 145:4	solicitors 20:7	sorts 67:15 82:24	spoken 2:22 48:1	174:14 176:20
152:23 163:7	47:6 48:16	85:22 87:12 90:4	56:5 133:6	180:17
164:24 184:14	<b>solicitors'</b> 46:19	90:25 104:2	St 48:8 179:20	statements 1:16,20
Singleton 126:1	solutions 139:25	105:5 109:14	stabs 54:24	38:12 44:14 63:9
sink 6:15 23:4	somebody 9:16	126:18 130:21	staff 39:25 59:8	63:15,17 120:2
sinner 174:24	18:21 22:1 31:9	144:17 146:23	116:4 144:2	states 36:19
Sir 126:1 150:25	33:9 68:4,13	167:2	stage 66:14 67:21	stating 145:4
151:1	71:20 90:2 92:20	sought 81:23	69:5,7 71:19	station 18:3 20:19
sit 7:16 23:5 32:12	92:23 98:5,11	sound 17:21	72:20 79:3 83:23	20:21
61:9 64:1 86:22	100:11,13,15	118:23	88:3 95:12 100:1	statute 172:11,24
114:9 133:17	101:12 103:14	<b>sounded</b> 4:18	100:10 101:21	statutory 68:23
situation 60:20	104:25 107:6,22	sounds 98:1 115:9	103:18 110:10	154:2 172:8,10
70:6 140:14	108:21 116:11	South 18:19 19:10	stages 101:23	stay 4:1 5:6,7,9,22
154:24 155:15	117:21 135:4	19:18 26:4 113:4	108:15	6:1 8:2 10:6 12:8
163:16 173:6	142:14 155:3	Southwark 113:5	stand 6:7 10:21	40:25
situations 67:15	158:6 165:3	space 184:25	99:11 169:5	stayed 3:25 4:14
89:5 160:13	171:14,20 176:1	speak 22:2 25:20	standard 27:12	6:20
six 81:25 135:23	182:23	71:9 72:7 78:24	146:16,16	staying 4:10
178:23	somebody's 32:13	79:14 86:18 90:1	standards 106:18	Steering 80:9
size 112:1	someone's 106:10	103:15 116:5	143:22 144:23	94:13 123:19
skills 166:15	soon 53:21 121:8	117:12 122:3	145:21 146:4,8	step 69:8
skinny 5:16	165:24 187:5	137:17 141:8	standards' 143:18	Stephen 113:8
<b>Slater</b> 180:14	sorrow 184:22	149:11 166:22	standing 10:22	Stepney 113:6
182:22 183:7	sorry 2:23 6:25 7:1	speaking 43:2	11:7 68:2,6	<b>Steven</b> 11:23,25
sleep 5:13 12:16	7:8 9:2 10:17	54:11 130:15	standpoint 170:14	12:12 13:5,25
sleeping 7:5	13:2 27:4 42:23	139:23 156:8	stands 171:7	15:8,14 16:2,5,14
<b>slight</b> 157:5	55:3 61:25 62:2	special 180:3	<b>Star</b> 21:21	28:6,8,14 32:22
slightest 150:23	74:3 84:14 109:9	specialist 50:11	start 22:7 51:23	32:24 33:6 35:11
<b>slightly</b> 63:6 83:13	110:14 131:16	105:4	62:9 83:2 84:1	41:25 46:14
157:4 167:23,24	132:4 143:2,2	<b>specific</b> 64:25 65:5	179:9	49:22 50:4 54:16
170:2	151:24 181:10	72:1	started 4:21,24 7:2	stewards 131:18
slowly 87:23 88:11	183:3	specifically 11:3	21:10 23:4 53:10	stick 46:25
<b>small</b> 60:11 99:6	sort 3:25 5:15	25:10 39:22	77:6 123:25	sticking 13:5
133:11 153:3	12:10,17 57:24	speculate 183:24	134:15 149:9	168:7
<b>smoking</b> 173:22	65:7 68:12,14	<b>Speed</b> 18:25 19:1	starting 82:22,24	stock 12:21
173:22	72:8,8 74:3	speeding 18:22	124:10 168:11	stood 20:22 24:14
<b>Smyth</b> 60:23	76:12 79:12,23	<b>spells</b> 167:3	statement 14:14	61:24 130:17
<b>Snow</b> 13:15,22,23	85:24 86:9 89:7	<b>spend</b> 84:16	16:12 18:1 20:12	<b>stools</b> 119:19
27:15 28:9,14	90:6,7 92:6	122:14	21:2 23:8,11,20	stop 25:19 62:25
33:7,11 35:18	95:15 99:14	spending 134:17	26:14 31:13	75:24 103:6
36:13 42:1 47:8	105:5 110:3	<b>spent</b> 2:16	32:20 35:25 36:4	<b>stopped</b> 120:23
50:6	115:10 117:11	<b>sphere</b> 50:19	36:8 41:2 49:17	134:22
society 146:5	122:10 126:23	Spiritual 173:14	79:9 99:13 100:4	<b>stories</b> 124:23
147:20,21	133:18 134:24	<b>spite</b> 147:7	100:6 101:3	125:6
softly 2:22	135:16 142:6	Splitting 42:13	111:13 112:3,8	story 60:22 100:3
<b>Soham</b> 148:22	147:3 155:17	<b>spoke</b> 12:11,12	112:11,13,17,21	146:13
<b>solely</b> 86:15	161:15,15 162:11	18:3 22:16 25:18	126:22 132:9	<b>straight</b> 5:18 12:9

				1 age 213
58:21,25	suddenly 45:9	134:11,15,18,24	104:24	36:10,12 59:24
strands 80:11,13	140:2 173:23	135:2 140:22	<b>suspend</b> 91:25	63:4 65:19 66:3
strange 22:14	180:23	141:16 142:20	158:4,7 161:19	84:23 88:3 89:15
116:11	Sue 118:16	171:3	161:21,23 163:8	91:4,14 92:19
strategic 115:1	suffered 2:3 4:13	supported 38:11	169:22	95:24 103:15,22
119:18	38:1 39:7 125:5	38:19 129:1	suspended 92:11	110:20 111:17
street 27:23	177:8	140:25	157:24 158:1,22	116:13 117:17
streets 6:5	sufficient 38:6	supportive 59:9	159:19 160:3,20	118:19 125:15
stress 32:2,7 39:6	66:16,19,25	<b>suppose</b> 19:1 75:9	162:2 164:19	128:10 130:9
stressed 42:19,24	67:16,19,25	76:13 133:4	165:1,9	141:18 145:2
stronger 61:18	68:17,25 69:2	150:12 157:17	suspending 157:23	146:15 158:20
struck 82:1	70:2 83:22	158:25 161:11	158:2 161:15	162:10,12,24
structural 47:23	sufficiently 36:21	162:3 166:10	164:18,25	171:21 180:1,2
structurally	suffragan 16:8	supposed 18:4	suspends 92:1	184:15 187:5
172:22	26:18 87:7	129:1 176:10	suspension 91:20	taken 2:19 23:1
structures 172:17	101:22 154:19	186:2	91:23 92:5,17	66:22 75:7 92:14
172:18,21 173:3	165:22,24 166:7	<b>Supposing</b> 117:25	158:13 159:23,23	106:9 116:24
struggling 119:8	166:9 168:6	sure 27:19 40:22	160:12 161:3,3	127:18 130:19
121:23	suffragans 167:6	43:22 55:14 88:5	161:17 162:20	134:19 135:24,25
stuck 47:1	suggest 125:7	91:22 120:18	sustain 38:7	142:23 145:14
student 58:8	suggestion 97:17	122:15 128:9,10	swept 142:15,17	159:15 166:7
studies 119:23	129:2	140:24 148:17,18	173:19	168:9
study 7:25	suggestions 140:5	149:4,17 161:25	swift 186:22,25	takes 37:14 42:7
stuff 42:12 156:19	140:9	165:6 171:20	swifter 162:12	61:4 84:21 91:11
175:18	suggests 7:5 88:17	surely 11:11	Switalskis 130:25	116:10 185:21
subject 16:23 39:8	suitable 41:20	surprised 125:23	162:15	talk 2:4 9:14 17:4
41:4,9 47:13,15	72:14 94:5	surprising 38:22	sworn 1:7 62:17	28:17,23 42:20
49:13 53:5 63:16	110:17	surrounding 64:7	111:5 188:3,9	44:7 54:8,10,13
73:3 78:24 90:25	summarise 42:14	survived 129:4	symbolically 76:6	55:11 57:2 66:1
105:1 106:16,18	summarised 14:13	survivor 11:15	184:8	82:5 83:8 116:16
112:25	summary 68:6	73:6,8 97:4 98:9	synod 53:14,23	131:9,10,14
submitted 71:9	72:3 138:18	98:10,11,17,20	54:1 55:21	132:17,18,21
subsequent 138:13	162:7	98:21,23 129:18	130:17 131:4	140:20 143:14
subsequently 9:14	summoned 22:9	140:16	132:10 140:6	147:3 149:19
15:17 16:22	22:10	survivors 41:21	185:20	176:20
19:14,22 21:5	<b>Sunday</b> 172:19	56:4 71:18 76:2	system 44:6 46:1	talked 28:6 99:2
152:20 186:15	173:2	79:25 89:2 98:8	83:10 94:17	117:7 125:12
substance 66:16	supplied 115:22	99:15 124:14,23	105:7,10 112:6	157:16 174:10
66:19,25 67:16	137:23 138:4	124:24 127:24	122:15,19 143:3	talking 31:10
67:19,23,25 70:2	<b>support</b> 15:4,12	128:6,17 129:8	systemic 122:19	32:13 44:18
136:7	21:8,17 22:2	129:14 131:4		55:20 57:17
substantiate	23:3,18 24:4,17	132:11 135:10	T	58:22,25 68:21
183:24	32:6 33:14 41:25	137:3 138:11	<b>tab</b> 36:14 37:18	81:10 95:16
substantive 187:3	44:4,16,20 59:6	139:3,9,13	63:12 112:5	107:1,1 153:9
substitute 103:17	96:11,13,14,17	141:12 151:17	<b>tabards</b> 131:19	172:7,11
substituted 103:17	96:23 98:7	170:21 171:4	table 31:8 116:16	talks 153:9 171:15
103:20 104:7,10	114:25 121:7	172:1 173:18	138:19,20 170:25	tangentially 68:16
substitution 104:3	125:11 127:20	184:10 185:1	take 18:8 19:3	tariff 90:8
<b>subtle</b> 151:14	128:21,24 130:22	<b>suspect</b> 80:4 94:14	22:21 26:9 31:21	tea 55:15
		_	32:11,15 35:10	
	ı	I	ı	1

				1 480 210
team 16:25 17:10	84:10,15 90:15	132:25 134:1	105:8 106:11	7:19 11:1 17:22
17:13 23:24 41:6	98:16 100:20,21	157:1 159:16	108:6,15 109:15	20:5,9,9 23:5
44:17 48:21	101:8 103:22	164:11 165:21	110:5 115:22	30:4,19 46:21
79:24 83:17	110:6 113:20	170:19 175:5	116:21 117:8	57:8 89:24 122:9
94:14 114:11	115:25 116:23	181:22	118:2 119:5,8,16	153:13
116:15,15,18,22	118:5 122:5	things 3:17,25	119:18,19,20	thoughts 23:14
117:1,15 123:10	125:20,23 137:2	4:21 6:6 15:11	120:7,23 121:22	135:10
134:16 135:18	139:14 144:16	18:23 35:6,22	122:7,9 123:12	thousands 79:6,7
146:13 155:1	156:5,21 166:10	37:16 43:12,17	124:15,20,23	95:15,21,21,21
156:6 163:3	166:21 176:16,18	45:1 53:3 55:4	125:1 126:1,13	three 3:3 14:14
164:10 170:24	186:23	56:3 57:17 63:6	126:23 128:1,5	15:13 16:1 18:19
tears 60:5	terrible 177:7	66:14 77:19 84:1	128:13 129:25	19:3 52:4 80:12
technical 62:21	test 62:23 67:25	85:25 88:25 89:6	130:15,23 131:17	119:4 122:14
technicality 34:21	83:22 111:11	90:5 93:8 96:9	133:19 134:5,9,9	138:20 147:5
teenager 3:16	163:17,19	99:2 107:18	134:13,18 135:9	169:1 179:8
telephone 13:8,10	Testament 102:8	111:10 116:16	135:13 136:4,6	threshold 69:7
88:25 135:4,5	tested 81:5	119:18 127:5	137:14 140:6,23	163:18 165:7
television 22:23	testing 16:20	130:23 132:23	141:16 142:8,18	thrones 61:9
32:2 35:3,19	text 18:9,17	136:4,4 137:3	145:9,21 146:13	throwing 121:1
37:1,5,16 42:2	thank 1:5 10:10,24	140:8 145:3	146:21,22 147:21	thrown 171:2
143:4	16:18 43:6 59:3	148:21 161:6	147:22,24 148:10	<b>Thursday</b> 187:20
tell 3:11 4:12 8:12	59:7,14,21,23	174:24 176:1	148:21,23 149:6	ticket 18:23
9:22 12:2,19	62:1,3,6,19 69:5	182:16 183:24	149:8 150:18	tidy 5:19
16:7 20:18,23	95:24 109:2,6,7,7	think 2:8 5:8 7:22	151:10 152:13	<b>Tilby</b> 57:22 79:9
22:24 24:2 27:2	110:13,13,22,22	8:5 14:13 15:9	153:20,21 155:6	154:20
31:9 34:24 45:22	111:10 112:15,19	17:9 18:2,8,15	155:18 156:4,24	<b>Tim</b> 48:13,14
47:2 52:5 61:20	119:21 120:10	21:25 22:15	157:1,4 158:24	time 3:21 6:10,15
88:25 89:14,17	121:3 128:14	23:21 26:9 28:13	162:13 163:8	8:15 9:12,15
100:2 125:1	129:12,15 131:25	29:23 30:6 35:9	167:10 168:2,19	10:16,23 11:16
147:6 153:11	132:1 157:3,6,10	35:22 37:1,2	169:19,25 171:9	13:22 16:20
165:8 175:14	184:2 185:11	41:22 42:16	172:3,24 173:4	18:21 19:23
telling 8:19 10:24	186:5,9 187:8,9,9	44:25 45:6 46:19	173:16,19 174:2	23:17,22 26:10
11:6 13:25	187:11,12,17	48:25 49:10,16	174:11,14 175:6	27:5 28:2,15
107:14 139:10	them?in 61:12	50:15,17,18,18	175:19 177:2	29:9,10,14,21
148:3,4 158:18	themes 138:18	51:20 52:18	181:10,11 182:7	30:18 33:2 35:4
tells 139:1	theological 75:6	54:11 56:9,15,19	183:9,17,19,25	38:11,13,19,24
ten 3:6,7 7:17	112:20 170:14	58:11,14,22	184:14,19 185:5	41:8 42:18,24
tends 156:12	Theology 178:17	60:13,18,21	185:24 186:18,23	43:23 44:7 46:24
tens 79:6,7	theoretical 159:8	61:18 62:1 68:6	186:25	47:1 54:14 62:25
tension 86:20	theories 139:23,24	75:21 78:18,20	<b>thinking</b> 8:5 9:10	64:24 74:15 75:2
165:19 166:19	they'd 22:25 33:20	79:8 80:21,23	11:10 36:6 57:11	75:4 76:23 81:23
termination 103:7	84:22 89:6	81:14,24 82:20	99:5,15 103:21	82:2 83:6,12
terminology 76:4	thing 5:2 6:6,14	85:7 86:2,16	107:5,19 145:24	84:15,22,23 88:2
113:13	11:9 20:20 22:1	88:1,8,11,18 90:5	155:2 174:17	95:23 97:14
terms 2:1 24:25	24:23 30:16	90:11,22 92:8	thinks 30:10 55:18	111:14,15 124:13
43:8 50:25 67:1	37:13 41:6 52:24	94:4 95:3 96:2,3	154:11	127:10 134:13,17
68:1 69:22 73:11	52:25 55:7 56:13	96:22 97:9,24	Thornton 48:13	134:18 135:14,23
76:18 77:24 78:5	57:16 59:2 79:12	99:8 101:12,13	48:14	135:24,25 136:2
79:3 81:13 84:4	102:7 117:19	103:3 104:11	<b>thought</b> 6:2,4 7:14	136:5,10,10
	•	•	•	•

				1 age 217
144:25 152:15	56:22 59:9,9	treating 145:9	112:14,15 147:7	85:12
154:4 157:3	133:9,10 146:6	treating 143.7	173:22 181:18	unaccountability
158:11 162:11	touch 4:24 21:3	134:6	truly 22:2 109:11	155:20
168:5 176:3	30:8 39:23 88:23	tremendous 177:2	trust 156:17,23,24	unbecoming 37:3
179:10 184:5	88:24 89:21 97:2	tret 57:22	156:25	74:6 106:11,12
timely 130:6	98:9,20 140:16	<b>Trevor</b> 3:9,12 4:2	trusted 60:1,4	107:12 163:16,20
times 12:4 18:19	140:21 141:13	4:5,13 7:15,25	truth 59:19 107:14	163:21
76:10,14,24	170:19	8:7 19:25 21:8	107:16	undergo 78:22,23
tiny 4:15 34:14	touched 87:15	22:5 23:10,14	try 5:12 6:13 10:4	162:4
125:15	touching 47:21,22	28:3,4 30:2 38:2	17:9 40:21	undergoing 79:19
today 1:14 12:15	47:23	38:14 39:8 40:19	129:14 130:14	96:8
59:7,16,17 64:11	tough 173:21	48:10 52:12	147:16 151:14	undergone 177:18
118:23 150:11	tougher 61:18	54:21 58:3,17,18	175:19 183:23	understand 8:18
186:11 187:14	trace 25:20 102:6	129:19	trying 35:22 50:12	8:21 11:22 13:6
today's 143:18,22	102:8	trial 21:7 22:6,7	52:5 104:8 105:8	14:4 17:13 24:13
144:23	trade 70:8	73:11	123:2 134:17	27:9 32:25 34:3
toilet 5:19	trading 70:13,18	tribalism 176:19	142:8,20 144:22	43:10,11,14,15
told 5:4,5,24 8:11	70:23 71:2	tribe 166:24	145:1 151:18	43:19 45:2 46:1
8:22 10:11,20	tragedy 142:21	tribunal 36:22	154:9	48:19 50:21
11:3 12:23,23,24	trained 79:6 113:1	64:18,19 69:10	Tuesday 179:18	52:13,14 55:20
13:4,6,12,24,24	121:10 123:4	69:15 70:9 73:11	turn 4:20 5:12	55:23 57:3 59:9
14:3 17:23 18:6	166:13	73:17,19,21 74:9	22:13,15 182:21	60:7 64:2,7
18:16 19:8,16	training 64:22,24	77:4,8,13,20,25	turned 3:18 5:7	70:25 74:12 76:1
20:3,4,25 21:11	65:1,3,5,8,10	78:5,9,14 81:9,17	7:21 39:19,20	76:7 80:20 86:10
21:12,15 22:9,9	78:22,23 79:7,16	85:13 91:9 92:22	turning 183:1	92:9,10 95:11
22:13,25 24:1,9	79:19 85:20,23	93:3,8 98:19,24	TV 33:14,15	98:5 102:21
25:21 28:3,4	85:24 97:6,10,23	99:22 100:8	tweaked 80:25,25	109:25 110:1,7
29:11 31:17 38:1	117:21 144:1	101:18,25 102:1	81:1	111:7 112:21
43:25 45:15	149:8,8,9,15,18	103:9,9,11	twice 112:18	113:12,23 131:4
47:22 48:13 49:3	151:19 166:17	104:20 105:12,14	two 1:16 10:15	131:25 135:8,25
49:5 51:3,15,15	167:6,15,17,22	105:16,24 108:13	14:25 44:12 45:5	152:20 157:24
51:22,25 52:19	167:24 168:15	136:9,14,16	52:4 57:24 58:3	179:24 180:21
55:14 57:22 58:1	176:5 177:18	164:8 165:2,4,5	63:2,9 64:15	understanding
58:5 67:6 71:4	178:13,14,15,16	<b>Tribunals</b> 16:10	66:14 79:23 86:7	65:11,24 66:4
88:23 118:20	178:18,24 179:5	27:8 33:3,19	86:8,25 87:17	75:5 187:6
128:25 132:20,22	179:6,11,17,25	36:1,9 47:10	93:8 95:11 97:15	understands 66:2
132:24 140:17	180:10 181:23	64:17 72:13,15	111:20 114:21,25	162:5
148:9 152:8,9	transcribers	91:24 136:12	119:19 150:19	understatement
154:9,20 155:22	111:19	tried 3:25 92:21	165:19,21 179:8	30:7
175:11 183:21	transparency	99:11 124:8	two-year 178:19	understood 21:19
tolerated 161:16	90:23	tries 114:25	typed 36:3	150:20 178:5
tomorrow 187:15	transparent 91:8	177:25		undertake 65:9
tone 19:7	transparently	trivial 36:18 37:9	U	70:24 105:6
tool 94:5	94:20	42:12	ubiquitously	115:10
top 52:9 175:25	trap 145:24	trouble 7:14,20	150:13	undertaken 80:13
topic 25:1 87:16	travel 140:18	9:7,11 84:1	<b>Uganda</b> 112:23	92:24 172:6
170:2	treated 14:20	165:8 174:16	<b>UK</b> 172:13	undertaker 31:5
<b>topics</b> 24:25	145:10 161:8,9	true 24:17 33:21	<b>ultimate</b> 37:7,13	undertakes 71:16
totally 41:22 56:19	169:16 185:2	63:21 88:12 99:9	75:3	157:25
			ultimately 6:21	
	I	I	I	ı

	i	1	•	
undertook 113:2	vestry 10:15,15	vocation 177:23	132:22 137:21	184:8,21
unexplained 87:21	vetting 177:19	voice 2:24 140:3,4	170:19 171:3	ways 86:21 150:9
unfair 88:1	178:15	140:5	wanting 117:5	we'll 22:18 24:11
unfortunate 177:7	vicar 3:5,19,19 9:8	volition 72:7	184:17	46:21 54:10
unfortunately	9:24 10:21 40:25	vulnerable 64:23	wants 60:13 65:20	we're 32:9 56:17
134:10 145:19	67:5,5 117:18	65:6,6,12 105:3	88:22 119:11	107:1
161:19 175:16	158:9 159:21	105:25 175:8	136:17 140:16	we've 41:10 46:7
unhappy 39:22	169:22	178:10	171:15,19	86:15
unintended 84:3	vicarage 4:3,14		warning 178:9	weak 175:15
Unit 18:12	6:23 7:9,10,22	<b>W</b>	warrant 22:17	wear 61:10 151:15
United 112:23	8:6 12:4 28:4	Waddington	wasn't 5:6,24 7:20	156:17,25 175:14
unjust 129:11	38:16,18 39:19	123:25 128:17	14:5 22:3 26:4	176:9
unquestioned	40:3,10,14,25	140:18 142:22,23	36:1,3,6 49:7	wearing 175:13
156:16	victim 98:17	wage 45:15	76:21 90:13	website 63:11
unsuitable 41:22	127:19 128:2	wait 18:14 25:23	127:6,7 136:24	125:3 137:10,16
unusual 180:3	victim/survivor	108:7 134:20	137:15 138:5,8	138:8,8
unworkable 94:18	49:1	135:3	150:25 153:25	<b>Webster</b> 27:16
upbringing 2:2	victims 41:21	<b>waiting</b> 186:23	154:6 155:22	28:24 34:15
update 89:7	53:23,24 55:17	waived 32:1	158:21 159:3,17	Wednesday 1:1
uphold 118:3	56:4 59:5,14	Wales 74:17	160:4 165:22	weed 67:22
upper 94:9	60:24 61:18	walk 11:1 55:16	183:3	week 21:23 24:12
upset 24:23 99:12	71:18 76:1 79:25	140:7,9,13	<b>watch</b> 10:16	45:5,12,22
upsetting 9:6	89:2 128:5	walked 7:10 8:6	176:13	101:13 103:3
use 16:12 76:4	129:13 131:4	10:25 11:5 55:12	watched 10:25	137:4,12 149:21
88:16 92:4	132:11 137:2	75:22 133:2	143:4	165:10 170:5
146:16 154:11	138:11 137:2	walks 167:20	watches 185:24	178:20 185:20
166:15	151:17 184:9	want 8:24 9:14	watching 10:24	weekends 5:22 9:1
usefully 65:16	Victor 137:6 152:9	11:5 17:8 18:7,8	22:22 59:17	weeks 60:5 81:25
usher 111:4	180:16,18 181:9	18:14 20:15,18	177:9	135:23
usually 109:3	181:21 182:14,24	21:18,20 23:5,5	watertight 170:21	weight 150:24
180:1,20	183:14	24:9,10 26:8	171:12	Welby 54:1 58:8
	video 21:2 105:11	29:13 36:17	way 2:13 14:20	60:4 160:10
V	view 23:20 46:7	42:20 53:1 54:15	24:18 25:13,21	welcome 1:3
vague 10:7	49:15 53:11 75:7	54:15,15,16 57:2	25:24 38:3 50:24	Wells 42:17
<b>valid</b> 46:8,9	80:21 84:7 91:11	57:18 58:19,24	57:21 65:17,25	went 3:19,24 4:4
valuable 139:7	92:10 100:19	59:2,3,7,14,17,21	71:2,22 76:13,17	5:1,3,18,21 7:16
<b>value</b> 146:15	117:22 118:6	61:14 68:19	80:15 81:11 87:5	7:25 10:15,25
valuing 138:22	139:11 172:21	98:13 110:18	89:9,9 94:22	12:12 15:23,24
<b>varies</b> 84:17	viewed 150:14	119:21,23 125:7	96:7 100:20	16:2,4 18:3
variety 81:22	viewer 35:23	137:14 139:24,24	108:16 111:12	19:22 20:11 21:1
various 72:21	viewing 150:15,22	140:7,8,8 149:3	113:9 118:25	21:24 22:3 32:3
76:14 79:25	views 41:18 82:15	149:15 150:24	124:4 128:9,19	35:3,8 36:6
101:23 107:8	84:10 100:24	151:3 154:16	133:13 135:1,2	40:20 41:24
113:2,3 115:9	129:13,23 167:16	166:24 168:4	137:1 140:19,19	42:21 44:12
122:25 126:17	170:2,4,13 172:7	169:6 171:13,22	145:9,10 155:17	47:15,17 51:20
132:11 163:15	vision 112:1,2	172:17 176:19	156:1 168:13,13	55:13 77:8 78:9
165:11	visited 38:16	185:10 187:2	169:10,12,14	81:17 94:12 95:8
vast 60:7,10,16	visiting 38:18	wanted 3:19 11:4	171:7,24 172:24	95:12 138:7
63:3 85:9	visits 179:2	24:22 57:14	175:7 176:4	143:4 177:22,22
verbatim 132:13		59:18 91:19		
	I	l		<u> </u>

				8
177:24,24 178:2	152:14 180:17	79:14 82:7 94:11	132:12 138:13	<b>1(c)</b> 80:12
178:4,12 180:9	187:13	96:19 101:18	184:21	<b>1.45</b> 110:21 111:1
weren't 40:7,8,14	witness's 23:7	106:23 118:16	years 2:6 3:3,6,7	<b>10</b> 1:1 53:12 84:14
40:16	26:14	150:24 155:25	8:16,22 10:20	180:15
West 19:19,23	witnesses 39:2	161:1	15:13 21:24 43:3	<b>10-15</b> 143:23
25:25 52:16	64:23 65:3,6,12	write 19:15 27:9	44:12 45:5 54:18	<b>10.00</b> 1:2 187:15
Westminster 30:9	72:21 105:25	29:1 30:10 51:8	55:2 57:24 58:3	187:20
whichever 111:25	133:23 134:4	51:8 52:15,17	95:17,18 119:4	<b>101</b> 20:18
whilst 4:9 33:9	woman 20:22	99:7 121:19	122:14 125:15	<b>108</b> 188:7
76:4 186:12	women 176:17,21	142:7	128:12 143:23	<b>11</b> 187:20
Whitsey 137:6,25	176:23 177:3,13	writes 69:6	152:13 156:11	<b>11.17</b> 62:12
152:9 157:22	wonder 62:8	writing 26:24	178:23	<b>11.35</b> 62:11
164:1 181:9,21	wonderful 183:12	28:25 43:12,13	yesterday 53:2	<b>11.36</b> 62:14
182:14,24	wont 32:10	65:17 66:8 70:14	82:11 128:16	<b>111</b> 188:9,11
Whitsey's 180:16	word 7:15,25	71:6 85:25 99:2	154:20	<b>117</b> 23:8
180:18 183:14	11:21 15:5,7,16	99:18 147:8	yesterday's 143:18	<b>118</b> 23:9
widely 104:2	18:16,18 19:13	185:25	143:22 144:22	<b>12</b> 114:1 148:3,23
wider 32:7 155:14	29:13 41:16	written 16:15 17:3	York 16:11,18	148:23
wife 31:6 177:15	48:11 60:19	29:6 34:1 59:10	20:4 32:6 50:4	<b>12.43</b> 110:24
177:18 180:4	166:24	79:24 98:23,24	60:15 61:22 86:6	<b>124</b> 138:17
<b>William</b> 53:7	words 13:9 31:24	99:1 104:21,22	113:13,15,24	<b>14</b> 91:14 128:12
60:17	126:1 140:12	104:22,23 130:4	114:8 122:21	<b>15</b> 77:6 111:18
Williamson 27:21	162:2 174:14	137:15,25 143:11	125:17 128:5,13	128:13 133:13
37:22 41:2	work 17:20 43:21	wrong 15:25 43:24	140:19 167:5	<b>1549</b> 102:6
willing 142:19	56:22 80:6,11,13	44:1 52:19 74:22	180:4,21 184:1	<b>16</b> 4:6,7 77:5
184:25	81:1,15,15,16	175:10	185:10,11	<b>16-year-old</b> 9:8
Wilson 47:25	91:17 114:10	wrongs 155:15	York's 49:21	<b>17</b> 59:12 77:6
window 6:8	118:22 120:1,8	wrote 16:4,5,6,18	<b>Yorkshire</b> 18:2,19	<b>18</b> 80:14 129:11
wisdom 140:13	121:7 128:6	20:12 25:25	19:10,18,19,23	<b>18-month</b> 129:5
wish 63:2 122:16	159:14 167:21	27:16 30:2 35:15	25:25 26:5 45:3	<b>186</b> 188:13
wished 155:2	172:23 176:1	35:19,24 39:25	52:16 178:22	<b>191,000</b> 122:14
wishes 16:20	178:10,22	40:18 45:14 47:8	Yorkshireman	<b>1950s</b> 182:7
withdraw 103:25	worked 17:15 80:5	128:17,18,22	58:20 61:25	<b>1960s</b> 182:3
withdraws 103:13	80:23 98:21		young 6:17,17	<b>1970s</b> 152:7 182:4
104:14	working 53:9 82:3	X	7:22 40:2,13	<b>1977</b> 182:8
withdrew 62:7	96:10 121:12	<b>X</b> 117:18 187:22	140:17 170:18	<b>1979</b> 48:7
110:23 187:13	122:15		173:2 186:12	<b>1980s</b> 144:14
witness 1:5,6,16	works 65:25 80:22	<u>Y</u>	younger 40:23	<b>1981</b> 181:9,10
1:20 16:12 18:1	81:12 113:10	<b>Y3</b> 117:4	youngster 11:13	<b>1986</b> 180:25 181:3
32:20 49:17 62:4	worried 9:6	yeah 7:1 24:10		181:9,15,25
62:7,10 63:9,15	worry 84:13 129:3	39:16 40:3 49:24	Z	<b>1987</b> 181:12
63:17 79:9 97:4	worshipped 148:8	49:24,24 59:8	Zimbabwe 184:6	<b>1989</b> 82:22 144:16
99:13 100:4,6	worships 148:16	61:13 134:23	Δ	<b>1990s</b> 144:14
101:3 104:7	<b>worthy</b> 97:17	year 3:1 25:24	0	<b>1992</b> 183:13,15,18
105:15 110:23	<b>wouldn't</b> 6:1 8:24	30:15 35:9 46:23	002 127:14	<b>1993</b> 113:5
111:13 112:3,7	32:16 40:7,15	53:14 55:21 58:7	<b>023</b> 143:10	<b>1995</b> 145:8
112:11,13,16,21	43:25 47:5,19	58:11 59:13	1	<b>1996</b> 113:5,6
120:2 137:5	51:13 52:17 59:4	76:10,14,24 77:4		
143:5,8 144:18	60:20 70:21	78:15,17,18	1 16:5 63:12	2
		81:16 96:22	187:24 188:1	<b>2</b> 124:20
	<u> </u>	1	I	1

				Page 220
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	2010 ( 50 1 05 15	1 102 11 21 112 10		
<b>2,000</b> 45:6	<b>30</b> 19:6 72:1 95:17	102:11,21 143:10		
<b>2.00</b> 110:18	95:18	143:11		
<b>2.19</b> 131:22	<b>33</b> 89:23	<b>99</b> 118:2		
<b>2.29</b> 131:24	<b>34</b> 19:6			
<b>20</b> 95:17,18	<b>35</b> 89:24 90:18			
<b>2000</b> 3:1	91:3			
<b>2002</b> 113:6,11	<b>37</b> 158:3 164:25			
<b>2003</b> 75:1	4			
<b>2003/2004</b> 78:12				
<b>2004</b> 63:25	<b>4.11</b> 187:18			
<b>2005</b> 113:11,14	<b>40</b> 45:2,4 53:24			
122:22 123:20	133:12			
<b>2008/2009</b> 78:13	41 65:22			
<b>2009</b> 126:19	<b>43-page</b> 112:7			
<b>2012</b> 9:17 12:3	5			
<b>2013</b> 13:9 17:24				
123:1	<b>5</b> 143:7,12			
<b>2014</b> 123:1,21	<b>500</b> 45:12			
127:10 128:1	<b>54</b> 81:24 135:23			
<b>2015</b> 19:22	6			
<b>2016</b> 15:9 17:1	<b>6</b> 36:17 84:13			
26:2 28:16 35:3	94:12			
76:11,16,19,20	<b>6.47</b> 45:13			
76:20 121:25	<b>62</b> 188:3,5			
<b>2017</b> 31:4 51:3	02 100.3,3			
57:22 63:10	7			
153:20 154:5	<b>7</b> 95:24 144:18			
157:19	<b>72</b> 79:10			
<b>2018</b> 59:12 64:21	<b>75</b> 26:14			
157:19	<b>76</b> 32:20			
<b>2019</b> 1:1 63:12	<b>79</b> 148:24			
149:15 155:5	<b>7th</b> 179:21			
187:20				
<b>20s</b> 77:7	8			
<b>22</b> 31:4	<b>8</b> 1:3 36:19 85:6			
<b>24</b> 47:7	89:24			
<b>24th</b> 18:16	<b>8,000</b> 149:24			
<b>26</b> 16:2 47:16	<b>80</b> 152:18			
176:24	<b>800</b> 149:25			
<b>27</b> 85:5	<b>81</b> 182:18			
<b>28</b> 10:20 85:5	<b>84</b> 65:22			
87:17	<b>86</b> 88:6,16 91:14			
<b>2nd</b> 180:12	182:10			
	<b>87</b> 92:19 182:19			
3	<b>88</b> 182:19,20			
<b>3</b> 38:9 141:19,22				
<b>3.00</b> 111:18 157:4	9			
<b>3.08</b> 157:11	<b>9</b> 63:10 84:13			
<b>3.25</b> 157:9	101:5,15,19			
<b>3.26</b> 157:13				
	1	ı	1	ı