

<p>1 Thursday, 8 March 2018</p> <p>2 (10.00 am)</p> <p>3 ARCHDEACON PHILIP JONES (continued)</p> <p>4 THE CHAIR: Good morning, everyone.</p> <p>5 Examination by MS McNEILL (continued)</p> <p>6 MS McNEILL: Chair, may we resume with this witness?</p> <p>7 Archdeacon Philip, of course you remain under oath.</p> <p>8 Where we left off, according to my notes, yesterday,</p> <p>9 we had discussed the Meekings Report and discussed your</p> <p>10 implementation and your role in dealing with the</p> <p>11 recommendations, and we had gotten to the stage where</p> <p>12 you had -- or the diocese, sorry, I should be clear, had</p> <p>13 asked Baroness Butler-Sloss to conduct a review.</p> <p>14 Others have told us about the review, its findings</p> <p>15 and its recommendations. What I would like to talk to</p> <p>16 you about is one particular area of her findings and the</p> <p>17 circumstances which led to the need for her to produce</p> <p>18 an addendum to her report.</p> <p>19 To assist you, your statement deals with this around</p> <p>20 paragraph 112 onwards. Chair, that's behind tab A1 of</p> <p>21 your bundle and is at page 42 of the witness's</p> <p>22 statement. It is probably better to start around</p> <p>23 paragraph 103, actually, page 38.</p> <p>24 Is it right, Archdeacon Philip, that one area of</p> <p>25 Baroness Butler-Sloss's consideration was the grant of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 1</p>	<p>1 contact with children. The purpose of the PTO was,</p> <p>2 according to Wallace Benn and supported by NR</p> <p>3 [Nicholas Reade] to permit him to celebrate communion in</p> <p>4 the nursing home where he was then living."</p> <p>5 Archdeacon Philip, did you understand, at the time</p> <p>6 of publication of Baroness Butler-Sloss's first report,</p> <p>7 this to be Bishop Benn's position?</p> <p>8 A. Yes, because, in the course of assisting him to prepare</p> <p>9 his comments during 2009, he confirmed that that's what</p> <p>10 he thought.</p> <p>11 Q. Archdeacon Philip, I'm not cutting you off, but I am</p> <p>12 going to try to help you. Paul, can we have the next</p> <p>13 document on the screen, which is ACE023515_005. Chair,</p> <p>14 I'm sorry, this isn't in the bundle but I thought it</p> <p>15 would assist to look at it this way.</p> <p>16 Paul, can you zoom in on the bottom box on that page</p> <p>17 for us? Is this document the comments produced by</p> <p>18 Bishop Wallace to the Roger Meekings report? Would it</p> <p>19 assist you to go back to the first page?</p> <p>20 A. Yes, it would, thank you.</p> <p>21 Q. Can we look at page 1 of this document? "Comments by</p> <p>22 Wallace Benn dated 17 July 2009"?</p> <p>23 A. Right.</p> <p>24 Q. So when we talked yesterday about you having a role as</p> <p>25 an intermediary between Bishop Wallace and</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 3</p>
<p>1 PTO to Roy Cotton in 1999 when he retired?</p> <p>2 A. Yes.</p> <p>3 Q. So that we rehearse the chronology, by 1999, Roy Cotton</p> <p>4 had a conviction in 1954 for a child sexual offence --</p> <p>5 yes?</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. By 1999, Bishop Wallace knew that there was an</p> <p>8 allegation in 1954, but there was some dispute as to</p> <p>9 whether or not he was aware it was a conviction?</p> <p>10 A. Yes.</p> <p>11 Q. In addition, Roy Cotton had been investigated for</p> <p>12 allegations made by Philip Johnson in 1997; is that</p> <p>13 right?</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. This is where we are, 1999. Paul, can we look at one</p> <p>16 section of Baroness Butler-Sloss's report, which is</p> <p>17 OHY000186, and it is page 9 of that. Can you highlight</p> <p>18 for us the top paragraph, so we can just look at that.</p> <p>19 Archdeacon Philip, it might be easier to look at the</p> <p>20 screen. I just want one sentence from this.</p> <p>21 A. Okay.</p> <p>22 Q. The second sentence says:</p> <p>23 "A further reason relied upon by WB [Wallace Benn]</p> <p>24 not to be concerned about the granting of the PTO was</p> <p>25 the continued ill-health of Roy Cotton and his lack of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 2</p>	<p>1 Roger Meekings, did Bishop Wallace produce this document</p> <p>2 setting out his comments?</p> <p>3 A. That was the result of it, yes.</p> <p>4 Q. Can we go back to page 5 now, that box we were looking</p> <p>5 at?</p> <p>6 In the left-hand column, in italics, is</p> <p>7 Roger Meekings' comment, which is:</p> <p>8 "In the original report, Bishop Wallace issued PTO</p> <p>9 to Cotton shortly after his retirement ... this comes as</p> <p>10 a surprise [to a lay person] given the police</p> <p>11 investigation and Bishop Wallace's knowledge of</p> <p>12 the previous conviction."</p> <p>13 The next box along is Bishop Wallace's response.</p> <p>14 I would like to look at the second sentence:</p> <p>15 "Furthermore, there was, following the police</p> <p>16 investigation, no evidence to prevent the issuing of</p> <p>17 a PTO, which Bishop Wallace didn't really want to do but</p> <p>18 felt he had no alternative. As Nicholas Reade and</p> <p>19 Bishop Wallace ... talked about this issue, soon after</p> <p>20 Roy Cotton's retirement, he was admitted to a home due</p> <p>21 to very poor health. The only ministry he had was to</p> <p>22 take the odd communion service on a rota in the home.</p> <p>23 He had no public ministry beyond that and, when</p> <p>24 hospitalised for about the last three years of his life,</p> <p>25 had no ministry at all."</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 4</p>

<p>1 Does that reflect the discussions that you had in 2 your role as intermediary? 3 A. As far as I can recall, and at that stage it was clear 4 that Bishop Wallace did not know where Roy Cotton was 5 living. 6 Q. That's the point we are coming to, because in July 2011, 7 did a BBC journalist and Mr Philip Johnson raise some 8 concerns about the accuracy of Baroness Butler-Sloss's 9 report? 10 A. Yes. 11 Q. Did those concerns centre around the fact that 12 Roy Cotton was not then in a nursing home in 1999? 13 A. Yes. 14 Q. And had taken public services? 15 A. Yes. 16 Q. Did you make enquiries as a result of their concerns? 17 A. Yes. 18 Q. What enquiries did you make? 19 A. Arranging to contact the parish priest in the area, 20 different parishes, to see whether in fact Roy Cotton 21 had functioned in any other parishes, which to some 22 extent he had not, but there were some where he had. 23 Particularly the incumbent of Brede and Udimore, who 24 I was in touch with -- 25 Q. Duncan Lloyd James?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 5</p>	<p>1 far as your discussions with him showed, were there any 2 stringent conditions attached to Roy Cotton's PTO? 3 A. The stringent conditions were talked about a great deal. 4 I think Nicholas Reade was confused about that, as he 5 was confused about the movements of Roy Cotton. I don't 6 think at any stage he really knew where Roy Cotton was, 7 either living at home or hospital or nursing home. 8 There was discussion as to where the stringent 9 conditions referred to could possibly have applied. 10 I think his view, at one point, was that they might have 11 applied to Roy Cotton living in his home in 12 Seddlescombe, which is where he moved after he retired, 13 although the suggestion from discussions with 14 Bishop Wallace appears to be that the conditions applied 15 to the nursing home. 16 Q. From 1999? 17 A. That's what they thought. 18 Q. But subsequently, you discovered that couldn't be the 19 case? 20 A. (a) it couldn't be the case and (b) there was no 21 evidence of any stringent conditions at all. Nothing 22 was reduced to writing. 23 Q. Before we move on in the chronology, what you say in 24 your statement is that this episode, for want of 25 a better word, raised for you some real concerns about</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 7</p>
<p>1 A. No, that was Martin Harper who I wrote to. He was the 2 incumbent where -- he followed Roy Cotton. 3 Q. So you spoke to come priests in the area. Did you also 4 contact the nursing home that Roy Cotton had been in? 5 A. Yes, I did. Queen Mary Lodge in Hastings. 6 Q. When did you discover that he had been admitted to that 7 nursing home? 8 A. At some point in 2011, when all this blew up and I was 9 trying to find out where he had been. I also spoke to 10 a former colleague friend of his who is mentioned in my 11 statement, Father Colin Tolworthy, who in fact visited 12 him both there and at his home. So he was able to 13 confirm to me exactly what the movements were. The 14 nursing home confirmed the dates. 15 Q. I'm looking at your statement, paragraph 103. You say: 16 "I subsequently contacted Queen Mary Lodge and they 17 confirmed that Cotton was transferred to there from the 18 Conquest Hospital, Hastings, on September 17, 2003? 19 A. Yes. 20 Q. Some four years after the grant of his PTO? 21 A. Yes. 22 Q. As a result of your enquiries, did you speak to 23 Nicholas Reade, who was by then the Bishop of Blackburn? 24 A. Yes, I believe I did. 25 Q. What did he say? If I could make that more focused: as</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 6</p>	<p>1 the issue of permission to officiate. 2 A. Yes. 3 Q. I'm looking at paragraph 105 of your statement, which is 4 at the top of page 40 of your statement. Can you tell 5 us in summary -- I don't expect you to give us a full 6 thesis about it -- what you thought the main concerns 7 were around permission to officiate which were 8 highlighted by this incident? 9 A. I suppose if we'd thought about it, bishops and 10 archdeacons would have known that in fact at no stage, 11 in general terms, was it possible to track the movements 12 of a retired priest, because, once someone retires and 13 goes to live out of the parish and out of the clergy 14 house, they are not under anyone's observation or 15 control, they are simply taken on by parishes to fill 16 gaps in their services rotas, and no-one knows where 17 they go -- where they come and go at all. 18 Q. There is not a register, for want of a better word, of 19 who has PTO and where they are and where they are 20 officiating? 21 A. There is a register of those who have PTO but it doesn't 22 relate to what they do in the exercise of it. 23 Q. So they could have PTO within the diocese and be 24 ministering anywhere within that diocese? 25 A. Yes.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 8</p>

<p>1 Q. Without anybody --</p> <p>2 A. And sometimes people lived outside the diocese and had</p> <p>3 PTO to operate in the diocese.</p> <p>4 Q. Is it right that you decided, partially as a result of</p> <p>5 this, to put together a draft protocol for managing</p> <p>6 permission to officiate?</p> <p>7 A. Yes, I did.</p> <p>8 Q. To try to address some of these concerns?</p> <p>9 A. I did. I think it saw the light of day towards the end</p> <p>10 of 2011/early 2012.</p> <p>11 Q. What did you come up with as some practical suggestions</p> <p>12 for managing what you see as the lacuna in permission to</p> <p>13 officiate, if I can use that word?</p> <p>14 A. It would be ideal to have, I think, as is the case now,</p> <p>15 that the person who wants PTO obtains a recommendation</p> <p>16 in writing from a parish priest, ostensibly to act in</p> <p>17 that parish, in support of that parish priest. PTO is</p> <p>18 not given unless there is that recommendation now, but</p> <p>19 I was proposing that in fact that parish priest should</p> <p>20 have a much greater degree of oversight and the PTO</p> <p>21 priest should report to his sponsoring priest who would</p> <p>22 keep a record of where he was operating at any given</p> <p>23 Sunday, or whatever.</p> <p>24 Q. For want of a better word, you wanted them to be</p> <p>25 tethered to an individual parish priest who could have</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 9</p>	<p>1 place. So I don't propose to take that any further with</p> <p>2 you.</p> <p>3 I would like to move to talk about the CDM complaint</p> <p>4 about Bishop Wallace. Again, others will give us the</p> <p>5 detail of the complaints and the subject. What I want</p> <p>6 to ask you is the practical -- because you were a member</p> <p>7 of that Diocesan Safeguarding Advisory Group --</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. -- that brought the complaint. If it had been not</p> <p>10 a bishop but a parish priest and a CDM complaint was</p> <p>11 ongoing, would there have been the power, first of all,</p> <p>12 and consideration, second of all, to suspending them</p> <p>13 while that process was ongoing?</p> <p>14 A. An ordinary parish priest, no, but the practice was to</p> <p>15 arrange for them to stand aside.</p> <p>16 Q. By way of example -- it is not a CDM, but you have told</p> <p>17 us in your statement that when Reverend</p> <p>18 Christopher Howarth was arrested and the investigation</p> <p>19 by the police was ongoing, you didn't have the power to</p> <p>20 formally suspend him, but you did -- you were part of</p> <p>21 the individuals who spoke to him and persuaded him to</p> <p>22 step aside voluntarily during the investigation?</p> <p>23 A. I rather told him he had to.</p> <p>24 Q. My question, you might anticipate, then, is, was the</p> <p>25 same approach considered with Bishop Benn? There was no</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 11</p>
<p>1 some level of oversight?</p> <p>2 A. Some oversight and the ability to record, and the record</p> <p>3 would then be passed on to a rural dean simply so there</p> <p>4 was a record which could be tapped into if questions</p> <p>5 arose, which would have helped in this case.</p> <p>6 Q. Would doing it that way also allow you to make sure</p> <p>7 those who had permission to officiate had appropriate</p> <p>8 safeguarding checks and safeguarding training?</p> <p>9 A. I was proposing they should have safeguarding training</p> <p>10 as a condition of being granted PTO.</p> <p>11 Q. For the absence of doubt, did that exist at the time you</p> <p>12 were considering this, so 2011?</p> <p>13 A. No. No, but I understand there are moves afoot to make</p> <p>14 it a statutory requirement.</p> <p>15 Q. You put together this proposal in 2011. As far as you</p> <p>16 were aware, was any action taken to implement it in</p> <p>17 2011?</p> <p>18 A. No, because it was overtaken by the Archbishopal</p> <p>19 Visitation and the commissaries examined it and</p> <p>20 commented on it. There were aspects of it they didn't</p> <p>21 like in terms of the drafting, but I think they agreed</p> <p>22 with the principle of it. That may in time have led to</p> <p>23 the proposals, which I gather are now coming forward.</p> <p>24 Q. We will hear evidence, chair, from individuals at the</p> <p>25 national church about when and how those have come into</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 10</p>	<p>1 power, we understand, to suspend him during the CDM.</p> <p>2 A. No.</p> <p>3 Q. Did anybody consider approaching him in the same way and</p> <p>4 saying, "For everybody's best interests, perhaps you</p> <p>5 should voluntarily step aside while this is ongoing"?</p> <p>6 A. I did not. I suppose it wasn't my place to do so. It</p> <p>7 would have been the place of the diocesan bishop to</p> <p>8 suggest that. I think it may have been canvassed, but</p> <p>9 there was very strong opposition on the part of</p> <p>10 Bishop Wallace to take any step which might reflect</p> <p>11 adversely on him, even though the understanding, of</p> <p>12 course, is that if you do step aside or, if you are</p> <p>13 suspended in any way, then it is a neutral act.</p> <p>14 Q. So it was understood within the diocese that suspension</p> <p>15 itself was neutral, not a prejudgment?</p> <p>16 A. That's what the dogma says, but, I mean, I think if --</p> <p>17 generally speaking, people know that if someone is</p> <p>18 suspended, then there's something seriously wrong.</p> <p>19 Q. Whilst we are talking about Bishop Wallace, and I would</p> <p>20 like to talk, if we can, about some of the reflections</p> <p>21 you have put in your statement about his practice and</p> <p>22 also how his mode of worship affected his practice in</p> <p>23 the diocese. What you have explained at paragraph 20 of</p> <p>24 your statement -- sorry to be jumping around. It is</p> <p>25 paragraph 20 -- I will find you a page number, but I am</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 12</p>

<p>1 coming towards the end.</p> <p>2 A. Page 7.</p> <p>3 Q. You have explained that Bishop Wallace was</p> <p>4 a conservative evangelical for whom holy scripture is</p> <p>5 the yardstick, guide and authority in life. My first</p> <p>6 question is, are you able to assist us, in brief terms,</p> <p>7 mindful that the panel is not wanting to engage too much</p> <p>8 in theology, what that would mean?</p> <p>9 A. The term "conservative evangelical" was touched on by</p> <p>10 Bishop John Hind yesterday. It is to do with an</p> <p>11 understanding of scripture, and in particular an</p> <p>12 understanding that men have a superior role to women, it</p> <p>13 is called the headship of men. It is also to do with,</p> <p>14 therefore, an opposition to the ordination of women as</p> <p>15 priests or bishops. But it is principally to do with</p> <p>16 a rigorous adherence to scripture and scriptural</p> <p>17 commands and doctrines.</p> <p>18 Q. Before we go any further, I would like to say, is it</p> <p>19 right that you have, to some extent, a background or</p> <p>20 some experience in evangelicals?</p> <p>21 A. I grew up in a fairly strict Baptist environment, which</p> <p>22 is steeped in the same traditions.</p> <p>23 Q. So you have an understanding --</p> <p>24 A. I have an understanding.</p> <p>25 Q. But you would now identify, I understand, as an</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 13</p>	<p>1 A. Could I just -- one thing on forgiveness, which really</p> <p>2 arose for me in terms of Gordon Rideout's conviction.</p> <p>3 He absolutely resisted any suggestion that he was guilty</p> <p>4 and, as far as he was concerned, I believe, and to some</p> <p>5 extent what he was saying, both before conviction and</p> <p>6 after, I believe he took the view that he had been</p> <p>7 forgiven by God, his slate was therefore wiped clean,</p> <p>8 but more than that, in terms of his mental approach to</p> <p>9 it, indeed his psychological approach from a very</p> <p>10 conservative viewpoint, was that it would be almost as</p> <p>11 though the events for which he was under investigation</p> <p>12 and then convicted for hadn't happened. So the mental</p> <p>13 approach is that forgiveness in those circumstances</p> <p>14 means it's gone.</p> <p>15 Q. Is that unique to Canon Rideout?</p> <p>16 A. I think that may be a fairly prevalent view.</p> <p>17 Q. I don't mean to be glib, but is that a prevalent view,</p> <p>18 in your experience, amongst those who have been</p> <p>19 convicted or do you think, even, that's a view some hold</p> <p>20 of individuals under investigation?</p> <p>21 A. I think you are looking at particular people. The</p> <p>22 contrast with somebody who would be a more Catholic</p> <p>23 standpoint is where there was confession and absolution,</p> <p>24 and again you heard about all that yesterday from</p> <p>25 Bishop Hind. Equally, the understanding is there's</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 15</p>
<p>1 Anglo Catholic or more towards --</p> <p>2 A. I think I would be described by some people as a bit of</p> <p>3 a hybrid.</p> <p>4 Q. What I want to ask is, now that you have explained to us</p> <p>5 about conservative evangelical and the type of views</p> <p>6 that Bishop Benn would hold, how do you think that</p> <p>7 affected his approach to safeguarding?</p> <p>8 A. His aim always was for forgiveness and reconciliation</p> <p>9 and a transformed life. Therefore, anyone who had, in</p> <p>10 inverted commas, "done wrong", needed to seek</p> <p>11 forgiveness, be restored, be reconciled, but also move</p> <p>12 towards a completely transformed life in a Christian</p> <p>13 sense. Therefore, when he was faced with anyone who had</p> <p>14 done anything wrong, disciplinary or not, that's what he</p> <p>15 expected, and he would apply scriptural principles as to</p> <p>16 how that was to be achieved.</p> <p>17 I always had the impression that in fact he thought</p> <p>18 along those lines, even in regard to issues relating to</p> <p>19 safeguarding.</p> <p>20 Q. I don't want to focus too much on Bishop Wallace,</p> <p>21 because I want to talk about the diocese as a whole. Is</p> <p>22 it possible to tackle these kind of attitudes, to speak</p> <p>23 to conservative evangelicals and engage with them to</p> <p>24 help them understand the safeguarding practices and how</p> <p>25 their views might need to be adapted?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 14</p>	<p>1 forgiveness and restoration, but not to the extent of</p> <p>2 avoiding the issue of both retribution and restitution,</p> <p>3 whereas the thinking, I suspect, as far as</p> <p>4 Gordon Rideout was concerned, was that, actually, it was</p> <p>5 gone and there was no question of either retribution or</p> <p>6 restitution.</p> <p>7 Q. What the panel may be interested to know is, we have</p> <p>8 heard from Bishop Hind, and it is understandable, that</p> <p>9 there is a need for different traditions within the</p> <p>10 church to have respect for one another's beliefs and</p> <p>11 modes of worship. Within Chichester diocese, where you</p> <p>12 have Anglo Catholics, you have conservative</p> <p>13 evangelicals, how do you think the diocese should or can</p> <p>14 ensure that these different beliefs or different modes</p> <p>15 of worship do not impede proper safeguarding?</p> <p>16 A. It goes back to the first part of your question, which</p> <p>17 is to do with training. Training and selection.</p> <p>18 I speculate, but actually I think it is borne out that</p> <p>19 if you asked any archdeacon, and perhaps even any</p> <p>20 bishop, they would say to you that they had met in the</p> <p>21 course of their ministries people who they really</p> <p>22 thought should not have been ordained. The process of</p> <p>23 course is not infallible, but there must be scope for</p> <p>24 taking into account potential risk factors when you're</p> <p>25 assessing somebody's suitability for selection for</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 16</p>

<p>1 ordination training, and that assessment of risk factor 2 should go on, in my view, throughout their training, 3 which means prior to selection, after selection at 4 a theological college or course, into ordination as 5 a deacon and a curacy. Through that entire process, 6 which might take as much as six or seven years, there 7 should be a more rigorous approach to ongoing assessment 8 of character, affiliations, risk factors, which might -- 9 and I stress this is speculative -- might lead you to 10 suspect that someone may be exhibiting characteristics 11 which you think might need to be addressed at that stage 12 and that therefore --</p> <p>13 Q. I want to make sure we are completely clear what we are 14 talking about and I'm not interrupting you, because it 15 is valid evidence, but in terms of selection and 16 training, are you talking about identifying and 17 addressing individuals who may have or may in future 18 offend or individuals who may not respond appropriately 19 in a safeguarding situation or both?</p> <p>20 A. I think it could be either. I think my worry, and 21 I have seen one or two particular cases which I have 22 dealt with over the years where I know that in fact the 23 wrong approach was taken, or no approach was taken, to 24 assessing characteristics fully and properly in that 25 particular instance. In one case, I would have said the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 17</p>	<p>1 is ensuring individuals have CRB checks, and you have 2 said that you experienced some reluctance within 3 a parish level to individuals undertaking CRB checks. 4 Can you explain to us the reluctance you've experienced 5 and also how you think it might be addressed?</p> <p>6 A. CRB then, DBS now.</p> <p>7 Q. Sorry.</p> <p>8 A. Simply not so much in terms of clergy or lay readers or 9 people in positions of leadership with particular 10 children, who I think readily accept they have to 11 undergo the process and it isn't a problem. I think -- 12 and this is 25 years ago -- in a parish with quite 13 a number of families and children, I had a member of my 14 PCC who refused to undergo a check.</p> <p>15 Q. PCC?</p> <p>16 A. Parochial church council.</p> <p>17 Q. Thank you.</p> <p>18 A. Who promptly resigned because I said he had to. But 19 more recently, in my present parish, the problem that 20 has arisen, which is common everywhere, is that people 21 are irritated by having to undergo repeated DBS checks 22 for different roles, and I said in my statement I think 23 I'm about to go through -- it hasn't come through yet -- 24 a DBS check for a third role.</p> <p>25 Q. That's because, if you are DBS checked for one</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 19</p>
<p>1 person concerned should never have been ordained. This 2 wasn't a safeguarding of children issue, it turned out, 3 in fact, to be a safeguarding of adults issue.</p> <p>4 Q. But you thought the risk factors or the indicators were 5 there before ordination?</p> <p>6 A. I believe they were but I don't think they were 7 addressed or seen. When you see a reference given by 8 a college principal, which is glowing, after the event, 9 you really do wonder whether they knew the candidate at 10 all.</p> <p>11 Q. Sorry if I inelegantly summarise, but there should be 12 better, more rigorous recruitment procedures. Does that 13 involve, do I take from what you have said, also greater 14 openness from those giving references?</p> <p>15 A. Absolutely.</p> <p>16 Q. And in addition to that, ongoing assessment, review and 17 training of individuals' suitability?</p> <p>18 A. I think that's really, chair, what we are talking about. 19 I'm not in a position to comment on the assessment 20 processes now, but from what I have seen, I do believe 21 that in fact there has been a lack in the past which we 22 need to review and reassess today.</p> <p>23 Q. A linked topic, and I don't ask you to turn it up 24 because I will read it to you. At paragraph 26 of your 25 statement, you said that part of your role at the moment</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 18</p>	<p>1 institution, it is not necessarily something you can 2 carry over when you join another role, because it needs 3 to be kept under review?</p> <p>4 A. They are not portable. I'm sure that the panel -- 5 people do need to understand a DBS check is valid only 6 at the date of issue. It is a snapshot of your status 7 at that point.</p> <p>8 Q. Be reassured, we do have some evidence from the 9 Disclosure and Barring Service to explain that to us.</p> <p>10 A. Excellent.</p> <p>11 Q. Not that it is irrelevant evidence, but we do have it, 12 so not to worry.</p> <p>13 What I want to clarify, you made reference to 14 attitudes in your parish 20 years ago and your current 15 parish. Was the reluctance to repeated checks or to the 16 principle of having a check at all or a bit of both?</p> <p>17 A. Then, to the principle; now, the irritation of repeated 18 checks.</p> <p>19 Q. So do you experience any reluctance now to the principle 20 of having a check?</p> <p>21 A. No.</p> <p>22 Q. A couple of final questions, if I can. The first is, 23 you know, I understand, that Baroness Butler-Sloss 24 raised some concerns about the perception of an 25 antiwoman culture within the Chichester diocese?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 20</p>

<p>1 A. Mmm. 2 Q. How would you respond to the concerns that she raised? 3 Would you agree that there was potentially an antiwoman 4 culture within the diocese? 5 A. I think there was that kind of culture 20 or 30 years 6 ago. Certainly over the last 10 years, and more 7 recently, I think it's changed radically. 8 Q. I want to be clear that I don't want to just ask about 9 the ordination of women. Do you think women in lay 10 positions, safeguarding positions, secretarial 11 positions, within the diocese, were appropriately 12 treated or their views appropriately respected? 13 A. In a sense, it doesn't -- to a layperson, it doesn't 14 make sense at all, because, although we are talking 15 about leadership positions, on the one hand, and other 16 people, on the other hand, we covered the leadership 17 point. 18 The church would fall down without the involvement 19 of lay women at every level doing every kind of work, 20 some of which relates to safeguarding and some doesn't. 21 There has never been any hesitation, as far as I'm 22 concerned, in that happening. 23 Q. There have been a lot of reports into the diocese as 24 a result of which we are hearing evidence from 25 individuals about the changes that have been made. Do</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 21</p>	<p>1 anything about it, but I'm sorry to say there are still 2 issues there which need to be corrected. But, again, in 3 time, with training, over time it will disappear, 4 I think. 5 Q. Does that link us full circle back to your point about 6 better recruitment and vetting procedures and better 7 training for people throughout -- 8 A. Yes, it does -- 9 Q. -- to identify these kinds of attitudes? 10 A. We have to remember the theological differences will 11 still be there and the key issue is to work out ways of 12 enabling people of different opposing -- of opposing 13 theological positions to work together. The Archbishop 14 of Canterbury has spoken much about that. Our own 15 diocesan bishop, Dr Warner, has spoken a great deal 16 about that. I think we are moving towards a better 17 place on that. 18 I could enlarge on it at some length because the 19 other area where this does emerge still is groups of 20 clergy meeting together who are of opposing views in 21 this respect, and they do find it extremely difficult to 22 get on. 23 Q. But does this have an effect -- I don't want us to get 24 too sidetracked, diocesan running and theology, does 25 that have an effect or a potential effect on</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 23</p>
<p>1 you think there are still significant outstanding 2 changes that need to be made within the Diocese of 3 Chichester, in your experience? 4 A. Continuing that same point, I think it will take perhaps 5 another generation for there to be a clear understanding 6 across the board in terms of all serving clergy and 7 those who have trained relatively recently that, if they 8 had an understanding that the ordination of women as 9 priests and bishops was inappropriate, I think that will 10 disappear in time, simply by the passage of time. Yes, 11 I know there are still people in the diocese who are 12 vehemently opposed to the priestly activity of women. 13 I know, for example, that the present Archdeacon of 14 Horsham has been the recipient of appalling letters and 15 has been treated, to her face, badly. I know there are 16 other female clergy who I have met who have equally been 17 treated appallingly, spoken to badly, by people who do 18 not accept them in their role. 19 Q. Is there anything that can be done, or are you saying we 20 have to wait it out generationally? 21 A. I think there is a disciplinary issue there which needs 22 to be addressed. Perhaps there may have been 23 a reluctance in the past to do that, but I think less so 24 now. It does depend, of course, upon the recipient of 25 the adverse attention as to whether they want to do</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 22</p>	<p>1 safeguarding, in your view? 2 A. I think we are talking about individuals, not about the 3 structures or groups of people. I think the real 4 problem is with individuals, which takes me back to my 5 concerns about training and assessment and selection. 6 Q. You hope that that would weed it out. I have one point 7 of clarification before I finish that I am asked to 8 raise by Mr Greenwood. It would probably help if I put 9 it on screen. ACE023815. Chair and Archdeacon Philip, 10 it is behind tab 9 of your bundle. Let's look at page 1 11 to establish what it is and then I will take us to the 12 paragraph. This was an outline of the safeguarding 13 situation in Chichester that was prepared by 14 Elizabeth Hall, who was then the national safeguarding 15 adviser in November 2010. We are going to hear from her 16 in evidence on Monday, so she can take us through it. 17 If we look at page 2, first of all, the second 18 paragraph, first few sentences: 19 "This summer, Bishop John appointed two people to do 20 a subsequent review of Shirley's more recent concerns -- 21 Clive Dilloway ... and ... Archdeacon Philip Jones." 22 We covered that yesterday, did we not? That was the 23 letter we looked at, it is not something different? 24 A. No. 25 Q. Okay. We wanted to clarify that. The next paragraph,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 24</p>

<p>1 if we can, please, Paul. The second sentence: 2 "Shirley states that Philip Jones has said that it 3 may be that the values of a registered social worker 4 conflicts with the aims of the church. Shirley 5 interprets this to mean that the diocese has still not 6 learned the need for openness ..." 7 Can you explain, is that a comment you made and, if 8 so, what did you mean? 9 A. I have no recollection whatsoever of saying anything of 10 the sort. 11 Q. What it may come from -- I don't want to speculate, but 12 what Mrs Hosgood has said is that there came a point 13 within her tenure that Angela Sibson and/or yourself 14 suggested that any safeguarding concerns should be 15 brought up with you and with her, or either/or, before 16 they were referred externally to statutory authorities. 17 Do you remember that discussion? 18 A. No, I don't, not least for the reason that -- I mean, 19 again, my statement covers it. Before Angela Sibson was 20 appointed diocesan secretary, my dealings with 21 Shirley Hosgood were as you would expect them to be. 22 Q. It is my fault, a slip of the tongue. It was 23 Francesca Del Mese. It was Angela Sibson's predecessor. 24 I'm sorry, that was my fault. Was the conversation with 25 Francesca Del Mese, yourself and Shirley Hosgood about</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 25</p>	<p>1 mindful that I know you have to be away by 11.00 am, 2 that you think would assist the chair and panel in their 3 consideration? 4 A. Chair, I do think the only thing I can say is to add 5 slightly to what I mentioned yesterday about a narrative 6 which deals with the history and the change of mind-set. 7 I really do want to emphasise that at no stage were 8 people not open to changes, but the difference was 9 considerable between what operated with the then 10 safeguarding group, the CAAG, prior to 2007 and what 11 happened afterwards. And I said Shirley Hosgood brought 12 a rigour which was no doubt necessary. I do think that 13 it was unfortunate that her way personally of dealing 14 with things didn't necessarily -- wasn't necessarily 15 attractive to people. In her own statement she talks 16 about having a professional working relationship with 17 people -- absolutely fine, but I think she was not, in 18 my view, someone who could be described as a critical 19 friend, emphasis on the "friend". The difference 20 between that scenario within which all the difficulty 21 with Bishop Wallace emerged and then the scenario which 22 came into place once Colin Perkins was in post, the 23 difference is stark. From that moment on, I would say 24 there's never been any difficulty at all. 25 It does come down to personalities. At the end of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 27</p>
<p>1 referring any concerns to you first before they went to 2 statutory authorities? 3 A. I don't recall that, but I think it might be consistent 4 with what Francesca would have said, given her views as 5 to -- going back to the issue of the terms of reference 6 for the safeguarding group. That might have come from 7 there. 8 Q. When yourself and Ms Del Mese were saying that you 9 should have a role within the Diocesan Safeguarding 10 Advisory Group, was that for the purpose of ensuring 11 that individuals within the church knew of concerns 12 before they went to statutory authorities? 13 A. I don't recall that. 14 Q. Do you see why Mrs Hosgood was concerned about the need 15 to potentially run anything by you before she raised 16 concerns externally? 17 A. Entirely. But by that stage, she and I had already 18 dealt with safeguarding issues and I had reported an 19 issue to her, she had gone to the LADO, et cetera, 20 et cetera. So things were dealt -- from my point of 21 view, things were being dealt with as they should have 22 been dealt with. 23 Q. Thank you. That clarifies my point. I don't have any 24 further questions for you. The chair and panel may. Is 25 there anything that you wanted to specifically add,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 26</p>	<p>1 the day, personalities should not have had the effect 2 that they did, but they did. 3 MS McNEILL: Chair, do you or the panel have any questions 4 of this witness? I don't have any further questions. 5 Questions by THE PANEL 6 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Archdeacon. Could I just pick up the 7 last point you made prior to concluding there. Could 8 I just clarify that there was no obstruction or vetting 9 when Ms Hosgood assessed a situation as needing to be 10 referred to the statutory authorities? 11 A. By no means. 12 THE CHAIR: So there was no obstruction, she could do that 13 directly? 14 A. And she did. 15 THE CHAIR: In every circumstance in which you were aware? 16 A. As far as I was aware. At the end of the day -- her 17 practice was to do what she believed was right and 18 no-one was saying that was inappropriate. 19 THE CHAIR: Thank you. Ms Sharpling? 20 MS SHARPLING: Thank you, Archdeacon. Just a question, 21 again on the remarks you have just made, when you talked 22 about the challenges that were experienced due to 23 personalities of individuals involved. I was wondering 24 whether you had a view on how that could be prevented 25 for the future if personalities can have such a dominant</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 28</p>

<p>1 effect on the conduct of safeguarding within the 2 diocese?</p> <p>3 A. I think it is extremely difficult because when you are 4 employing somebody as a diocesan safeguarding adviser, 5 for example, or indeed any post, you might want to 6 suggest that the same should apply, for example, to the 7 appointment of a diocesan secretary, because part of 8 the personality issue there was a problem.</p> <p>9 At the end of the day, it is assessment at the point 10 of appointment, proper references, proper background, 11 rigorous interviewing which one would hope would bring 12 out that kind of issue. Beyond that, there is very 13 little you can do. Things do tend to work out. What 14 I would hope -- we all hoped on each occasion during 15 that period was that the person who applied for any of 16 those posts would have understood what the ethos of 17 the diocese was and had picked up at least the vibes as 18 to how we saw life.</p> <p>19 Yes, changes were necessary, but there are ways of 20 dealing with change and sometimes what was perceived as 21 an occasionally confrontational approach wouldn't have 22 been appropriate and wasn't. I think personality does 23 inevitably play a part. It happens in all walks of life 24 in every institution.</p> <p>25 THE CHAIR: Mr Frank?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 29</p>	<p>1 firmly expressed. But I think most people at that time 2 were moving from a perspective which did not seem to 3 present this kind of issue as two diverse poles of 4 argument.</p> <p>5 When we moved into the era with Shirley Hosgood, it 6 became absolutely crystal clear there was a definite 7 division, and I think that, and I think I have said 8 elsewhere that, for all of us, it was a learning curve 9 from 2007, and I think that was probably part of it.</p> <p>10 I was fully aware of civil jurisdiction and balance 11 of probabilities, but for others with no legal 12 background, that would have been difficult.</p> <p>13 MR FRANK: Now, if we could please put up on the screen 14 ACE022267_375. You may have it behind your tab 9, you 15 may not. It will come up on the screen anyway. This 16 should be the minutes of the meeting on 19 October which 17 was chaired by, I think, Mr Akerman. Just for 18 completeness' sake, do you recall Mr Akerman who laid 19 the complaint that led to the CDM against Wallace Benn.</p> <p>20 A. Yes.</p> <p>21 MR FRANK: It was indeed. He was the chair of this meeting. 22 I wonder if we could turn to the following page at 376. 23 Do we see halfway down the page your observation 24 recorded where you said that there had been a big 25 cultural change within the church, due mainly to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 31</p>
<p>1 MR FRANK: Yes, please. Firstly, with your legal 2 experience, your background and experience in the law, 3 you were able to appreciate that, as you set out in 4 paragraph 21 of your statement, the approach that 5 Wallace Benn took to allegations of misconduct against 6 clergy for whom he was responsible was that he found it 7 very difficult to set the application of the civil 8 burden of proof on the balance of probabilities 9 preferring to adhere to the criminal standard "beyond 10 reasonable doubt". That was your assessment of 11 Wallace Benn's view of how to approach an allegation of 12 misconduct?</p> <p>13 A. Not just my assessment. That's what his stated views 14 were.</p> <p>15 MR FRANK: His stated views were. Can I ask you what your 16 view, as the archdeacon, was when you came to hear about 17 a complaint? Did you share that view or was it 18 a different view that you took?</p> <p>19 A. I think everyone who becomes involved in disciplinary 20 matters differentiates between discipline and 21 safeguarding, and I think everyone understands that 22 there has to be a different approach.</p> <p>23 Part of the change of mind-set, and therefore I'm 24 not specifically necessarily criticising Bishop Benn, 25 I pick that out because his views were very solid and</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 30</p>	<p>1 Shirley Hosgood's persistence. Do you see that there?</p> <p>2 A. Yes.</p> <p>3 MR FRANK: Would it be right to say that Shirley Hosgood had 4 to be persistent in order to get the change that you 5 recognise occurred?</p> <p>6 A. We are talking about 2009, October, so she'd been in 7 post for two years and, yes, I think persistence was 8 probably the right word.</p> <p>9 MR FRANK: Thank you. The next thing I want to ask you, 10 please, is, again, if we look on the following page, at 11 378, in the middle of the paragraph: 12 "The chairman [Mr Akerman] wanted it noted that the 13 whole safeguarding group considered such a review ..." 14 This is in relation to the external review that had 15 been required: 16 "... should have been the remit of the safeguarding 17 group, at least in the first instance. He said the 18 impression being given to the group was that their 19 specific function to advise the diocese had been 20 undermined by this decision to seek an external review." 21 Do you recall that being said by the chairman?</p> <p>22 A. Yes.</p> <p>23 MR FRANK: On behalf of the whole group?</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p> <p>25 MR FRANK: Of which you were part?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 32</p>

1 **A. Yes.**
 2 MR FRANK: Did you share that view?
 3 **A. I understood where he was coming from.**
 4 MR FRANK: It isn't recorded that you dissented in any way
 5 from that view.
 6 **A. No, I think the archdeacons on several occasions found**
 7 **themselves in a difficult position. They understood**
 8 **what the chair was saying, what the other members were**
 9 **saying, but at the end of the day, I think they**
 10 **understood that the Bishop of Chichester was, I think,**
 11 **mindful that it was essentially his responsibility in**
 12 **the past and, again, this is part of the change of**
 13 **culture and mind-set that, actually, if you have**
 14 **a safeguarding group, then the significance of that**
 15 **group and the reach that that group has is greater than**
 16 **perhaps you expected.**
 17 MR FRANK: I just want to invite your comment on what
 18 appears in the following paragraph as being something
 19 that you said. It recorded that you said that in
 20 respect of the report you added that there was a need
 21 for absolute certainty regarding the evidence and the
 22 weight attached to it, which, as you will appreciate as
 23 a solicitor and experienced lawyer, as you had been, was
 24 higher than both the civil standard and indeed the
 25 criminal standard in any investigation because the

Page 33

1 requirement for absolute certainty has never been
 2 required. I just want to understand what you meant by
 3 that, if that is what indeed you said.
 4 **A. I think I was simply elaborating for emphasis.**
 5 MR FRANK: Thank you. My final question, if I may, is this:
 6 on the final page of that document, on page 382, at
 7 paragraph 8 there is a reference to the resignation of
 8 a Ms Ellis, I think it was, recorded there.
 9 **A. Yes.**
 10 MR FRANK: She announced to the safeguarding group that she
 11 considered she could not continue on the group with the
 12 current culture in the diocese and would be resigning.
 13 Could you help us with this: the culture within the
 14 diocese, was that the culture of discourtesy to female
 15 members of staff of the kind which you have indicated
 16 was perhaps the culture at the time?
 17 **A. No, not at all. It was to do with the -- what was**
 18 **becoming apparent to her of the history of issues like**
 19 **Cotton and Pritchard.**
 20 MR FRANK: In any event, you asked her to reconsider, which
 21 she did, but in due course the chairman notes that since
 22 the meeting she has formally confirmed her resignation
 23 from the safeguarding group --
 24 **A. Yes.**
 25 MR FRANK: -- which I think you would have regarded as

Page 34

1 a loss to the group.
 2 **A. I did.**
 3 MR FRANK: Thank you very much. That's all I ask you.
 4 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much, Archdeacon.
 5 **A. Thank you, ma'am.**
 6 MS McNEILL: Chair, can this witness be released?
 7 THE CHAIR: Yes, of course.
 8 (The witness withdrew)
 9 MS McNEILL: Chair, our next witness is Alana Lawrence on
 10 behalf of MACSAS. I am going to hand over to
 11 Ms Scolding.
 12 MS ALANA LAWRENCE (sworn)
 13 Examination by MS SCOLDING
 14 MS SCOLDING: Good morning, Ms Lawrence.
 15 **A. Good morning.**
 16 Q. You should have a witness statement in front of you.
 17 I would usually say to you, because I know you used to
 18 be a lawyer, could you turn to the back, but your
 19 signature has been taken out under the
 20 Data Protection Act. So I am going to ask you, is this
 21 witness statement true, to the best of your knowledge
 22 and belief?
 23 **A. It is.**
 24 Q. Can it, therefore, be formally entered into evidence on
 25 the website, ANG000223-1.

Page 35

1 Ms Lawrence, if I could just identify a little about
 2 your background and qualifications, I understand, after
 3 a career in various voluntary services, you were
 4 a barrister in private practice between 2005 and 2015;
 5 is that correct?
 6 **A. That is correct.**
 7 Q. You are also, or were, a member of the executive
 8 committee of MACSAS, which I understand is the Minister
 9 and Clergy Sexual Abuse Survivors, between 2005 and
 10 2013; is that correct?
 11 **A. That is correct. I believe it was 2014. I amended it**
 12 **but then that didn't get through, unfortunately.**
 13 Q. And that you were chair of this organisation between
 14 2009 and 2013?
 15 **A. That is correct.**
 16 Q. But you are now no longer an active member of
 17 the organisation because you are undertaking training
 18 for the ministry?
 19 **A. Exactly. I thought that that would be a conflict of**
 20 **interests, but also would be a confusion to survivors,**
 21 **to see that there is a minister in the middle of MACSAS,**
 22 **which certainly wouldn't be helpful.**
 23 Q. Just a few background facts which are taken from
 24 paragraphs 2 to 8 of your witness statement. MACSAS is
 25 a support group for men and women from Christian

Page 36

<p>1 backgrounds who have been sexually abused by ministers 2 of the clergy or children as adults, and your express 3 role is to support survivors. That's correct, isn't it? 4 A. It is. 5 Q. It came out of a predecessor group, as I understand it, 6 started and run by somebody called Dr Margaret Kennedy? 7 A. That's correct. 8 Q. What are the objectives of the MACSAS organisation? 9 A. As you say, first, to support survivors who come and 10 tell us about their experience in churches. Quite 11 often, they have come because they have had really poor 12 responses from the church, and it would be fair to say 13 we see them. Also, really, to be with them, advocate on 14 their behalf, to support them through procedures, 15 whatever they may look like, to ensure or try and link 16 them up to support organisations like counselling 17 provision, and also to speak on their behalf into the 18 institutions, church institutions, across the country. 19 So that's basically the general run. 20 Q. I understand you run a helpline where people can 21 telephone or email you; is that right? 22 A. Yes. 23 Q. In what way do you provide kind of formal responses to 24 church documents or what sort of work does MACSAS do 25 with church institutions?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 37</p>	<p>1 it increased? 2 A. It has increased, and it's increased significantly in 3 the last five years. 4 Q. Can I identify now that your role involved in 2009, as 5 I understand it, being part of and/or working with both 6 the Church of England and the Methodist Church whilst 7 they were developing specific responses as to how to 8 respond to survivors of sexual abuse, and you set that 9 out at paragraph 19 of your witness statement, which is 10 page 5, chair and panel, if you wish to turn it up. 11 On or around that time, as I understand it, just 12 after the past cases review, a joint panel was set up to 13 try and consider and to produce some guidance which 14 then, in effect, in the Church of England anyway, was 15 issued in 2011? 16 A. Yes. I'm sorry to interrupt you, Ms Scolding. One of 17 the issues that MACSAS, I think -- whether we were 18 confused or whether the whole thing was confused was 19 that, as the past cases review was being published, as 20 there was a growing sense of unease about some of 21 the responses of the Church of England, at that moment, 22 the Church of England and the Methodist Church, through 23 Pearl Luxon, who was a national safeguarding adviser and 24 Methodist, set up this working group for Responding 25 Well. MACSAS was invited. We assumed it was responding</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 39</p>
<p>1 A. So that has varied over the years. It started by being 2 on working groups, engaging directly with churches, 3 talking into things like Time for Action, which was the 4 Churches Together in Britain and Ireland review in the 5 late '90s. In recent times, as things have evolved in 6 churches, that has included currently being a member of 7 the National Safeguarding Panel for the 8 Church of England. It did formerly and previously 9 involve the Joint Safeguarding Panel of 10 the Church of England and the Methodist Church, which 11 still exists but I don't believe has anyone from MACSAS 12 on it anymore, and, wherever possible, and wherever 13 invited, or wherever allowed in, to go to any working 14 group that is looking at issues of safeguarding. 15 Q. I said earlier that you operated a helpline. Roughly 16 how many people telephone this helpline on an annual 17 basis? 18 A. In 2017, there were over 400 calls to the helpline. 19 There were over 500 people who contacted via email. 20 Some people continued beyond that to reach to MACSAS 21 members because of the ongoing support. In 2016, there 22 were something in the region of 650 calls to the 23 helpline. So we are looking at between 400 and 600 24 calls currently. 25 Q. Has that remained steady over a number of years or has</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 38</p>	<p>1 well to allegations in the church. Indeed, it wasn't. 2 So it was much more in response to Time for Action, 3 which was a 2001 document for the Churches Together in 4 Britain and Ireland, where they had recommended that the 5 churches produce documents for responding to survivors 6 of abuse, full stop. People had been abused in 7 childhood who were now in churches and receiving very 8 poor responses, according to survivors, and it has been 9 something that CSSA, the forerunner of MACSAS, had been 10 instrumental in being part of. Margaret Kennedy was on 11 the working group, agreed that there should be 12 something. 13 Now, by 2009, MACSAS were involved in looking at 14 survivors of abuse in the church. So we went along -- 15 and that's why I write this in my paragraph 19 -- 16 thinking that we were talking about the people that we 17 represented specifically, and were told in no uncertain 18 terms that this was not such a document. This was not 19 about clergy abuse victims. 20 Q. It was simply a sort of -- 21 A. It was a wonderful -- 22 Q. -- generic -- 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. It is probably an incorrect way to describe it. 25 A. Yes.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 40</p>

1 Q. So you attended a couple of meetings, as I understand
 2 it, and then, after that, you were separated from the
 3 main group and sat with a lawyer and Pearl Luxon and one
 4 other, you say to consider trivia?
 5 A. Well --
 6 Q. If you could expand upon that slightly?
 7 A. Yes, I can expand upon it because I suppose it wasn't
 8 trivia, it was the law, and I was a lawyer, so there was
 9 that element. But we were focusing on -- rather than
 10 dealing with the issues of how you respond, we were
 11 focusing on things like, what's the theology like, and
 12 what is the ecclesial law on it? I said, "Really, I'm
 13 not here to talk about that. I would like you to
 14 respond to survivors, who are not lawyers", and the fact
 15 that I was wasn't the reason I was coming to the
 16 meeting. So I was put into a different category while
 17 other people got on talking about generic --
 18 a generic -- I call it the CAFOD or Christian Aid
 19 version of responding, which is for the good of all
 20 people. I was trying to get them to understand that, if
 21 they didn't start with the church victims, of which
 22 there were thousands, that was our estimate, then they
 23 wouldn't be able to respond appropriately or at all,
 24 really, to other survivors. So it was a real culture
 25 clash, I think, to be fair.

Page 41

1 Q. I understand in early 2010 you left the group because
 2 you felt that you weren't really having a useful purpose
 3 upon it?
 4 A. No, I did feel that any conversation I engaged with was
 5 being met by -- this is where the lawyer was very
 6 interesting, who just sat with me, and kept informing me
 7 that this wasn't what the thing was about. I said,
 8 "Well, that's okay, then, but MACSAS can't keep offering
 9 something that was not going to be effective".
 10 Q. When the document then came out, in 2011, "Responding
 11 well to those who had been sexually abused", did MACSAS
 12 seek to express a view and, if so, to whom did you
 13 express that view?
 14 A. Firstly, to Elizabeth Hall, who is now the national
 15 safeguarding adviser. She had come in -- to be fair,
 16 Pearl Luxon didn't ever establish Responding Well
 17 because I think she also lost faith in it at that time.
 18 I don't know. You would have to ask Pearl.
 19 But Elizabeth Hall came in and she came to see
 20 MACSAS -- it was during the Pope's visit, I think, and
 21 we were doing a lot of work. She came to see us to say
 22 she was going to resurrect the Responding Well document
 23 because it had something of benefit. Well, you know, we
 24 weren't against that, but I pointed out, and I think it
 25 was the first time that Elizabeth Hall had heard this,

Page 42

1 that this document wasn't at all to do with responding
 2 to victims of abuse within the church. She went back
 3 and read it and read it and then she said, "I see what
 4 you mean. It isn't". So we put that to her. We said
 5 it was a well-intentioned pastoral support document for
 6 general use in the church, but couldn't in any way be
 7 used for survivors of abuse coming into the church
 8 because -- by church officials, because they were met by
 9 institutional responses. So this document couldn't
 10 apply to them because they wouldn't be able to engage
 11 with it. They often wouldn't be in the church -- that
 12 was one of the issues, most survivors are not in the
 13 church, strangely enough, you know, but also it
 14 presupposed that you were actively in your church
 15 seeking support in the church, and that the church would
 16 be neutral in that and be able to offer you the support
 17 that it sets down.
 18 The problem is, as soon as an allegation is raised
 19 against a minister in the church, a whole different set
 20 of things were happening, and we said, "Therefore, they
 21 can't even engage in this well-meaning document, because
 22 they are told they are not allowed to talk to anyone".
 23 So it became -- it was just not fit for purpose.
 24 Q. Okay. So what steps, if any, have you sought to take to
 25 ensure that there is a sort of a "victim and survivor of

Page 43

1 church abuse" focused document published or promulgated
 2 by the church, and has one appeared?
 3 A. So there is currently work to develop Responding Well.
 4 We are not sure if that is to develop Responding Well
 5 for the general public because MACSAS haven't been
 6 invited to any working party to deal with that document.
 7 It is believed the document will come to the NSP, the
 8 National Safeguarding Panel, on which two members of
 9 MACSAS sit and will certainly have a say, but they have
 10 not been asked to comment in its new incarnation. We
 11 have specifically set out in "The Stones Cry Out", and
 12 elsewhere, the concerns we had about the failure to
 13 respond to survivors specifically. I understand that
 14 chapter 7, which is -- we call it chapter 7, of whatever
 15 procedures of the Church of England, safeguarding
 16 procedures, now attempts to set in place procedures for
 17 responding to survivors, but it is very much an
 18 instrument designed to respond institutionally. "We, as
 19 the DSA, will forward this case to the police or to the
 20 relevant authorities if the person is alive", and it
 21 sets out that process which had never been set out in
 22 the same way before.
 23 But it doesn't really address the situation of
 24 Responding Well. They are two very different documents.
 25 Q. Have you been involved -- I understand that the

Page 44

<p>1 updated -- or we have evidence that's been given by some 2 of the church members that the updated "Responding well 3 to those who have been sexually abused" has been, or 4 will be, influenced by a piece of work that SCIE, the 5 Social Care Institute for Excellence, have been doing 6 with the church around this. Has your organisation or 7 any members of your organisation had any meetings with 8 and/or work alongside SCIE in developing that particular 9 guidance? 10 A. As far as I understand it, SCIE came into audit all the 11 dioceses. 12 Q. Yes, they did. 13 A. MACSAS did, through Graham Tilby, the national 14 safeguarding adviser. The issue became that this was 15 done, again, on the documents within the dioceses and 16 practices of the officers, the safeguarding officers. 17 What it didn't do at any time is talk to survivors, and 18 that's as we have understood it. 19 I have just been talking through this with someone 20 else from MACSAS committee, that -- to make sure that's 21 true. Survivors weren't asked -- it is a bit like 22 service users not being asked when you review something. 23 They weren't asked at all how they thought processes 24 were going within dioceses. So we got the institutional 25 view, the church's view, but not the survivors' view of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 45</p>	<p>1 that Chichester is now running in the 30s. We looked at 2 these 13 cases of, what were the criteria, and we looked 3 at the criteria in the thing, how has it been so reduced 4 to 13 cases, of which basically two had something done? 5 How did that fit? It was open to criticism anyway, 6 because we criticised the fact that in at least 13 cases 7 bishops knew the people were a risk and allowed them to 8 continue ministering, so we did raise that issue, but we 9 said this is such a minimisation that we were extremely 10 concerned. Survivors expressed a level of distress 11 through our helpline and emails. They said, "How is 12 this possible?" Because we were very concerned that it 13 didn't address any sense of urgency that was coming from 14 survivors. 15 Q. As a result of that, I understand that you sent a survey 16 out to individuals who were -- was it just individuals 17 who were members of MACSAS or was it anyone who had 18 telephoned the helpline? 19 A. Specifically, we excluded ourselves, given that we were 20 so bored of our own stories, but we did ask -- we put it 21 on the helpline -- we put it on the website, only on the 22 website. It wasn't because of the past case review, 23 which had already -- didn't come out until after. 24 In 2009, there were a series of statements made by 25 different church officials saying -- I call them gold</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 47</p>
<p>1 how they experienced the work going on. 2 So there is a gap. It is good, it has raised the 3 baseline, but it hasn't really responded to survivors in 4 the way that MACSAS has been campaigning. 5 Q. Can I turn now to the past cases review, which came out 6 just before, about a year before, "Responding well to 7 those who have been sexually abused". This identified, 8 or certainly the full contents of the review have never 9 been published, but an executive summary was published 10 at some point in 2010, as I understand it. It found 11 only 13 cases of concern across the country from every 12 single diocese. What was MACSAS's response to that? 13 A. Shock. It was shock. We put out a press release 14 immediately to the effect that this shocking 15 underreporting, the understatement and minimisation, and 16 the sense of self-confidence coming from the church -- 17 what do you call that? -- you know, that they really did 18 believe -- complacency -- that they had dealt with all 19 these cases. 20 As we knew and were beginning to understand from 21 Chichester, and from the survey we did, that this was 22 far from -- we had dozens of cases from the 23 Church of England that no-one seemed to have responded 24 to. 25 So we looked at these 13 cases -- when you think</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 46</p>	<p>1 standard here, but I think the word was "model 2 standards" and procedures in place. I thought, this 3 isn't squaring with what we are hearing. Maybe we are 4 wrong and only hearing a few people and, in fact, things 5 are much better. I asked for the survey to go out not 6 to people we had heard from, but to others, and I said, 7 "Please respond. If you haven't talked about this 8 before, please let us know what your response is". 9 I didn't know anyone. I think a couple had been to 10 MACSAS, to be fair, but I didn't know any of the people 11 involved in these responses. They were anonymous, 12 primarily -- some did email, some did it on 13 SurveyMonkey. What I wanted to find out was whether 14 this was true. Whether there had been a cultural shift 15 we hadn't picked up on, in which case we were more than 16 willing to say so, but we strongly suspected the 17 opposite to be the truth, and that, whatever they were 18 measuring as procedures of model excellence, or whatever 19 it was they used, wasn't actually connected in any way 20 to the experience of survivors and/or the actions taken. 21 So we didn't know what they were measuring. That's why 22 "Stones Cry Out" came out. 23 Q. As a result of that, you published a report which you 24 have, chair and panel, at ACE05487 behind tab 1 of your 25 bundle. Paul, if you could get that up, but I won't</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 48</p>

<p>1 need it quite yet.</p> <p>2 You published "The Stones Cry Out". What was the</p> <p>3 aim of publishing that?</p> <p>4 A. There were two aims. One was to reflect the story that</p> <p>5 the survivors had told. I had said in the survey blurb,</p> <p>6 right at the back of the report, that we would publish</p> <p>7 the findings of this survey, so people would be heard.</p> <p>8 The first thing was to let those who had contacted us,</p> <p>9 often from a very dark place, a very lonely place, that</p> <p>10 their voice would be heard. That was the first thing.</p> <p>11 The second thing, though, was to let people know</p> <p>12 that they weren't on their own, that in fact there's</p> <p>13 phenomenal amounts of information that had accumulated</p> <p>14 over decades that were available to the churches, to</p> <p>15 a society, to us and to them, which I wanted them to</p> <p>16 read. So part 2 became this -- it came out of what</p> <p>17 I saw in part 1, "Do you know, you are in context, you</p> <p>18 are not alone and your response is not an unusual</p> <p>19 response? This isn't about you, it is about the</p> <p>20 institution".</p> <p>21 Those were the two broad aims.</p> <p>22 Q. As a result of this, you made a number of</p> <p>23 recommendations. Paul, can we get these up,</p> <p>24 ACE005487_174 onwards. Chair and panel, it is page 167</p> <p>25 in the internal pagination. I think there are 20</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 49</p>	<p>1 out of talks with Phil Johnson as part of his settlement</p> <p>2 and part of the pro settlement process, that there would</p> <p>3 be a review in order to release another document. So</p> <p>4 I heard about this. And I thought, I know</p> <p>5 Elizabeth Butler-Sloss -- I mean, not personally and</p> <p>6 going to dinner with her, but I had been before her in</p> <p>7 a case, and I had also been before her at the</p> <p>8 Cumberlege Commission. I thought, well, I also knew</p> <p>9 about the Cleveland Commission. I thought, okay, she</p> <p>10 may pick up a bigger narrative going on.</p> <p>11 So I asked to see her to talk about the wider</p> <p>12 context of Chichester. So that's why I went to see her.</p> <p>13 It just so happened, at that time, Phil got in touch</p> <p>14 with me personally, having worked with Margaret Kennedy</p> <p>15 before. So these two things. That's how I got to meet</p> <p>16 her.</p> <p>17 Q. What discussions took place at that meeting?</p> <p>18 A. So I went to one meeting. What was lovely, first of</p> <p>19 all, is I emailed her and said could I come. I thought</p> <p>20 maybe she is not going to respond. And she responded</p> <p>21 immediately. So clearly she was at this point of</p> <p>22 thinking, "Where am I going to get recommendations</p> <p>23 from?". So she said, "Yes, indeed". So I went along.</p> <p>24 The conversation was very general around Chichester. It</p> <p>25 did focus on Cotton and Pritchard, but she was able to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 51</p>
<p>1 recommendations --</p> <p>2 A. I started and I thought, "I'll keep going".</p> <p>3 Q. -- which were made. What I am going to do in a bit is</p> <p>4 take you through them and identify which ones the</p> <p>5 Church of England, in any event -- because this is not</p> <p>6 just the Church of England. This is all Christian</p> <p>7 churches?</p> <p>8 A. Yes, it was.</p> <p>9 Q. All Christian organisations and denominations?</p> <p>10 A. Yes.</p> <p>11 Q. So the first one is "Call for an independent inquiry".</p> <p>12 I think we can probably tick that one off the list.</p> <p>13 I will come back to the others later.</p> <p>14 As a result of this, I understand that you arranged</p> <p>15 to meet with Baroness Butler-Sloss to discuss the</p> <p>16 findings of the report. How did that come about?</p> <p>17 A. So I hadn't yet written this report, but I had collated</p> <p>18 the information that had come from the report and made</p> <p>19 those tables. It looked very concerning because if one</p> <p>20 case is being responded to like this, how were the</p> <p>21 others being responded to? So I wasn't saying that it</p> <p>22 was all bad news, but I was saying, if in 20 dioceses or</p> <p>23 15 dioceses, this is an issue in the</p> <p>24 Church of England -- as I was putting it together,</p> <p>25 I heard of the Butler-Sloss Review, and that had come</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 50</p>	<p>1 tell me about the bishop and that there were other cases</p> <p>2 of concern. She said, "What I want to know -- because</p> <p>3 there is so much concern here, what I would like to know</p> <p>4 is, what are we meant to do? What are the</p> <p>5 recommendations I can make? There must be stuff we can</p> <p>6 do", and she had some and she asked MACSAS to put</p> <p>7 together recommendations. So we went -- I went away and</p> <p>8 said, "Well, I haven't got them off the top of my head,</p> <p>9 but I can send them". So she asked me to send them</p> <p>10 quite quickly. So some of the recommendations in the</p> <p>11 Butler-Sloss Report actually are in this report. They</p> <p>12 weren't contradictory to the findings in "The Stones Cry</p> <p>13 Out".</p> <p>14 Q. So she took into account your views and also adopted the</p> <p>15 recommendations that you'd sent?</p> <p>16 A. Not all of them, of course, because we'd have</p> <p>17 a different planet now and we'd be a different church,</p> <p>18 but she did support a number of ones, including</p> <p>19 independence of DSAs, making sure risk assessments were</p> <p>20 done. The most important for survivors was, she</p> <p>21 recommended that not only do survivors have support, but</p> <p>22 that survivors of non-recent abuse are treated exactly</p> <p>23 the same way as if they were recent. She said the</p> <p>24 problem is it's the offender, not the age of the victim,</p> <p>25 that's of concern. She was very clear. She was also</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 52</p>

1 very clear that the standard of proof required, when
 2 considering safety of children and ongoing safety, meant
 3 that it had to be, on the balance of probability, having
 4 regard to the paramountcy principle. So I thought these
 5 were two or three very good points that she put into her
 6 recommendations that we crucially wanted to get across.
 7 There were a load of others. Some of them she put and
 8 some she didn't.

9 Q. As a result of possibly "The Stones Cry Out" and the
 10 discussions that you had with Baroness Butler-Sloss, you
 11 began to attend meetings with the then lead safeguarding
 12 bishop for the church, as I understand it.

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Bishop Paul Butler, who was then the -- who is the
 15 Bishop of Durham?

16 A. I think -- I didn't ever sit down and ask for the
 17 nitty-gritty of why they did this. I had got in touch
 18 with Elizabeth Hall, who had come the year before to
 19 talk about Responding Well, which I trashed a little
 20 bit, but I said -- supportive of one another. I sent
 21 her the names of all the alleged offenders raised "The
 22 Stones Cry Out". I couldn't tell her who the survivors
 23 were, even if I wanted to. It was all anonymous and
 24 I wouldn't have done because it was anonymous. But
 25 I thought the only duty of care I have is to ensure that

Page 53

1 none of these people, if they are living, ever cause any
 2 more harm, but also, if survivors have come forward
 3 about those who are dead and/or living, that someone has
 4 a context for this.

5 Elizabeth Hall pointed out to me at that first
 6 meeting where she took these and I said, "We don't hold
 7 all this information, we want you to have it", she said,
 8 "These are the first names" -- this is Elizabeth Hall --
 9 "These are the first names I have ever been given in the
 10 Church of England", and I went, "You're the national
 11 safeguarding adviser". There is not one piece of paper
 12 was left in her office the day she took over. I thought
 13 that was quite an amazing statement for Elizabeth Hall
 14 to make. I said, "How can you safeguard if you don't
 15 know anything?", and she said, "Now I know this and this
 16 is what I am going to use to get into ..." and she did,
 17 she produced a report for the House of Bishops. She
 18 looked at some of the case studies of these people which
 19 she anonymised at one level for me and showed there are
 20 patterns of offending of some of the people named in
 21 "The Stones Cry Out" who had never come to light. So
 22 she did use that information, I think, as effectively as
 23 Elizabeth Hall could use it, and I would say that, and
 24 I was kind of impressed that someone took it seriously
 25 because the response from the Catholic Church -- I know

Page 54

1 this is none of your concern -- was to ignore it. So
 2 I think it was good that Elizabeth Hall did do
 3 something.

4 Out of that, then, she -- we also did -- these
 5 things overlapped. The Stop Church Child Abuse campaign
 6 had got going at around the time we were doing our
 7 survey and the Pope's visit and post Pope's visit.
 8 Timing is everything, isn't it? There was a kind of
 9 growing climate. We had become members of that as well.
 10 I said, yes, we should align ourselves to the inquiry,
 11 the mandatory reporting, the aims of this group.

12 As a result of that, members of the Abuse -- Stop
 13 Church Child Abuse campaign, through Elizabeth Hall,
 14 were invited to a meeting with Paul Butler and
 15 David Gamble, the two joint heads of safeguarding on the
 16 joint safeguarding.

17 Q. We have heard about Paul Butler. Just for clarity,
 18 David Gamble was head of safeguarding in the
 19 Methodist Church?

20 A. He was. He was the former president of
 21 the Methodist Church and therefore considered a wise
 22 senior. He was also legal adviser within the church,
 23 Church House in the Methodist Church, so always had
 24 a legal role. Then he was, therefore, the joint chair
 25 with Paul Butler on the Joint Safeguarding Panel. He

Page 55

1 had given about 10, 20 years of his life to looking at
 2 safeguarding in the church, which is very interesting.
 3 He was an interesting man.

4 Q. So you had discussions with Bishop Butler. What were
 5 the nature of your discussions? Was it about cultural
 6 change, was it about changing practice and procedure?
 7 You must have gone in there with an agenda. What was
 8 that agenda and was it fulfilled?

9 A. So there were a number of us at that first meeting.
 10 Elizabeth Hall, Paul Butler, David Gamble, Phil Johnson
 11 who was, at that time, really speaking out on the
 12 Chichester experience, MACSAS speaking out of
 13 the general experience of survivors across,
 14 Graham Wilmer from the Lantern Project. It transpired
 15 that there were lots of conversations going on. So we
 16 all met, and David Greenwood, who was also the Stop
 17 Church Child Abuse, one of the leads in that, organising
 18 it.

19 We had two aims: to have an inquiry and to have
 20 mandatory reporting, because we saw that the bishops and
 21 the churches seemed to be incapable of reporting cases
 22 they had received to police. That was the constant
 23 narrative we got from survivors: "We have reported it
 24 and nothing has happened". So it was very focused, the
 25 first conversation. It was focused about persuading --

Page 56

1 I remember it specifically -- persuading the bishop why
 2 it was important to have an inquiry. He said, "But we
 3 already know abuse is bad". I said, "Don't you want to
 4 know how many? Don't you want to know who to support?
 5 Don't you want to know the nature of this?" Of course,
 6 in his mind, it was a done deal: if we accept that it is
 7 bad, let's just fix it. I said, "You can't, without
 8 knowing what the harm was, what the responsibility is,
 9 where it lies". I said, "You can't fix something
 10 without understanding the nature of the issue".
 11 Eventually, Paul Butler became a supporter of
 12 the inquiry.
 13 Q. MACSAS's relationship with the Church of England then
 14 became one that you would meet with them, what, fairly
 15 regularly, occasionally?
 16 A. I was trying to work that out. Well, three-monthly,
 17 six-monthly. It wasn't like every day, every week, it
 18 was as and when. So it would be between three and six
 19 months. Three times a year, maybe. Each time, things
 20 would shift a bit and the conversation opened up more.
 21 In the end, the conversation in the Church of England
 22 specifically, notwithstanding Stop Church Child Abuse,
 23 was literally about, how do we get survivors into the
 24 heart of conversations so that we can change things in
 25 the institutions? It was kind of, without talking to

Page 57

1 survivors, you are never going to change the culture of
 2 safeguarding. Just like, without talking to women, you
 3 are never going to affect patriarchy and without talking
 4 to people of other races, you are never going to deal
 5 with racism. You can't deal with it without meeting the
 6 people who are affected by it. We are very clear.
 7 Q. Would you say that the church's response was to allow
 8 that to happen or to -- has it been welcoming and
 9 permitted that, from MACSAS's experience?
 10 A. The Church of England -- so it did two things. I think
 11 it took the survivor who was on the Joint Safeguarding
 12 Board, which is higher, off, but opened up a new
 13 creature called the National Safeguarding Panel. This
 14 was new, 2012/13.
 15 Q. We heard evidence from Mr Johnson who is a member of
 16 that panel?
 17 A. Exactly. So that happened. But it happened as
 18 a consequence of the conversations, I believe.
 19 They also wanted to look at how to respond to
 20 survivors of abuse in the church, and I thought, "Oh, at
 21 last". So we had lots of conversations, some of them
 22 quite heated. We tried to explain that people aren't
 23 going to come into the church and use Responding Well.
 24 They are going to have to have a different thing to help
 25 them. At that point, we began to look at the idea of

Page 58

1 Safe Spaces --
 2 Q. Yes.
 3 A. -- which is still --
 4 Q. I was going to say, Mr Johnson gave us some evidence
 5 about the pilot Safe Spaces Project. I understand he
 6 said in his evidence that around 2014/15 there was
 7 a suggestion -- I don't know whether it came from you or
 8 came from the church -- that there should be kind of
 9 a national telephone helpline for victims and survivors
 10 of church abuse?
 11 A. Yes, among the different ways they thought could be
 12 supported would be this national helpline as well as
 13 regional support organisations. A number of people were
 14 approached to ask if they were interested and a number
 15 of organisations said they were interested. But one of
 16 them was a national helpline, because MACSAS had
 17 a helpline, so it was seen a bit that MACSAS maybe could
 18 offer that because it was this more remote, virtual
 19 engagement.
 20 Q. So what involvement did you have in the Safe Spaces
 21 Project and what involvement does MACSAS continue to
 22 have?
 23 A. We began by trying to help them shape what that would
 24 look like. The idea did come from survivors in
 25 a meeting, in a heated meeting, I must admit, with the

Page 59

1 bishop and the then acting safeguarding adviser,
 2 Jill Sandham, because Elizabeth Hall had been ill for
 3 quite a while.
 4 Q. Yes.
 5 A. So after that meeting, they got back to us and said, "We
 6 get it, we get it", and I thought, "That's great. "We
 7 are now going to have -- we think we get the idea of
 8 Safe Spaces being organisations that really do respond
 9 to survivors in a way that the church at the moment
 10 isn't able to" -- "at the moment isn't able to". They
 11 were his words. So we began to try and put together
 12 something, but the institution kind of grabbed it by the
 13 tail, really, and although survivors went to a number of
 14 conversations, MACSAS and other organisations, which was
 15 aimed at shaping what this would look like, it really
 16 went into the sand at some point due to, I think,
 17 institutional constraints, and requirements, and an
 18 inability to see something new that could be offered.
 19 That was my experience of it.
 20 Q. So is MACSAS currently still then working with the
 21 church on developing the Safe Spaces Project?
 22 A. Trying.
 23 Q. Or what is -- is it something that MACSAS thinks is
 24 a good idea in principle?
 25 A. It remains a good idea in principle. It remains a good

Page 60

<p>1 idea that when a referral is made to the church, someone 2 reports something, that they're immediately offered 3 places beyond the church in order to receive help, that 4 they may consider safe. So that was the whole idea of 5 it. However, it has really not ever materialised into 6 substance. 7 Q. I think the church's evidence is that it's still in 8 evolution? 9 A. It's probably, what do you call it -- what was the 10 thing? -- alluvial swamp somewhere. But yes. It rises 11 up and then it goes back down again. It is deeply 12 frustrating and a number of survivor organisations have 13 given up. MACSAS hasn't yet given up. 14 Q. Can I turn now to "The Stones Cry Out". I thought what 15 we could do is explore what MACSAS's view is as to how 16 current safeguarding practices could be improved by 17 going through those recommendations, looking to see what 18 the church has already done, what's still outstanding 19 from MACSAS's perspective. I know the church is 20 perfectly entitled to disagree and say it might have 21 done it? 22 A. Yes, of course. 23 Q. And if there is anything else -- if I could just 24 identify, you also set out, from paragraph 38 onwards of 25 your witness statement, various recommendations?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 61</p>	<p>1 go to the law and say, "There's been a criminal 2 offence" -- at the moment, anything to do with someone 3 over the age of 18 is considered consensual, an affair, 4 and blurring of the boundaries. 5 Q. Bearing in mind that we are dealing with children, so we 6 are only the under 18s, as far as this situation is 7 concerned, but it might affect the 16 to 18 -- 8 A. It would, yes, that blurring. 9 Q. Obviously, the age of consent is 16 for both -- 10 A. So the blurring between the children's legislation and 11 criminal legislation would actually be engaged on that 12 as well, and we saw this -- we have seen it in 13 Chichester, where there has been a blurring of ages of 14 victims, to the detriment, I think, of the survivors. 15 Q. So that is still outstanding. That is not anything that 16 the church in and of itself can, however, do. That is 17 something which parliament would have to determine? 18 A. But I would say that when the legislation was put in 19 place, they specifically lobbied to keep the clergy out 20 of it when it was originally -- when that legislation 21 was originally done, and Elizabeth Hall was able to give 22 evidence to that. She said it was actually specifically 23 omitted on the request of the churches. So in a way, 24 they do have some say in it. 25 Q. Recommendation 3:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 63</p>
<p>1 A. Yes. 2 Q. That's what I really want to do now. I think we can 3 pass over 167 and 168, because you're currently sitting 4 in the middle of it. The second recommendation you 5 make, which in fact you are not the only person who has 6 identified this. In fact, Elizabeth Hall in her 7 evidence also identifies this as a potential issue, that 8 at the moment the sexual offences legislation, the 9 breach of trust, because there is currently -- this is 10 really for the purposes of the public rather than the 11 chair and panel who know this very well. There is 12 currently a specific sexual offence of sexual offending 13 against individuals over the age of consent where there 14 is a breach of trust. Now that doesn't, at the moment, 15 include clergy and religious roles. It's been amended 16 or I think there is an intention to amend it to include 17 sports clubs, in the light of -- 18 A. Exactly. 19 Q. -- the revelations which have happened. So 20 recommendation 2 is obviously to extend that definition 21 to include clergy and religious roles. What difference 22 do you think that would practically make? 23 A. It would provide a mechanism by which those abused over 24 the page of 18, let's say, would be able to refer to the 25 law when they bring these allegations. They can either</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 62</p>	<p>1 "All diocesan and religious order ..." 2 This is page 170, if I can take you to that. 3 Happily, all the recommendations are in bold: 4 "All diocesan and religious order safeguarding 5 advisers/commissioners should be professionals within 6 the field of child protection/safeguarding. They should 7 also be independent of the church/religious order; they 8 should neither be a cleric or a member of religious 9 order, nor related to a cleric or a member of 10 a religious order." 11 Now, within the Church of England, I think there are 12 diocesan safeguarding advisory regulations from 2016 13 which introduce both the need for impartiality and 14 neutrality and also the need for appropriate 15 professional guidance? 16 A. This is true. It's not quite gone as far as we wanted 17 because -- well, the Church of England's head of 18 safeguarding is now -- when it was Pearl Luxon, she was 19 a minister. Janet Hind was the wife of a bishop. There 20 were big problems. What we saw here, and I think what 21 we got at, and I think you're right, what we got at was 22 the fact that, if there is a conflict of interest -- 23 I just kept thinking about, in law, you shouldn't be 24 able to sit on a panel to judge your husband's friend. 25 You probably would have to recuse yourself. So we saw</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 64</p>

1 **that the issue wasn't -- hearsays could be conflicted.**
 2 **So this was an attempt -- I think it has been now set in**
 3 **legislation. That was the issue.**
 4 Q. So recommendation 4, which is on the top of the next
 5 page, page 171, or 178 of the ACE number:
 6 "Diocesan and religious order authorities and
 7 safeguarding advisers/commissioners should take
 8 effective actions in response to all credible
 9 allegations ..."
 10 Now, you simply say "effective action". Within your
 11 witness statement, you identify that MACSAS's position
 12 is that of mandatory reporting?
 13 **A. Yes. Well --**
 14 Q. What do you mean by "mandatory reporting"? I think we
 15 have to be quite clear about -- who are you saying
 16 should be doing the reporting to whom and what sanction
 17 should there be? I'm solely talking about within the
 18 context of the church?
 19 **A. Sanction? Who knows? I mean, that's going to take an**
 20 **inquiry to find that out. Oh, yeah, it's an inquiry**
 21 **here. But what we are saying by mandatory reporting,**
 22 **and I really do -- I helped support the setup of**
 23 **the Mandate Now campaign. If an allegation is brought**
 24 **or if you suspect or if you are aware of -- you know,**
 25 **all these things have happened in the church and no-one**

Page 65

1 **has done anything, that it is reported -- if it is up**
 2 **through the chain of your diocese, fine. If it goes to**
 3 **the DSA under your regulations, fine. But that it**
 4 **doesn't stay within the diocese. It is reported to an**
 5 **external agency. It's reported often to the police, if**
 6 **the person is alive, and in such a state that that would**
 7 **be effective. And/or to the social services and/or the**
 8 **LADO and/or the RSCB. You know, LADO would be more for**
 9 **schools, I think.**
 10 **But it is reported out, so that people can get**
 11 **a better view of it from beyond the confines of**
 12 **the institution. That's what we mean.**
 13 Q. I want to come back and ask you some more questions
 14 about that, but I'm conscious that we have been sitting
 15 since 10.00 am. I don't know whether, chair, this may
 16 be a convenient moment for a break?
 17 THE CHAIR: Yes, we will take our break now, Ms Scolding,
 18 and return at 11.45 am.
 19 MS SCOLDING: Don't forget, Ms Lawrence, you are under oath.
 20 **A. Don't chat to anyone.**
 21 MS SCOLDING: Yes.
 22 (11.33 am)
 23 (A short break)
 24 (11.48 am)
 25 MS SCOLDING: Ms Lawrence, I just wanted to explore the

Page 66

1 issue of mandatory reporting and ask you a few further
 2 questions about its context within the church. You said
 3 that it would be the responsibility simply of clergy as
 4 office holders, or anyone?
 5 **A. Anyone.**
 6 Q. How could that be enforced, practically?
 7 **A. Normally, when someone reports, they report to someone.**
 8 **Also, normally, where there is a suspicion, it's made by**
 9 **someone who is in the environment. So my thing is that**
 10 **they need to report it forward. When you're talking**
 11 **about members of the congregation, that is much harder**
 12 **to enforce. Mandate Now and mandatory reporting has**
 13 **never asked for the general public to do it. So it is**
 14 **effectively some kind of office holder within the church**
 15 **who is either on the PCC, a member of -- a reader in the**
 16 **church, a member of the clergy, a safeguarding adviser,**
 17 **the church safeguarding officer. These people need to**
 18 **report it forward. They're there for a reason. They**
 19 **all fall under the general safeguarding remit of**
 20 **the duty of care owed in the church. So we would say**
 21 **those who have that duty need to use that duty**
 22 **effectively.**
 23 Q. Can I ask, you said "if there is a suspicion". One of
 24 the difficulties is working out the threshold,
 25 practically, for that, because the concern, as has been

Page 67

1 identified most recently in the response that the
 2 Department of Education gave on Monday, to the issue of
 3 mandatory reporting more generally was that there would
 4 be a needle in a haystack effect. Do you not run the
 5 risk of that in this context?
 6 **A. Well, as I say, this would need a proper and full study**
 7 **done on it; okay? What we have seen from other**
 8 **countries -- 83 per cent of other countries in the world**
 9 **who have mandatory reporting -- is that that isn't**
 10 **actually the issue. It is not the issue in Ireland**
 11 **where they have mandatory reporting now, in Northern**
 12 **Ireland. The issue there is the resources required to**
 13 **meet the number of allegations coming forward.**
 14 **There is no increase in unsubstantiated allegations.**
 15 **There is a proportionate number of them, but in terms of**
 16 **the -- the statistic doesn't change. So if it is**
 17 **12 or 15 or 4 or 5 per cent, it's remained the same**
 18 **before and after. So I don't think it is what we think**
 19 **it is. I think we have to be very clever in determining**
 20 **that in mandatory reporting we need to define who is**
 21 **going to report it upwards absolutely clearly, and the**
 22 **church -- it is not beyond their ken to work out that**
 23 **chain: who has a duty of care within the church, from**
 24 **the PCC upwards, who has that duty of care? But also**
 25 **that what you are reporting is, if you think, believe,**

Page 68

1 that something is wrong, you need to report it up,
 2 because, as you go up the chain in the church, it may be
 3 "No, he's just got a tic or something". That's not
 4 actually a safeguarding issue. You can begin to see how
 5 these things will work out where it isn't actually an
 6 issue, people are just worried. From where it is an
 7 issue, and as you keep going up, if the concern keeps
 8 remaining, its should be out at the police.
 9 Certainly if someone reports something, there is no
 10 problem. We are not here to be detectives, inspectors,
 11 people that analyse evidence. What we are saying is,
 12 "There's a concern here, I would like it to go out now.
 13 It needs to go out". It is not discretionary. If you
 14 make it mandatory, then it says: if you have that
 15 concern, report it. It is exactly what the Department
 16 for Education is saying on its website.
 17 Q. What the church would say is, they don't have mandatory
 18 reporting, but they do have the bishops' guidance which
 19 identifies that allegations must be reported up the
 20 chain in the way that you describe and that it is
 21 a disciplinary offence to fail to have due regard to
 22 that?
 23 A. Well --
 24 Q. Now, as two lawyers, we could have a discussion about
 25 due regard, but let's leave that to one side. So they

Page 69

1 would say, we might not have something that calls itself
 2 mandatory reporting, but in effect, we have something
 3 which is very similar which we have just brought into
 4 operation?
 5 A. But we know -- because that's been in teaching for
 6 decades, or for years. We know that that isn't
 7 effective. It can be effective, it can be, and this is
 8 where we come back to individuals with the moral courage
 9 to see something, say something and do something, will
 10 always use the guidance as a way of saying, "No, I must
 11 do this", but we have seen it time and again fail. We
 12 told the church this, MACSAS. This is exactly the same
 13 model we have in other institutions which are subject to
 14 inquiry, this inquiry, that it requires individuals to
 15 have the moral courage and strength to stand up to the
 16 institutional dynamics that would rather, in this case,
 17 they didn't say something. So in this case, this
 18 "wonderful, blessed, saintly man", Peter Ball -- that
 19 was the description -- "In this case, we don't need to
 20 say anything else because, apart from this small
 21 aberration, he is fine". That will continue to apply
 22 regardless of these guidelines and it depends who is
 23 responding.
 24 Now, if we are relying on brave people, about
 25 10 per cent they reckon, statistically, would respond

Page 70

1 courageously and into a situation. We call them
 2 whistleblowers at the moment. They would be
 3 whistleblowers still under this guise.
 4 The only way we can effectively put into place the
 5 disciplinary measures set down in that is, once it has
 6 been shown that it was a failure of that person to
 7 report that delayed whatever justice comes next.
 8 In the North Somerset case, with Nigel Platt, it
 9 took 10 years, 30 victims, and the head teacher was
 10 finally sacked and had his licence -- had his right to
 11 be a teacher removed. That was after 30 children were
 12 abused and after a prosecution. So when will this
 13 disciplinary measure take place? How will we know it's
 14 effective? Who going to find out that the bishop, the
 15 DSA, the parish priest, didn't report? How is that
 16 going to be determined, except in a court of law when
 17 a victim has finally been vindicated by a process which
 18 allows it? We have no independent process for assessing
 19 the allegations coming forward. So a bishop could quite
 20 rightly say, or the person could quite rightly say,
 21 "I didn't think it was credible or substantiated and
 22 there's never been any finding".
 23 Q. If we can come on to that, in terms of the way that any
 24 disciplinary process can work, but what you were saying
 25 earlier on in the first half of your evidence, so to

Page 71

1 speak, there were lots of things about people not
 2 reporting, et cetera, et cetera. Isn't that an
 3 educative issue, because we heard yesterday and we heard
 4 today, and as a society we have learned quite a lot
 5 about grooming, for example, in the past five years. So
 6 lots of things that people would think may be a bit odd
 7 but not odd enough to be suspicious, people would now
 8 definitely, I suspect, think, "Yes, that's a problem.
 9 I need to talk to somebody about that. I'm not very
 10 happy about that". That has come about largely as
 11 a result of an educative process rather than the
 12 imposition of any kind of mandatory duty.
 13 One could -- some people may -- say that the way
 14 forward would be a greater level of consciousness
 15 raising within the context of the church itself?
 16 A. Let me take that in two parts. I do agree we should do
 17 everything we can to educate members of
 18 the congregation. I do feel there is a huge resistance,
 19 even when we do educate members of the congregation, to
 20 believe their priest or any person or any religious
 21 person could possibly cause harm. That persists. It
 22 persists not because people are stupid, because this is
 23 what the government is saying, "People are just stupid
 24 and, when we give them the information, they will be
 25 clever", it persists because this is not rational. The

Page 72

<p>1 abuse of power is deeply relational, and the engagement 2 with it is deeply relational. So when we put in place 3 education processes which say, "Well, look, these are 4 the signs. This is what abuse is" -- we all get that. 5 Forever, we have had, "This is what sexual abuse is, 6 this is what physical abuse is". We can list off the 7 abuses forever. As if, somehow, once they can see it, 8 they will do something about it. It is a deeply 9 relational thing. It is utterly destructive 10 relationally. It is at the relational level that you 11 will never get any guidance to work because we are 12 talking about relationships, not rational things. The 13 relational nature cuts across all this in a very -- we 14 have seen it -- I have seen good people do the wrong 15 thing, utterly wrong thing, in the face of an allegation 16 that shatters their family or their community or their 17 church building. We have seen in court cases where, 18 even though the person has pleaded guilty, even though 19 it is obvious that so many -- the whole community is 20 shattered along relational lines where people say, 21 "I cannot believe it's happened", in the face of 22 the evidence. 23 If this is true where it's obviously happened, we 24 have come to the conclusion that it is going to be true 25 when we have these undecided cases, where we still get</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 73</p>	<p>1 in the church. 2 What I'm saying is, it's true anyway. Nothing we 3 can say about education is going to change our 4 relational natures. We can't educate relational nature. 5 But what can shift it is, if you put a moral onus on 6 them to say, "Are you a professional? Are you 7 a person -- an office holder in our church? Then you 8 must report any suspicion". They'll say, "Well, what 9 kind of suspicion?". "Do you think there is an issue?" 10 "Yes". "Report it". It is not your job or your 11 responsibility to find out what happens next. Your 12 responsibility is to report it and to let other people 13 take this on. 14 Q. Can we move on to recommendation 5, ACE005487_178. 15 Bottom of the same page: 16 "The victim of alleged sexual abuse should be 17 informed of the procedures that will be engaged with 18 when they report the abuse and should be kept informed 19 of all steps ... a support person should be provided for 20 the victim who is not otherwise involved in the 21 investigation ..." 22 Now, I understand that there have been some 23 developments in some dioceses -- in fact, we have some 24 written evidence from someone called Ms Marks-Good, who 25 played the independent support person role in the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 75</p>
<p>1 bishops in all the churches stating in public that if an 2 allegation has not been proven in a court of law, it is 3 a false allegation. That's the dynamic we have to 4 engage with. This is relational. It is not rational. 5 So all the education on the planet has so far, in 6 25 years, not dented the prevalence of child abuse in 7 this country, at all. Plus ca change, plus c'est la 8 meme chose, everything has stayed the same. NSPCC 9 statistics time and again have shown that the same 10 number and types and vulnerabilities of children are 11 exploited. That hasn't changed. It's got worse because 12 we have got the internet now, but it hasn't actually 13 shifted in any of the perceptible measures that we could 14 possibly assess. That's 25 years of education. Schools 15 are doing the same things wrong today as they did 16 10 years ago, as they did 20 years ago, as they did 17 30 years ago. Not because teachers don't talk in the 18 staff room. They do talk in the staff room. They did 19 in the case of the child that was killed by his mother, 20 starved to death. They talked in the staff room. They 21 didn't report it. Because the mother was an overbearing 22 woman who threatened them and they're relational people, 23 we are all relational, and said, "We had better not say 24 anything", and the child died. You're going, well, if 25 this is true -- if this is true over there, it is true</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 74</p>	<p>1 context of the Diocese of Chichester, but that is not, 2 as I understand it, in every diocese, as yet. Is that 3 something that MACSAS thinks is a good thing? 4 A. Absolutely. The amount of effort put in place -- and 5 I'm sure Phil Johnson took you there, I haven't heard 6 his evidence at all. The amount of effort MACSAS, 7 through Phil Johnson, put in place to try and get Gemma 8 involved in Chichester -- this is after this, of course. 9 This was a few years later. We had the Rideout case 10 which was, at the time, utterly destructive for people 11 that were coming forward. We had the Peter Ball case 12 which obviously led to the death of Neil Todd directly 13 because of the investigation process. I mean, we 14 couldn't have foreseen it, it was like Frances Andrade, 15 but there it was. We kept saying, you must support. Of 16 course, what happened in Chichester before Gemma came 17 in, and thank God, but what happened in Chichester was 18 that they would put some stuff in place -- Colin Perkins 19 said, "Okay, I get it, we will put something in place", 20 and then, because the investigation went on and on, they 21 went, "Oh, we're withdrawing it now". "But this is -- 22 we haven't resolved the case". They said, "Well, that's 23 not our fault, we were only going to give you six 24 months". So the pressure to put back in place -- so 25 when Gemma came in, at least there seemed to be</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 76</p>

<p>1 a joined-up thinking in Chichester that said, this 2 person will ensure – I don't know how effective that 3 was in the end because there were so many cases by the 4 time I left, hundreds of cases, hundreds of victims, 5 ensure that there was some continuity of support. 6 Now, it is the continuity of support as well as the 7 quality of support. So there is no point having 8 brilliant, brilliant support in place and then saying, 9 "Oh, look, that police investigation is going on, we 10 haven't got any more money for you". That's utterly 11 destructive to survivors because they are going, "But, 12 I mean, you know, how am I going to cope without you?" 13 If the case wasn't brought against someone, some of 14 the girls involved in the Rideout case, women, were left 15 with nothing because the case wasn't brought forward. 16 I know you may hear evidence on that from someone. But 17 it's shocking. So Chichester really for us was 18 a benchmark that said, "We have heard this all before 19 and here it is in one place, the horror of what will 20 happen: self-harming, all kinds of problems". It is not 21 everywhere I have seen other places, other dioceses, in 22 recent times where nothing was offered, and yet the same 23 trauma is being lived out for the people coming forward. 24 The church gets it at the top, gets it at one level, but 25 it is not filtering into – because bishops really have</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 77</p>	<p>1 is going to be at any further danger, then it's 2 absolutely imperative that there is an independent 3 determination, and whether that person continues to pose 4 a risk. 5 Q. I think that's recommendation 9. 6 A. So here the problem is – and the problem remains -- 7 I know Justin Welby will tell you that he gets this, 8 because he's said this in synod in 2012, I think, when 9 we went up there, and he said exactly this, that the 10 standard of proof is not the standard in criminal 11 courts, we have a duty of care which requires 12 a different standard of proof, requires a balance of 13 probability. But that isn't in the mind of people. 14 I have heard cases now -- now, in all the 15 churches -- where people are saying, if the person 16 wasn't prosecuted, there is another innocent man whose 17 life was tarnished by unfounded allegations. Well, this 18 still persists. Even though Justin Welby and the 19 national safeguarding team and Graham Tilby understands 20 it, it's not actually filtering down because, at the 21 practical level on the ground, we have to deal with the 22 reality, and the reality in churches is that what 23 happens when a man who is dragged through the press and 24 is then found not guilty by a court of law or not 25 prosecuted, which is even worse, they say, "Oh, well, it</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 79</p>
<p>1 the ultimate control over what happens in their diocese 2 and it is their discretionary fund that is used. There 3 is no central fund that says, "Here is 100 million for 4 supporting the victims of abuse in the 5 Church of England". There might be a nominal figure to 6 that. But actually, it has to come through the bishops' 7 discretionary fund by the look of it. And so the 8 bishops can discretionarily say, "No", or they can say, 9 "Yes", and that's not good enough, I don't think. 10 Q. Turning to recommendation 6: 11 "Diocesan and religious order ... and safeguarding 12 advisers/commissioners [page 179] should neither rely 13 upon the procedures and outcomes of the criminal justice 14 system nor the criminal standard of proof ..." 15 I think within the Church of England, anyway, it is 16 the balance of probabilities in respect of that: 17 "... to determine the nature and extent of 18 the actions ..." 19 One of the difficulties that Bishop John gave his 20 evidence about yesterday was how far the church should 21 carry out internal investigations if criminal 22 prosecutions don't take place, or if disciplinary 23 measures aren't practicable or effective. I mean, what 24 does MACSAS think should happen in those sorts of cases? 25 A. If we start with the idea of ensuring that no-one else</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 78</p>	<p>1 mustn't have been true then", and the communications 2 distort in the church so you don't get a fair reflection 3 of what's happening, you don't get a sense of -- 4 Q. So your view would be, therefore, that there should be 5 risk of mandatory risk assessments, in effect. I mean, 6 the church would say -- but we do have, again, they 7 amended their regulations in 2016 to introduce, in 8 effect, if the bishop considers, then the clergy have to 9 undertake a mandatory risk assessment. So is your view 10 that those regulations have addressed the particular 11 problem that you identified within the answer you have 12 just given? 13 A. No, because it's still discretionary. Until we are 14 certainly guaranteed that bishops actually are able to 15 see that even their best friend who they went to 16 seminary with, who has not been found guilty by a court, 17 who has not been prosecuted, even your best friend needs 18 to have a risk assessment because an allegation has been 19 made against them, it is really very difficult. Unless 20 it is written in, "It must happen", then we will 21 always -- and I say "always" -- going to have cases 22 where it doesn't happen where it should have happened. 23 Now, we might have to live with that reality. I get 24 this, and the panel has to be real and this tribunal has 25 to be real, but we must at least start by making very</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 80</p>

<p>1 clear that the institution understands the nature of</p> <p>2 what's happened here, and the nature of that is not --</p> <p>3 it is not always to do with people intentionally,</p> <p>4 wilfully wanting to affect the -- you know, distort</p> <p>5 everything. It is that when it comes to the</p> <p>6 nitty-gritty on the ground, the messiness of what we</p> <p>7 face -- and it is messy -- has to be engaged with</p> <p>8 institutionally or else we are just going to have</p> <p>9 well-meaning, well-intentioned procedures, as they</p> <p>10 undoubtedly were, that prove ineffective when push comes</p> <p>11 to shove, and we will still get these cases coming up.</p> <p>12 At least if they state they understand that in their</p> <p>13 procedures, we might see that that lessens considerably.</p> <p>14 At the moment, there is no reason why it should.</p> <p>15 Q. Can we come on to recommendation 7, if possible,</p> <p>16 recommendations 7 and 8:</p> <p>17 "... should be suspended from ministry immediately</p> <p>18 an allegation is made."</p> <p>19 Again, there have been amendments subsequent to the</p> <p>20 publication "The Stones Cry Out". So there is now the</p> <p>21 power to suspend?</p> <p>22 A. There was always the power to suspend, and in some cases</p> <p>23 that was always exercised by some people always</p> <p>24 sometimes, and that's the nature -- I think they</p> <p>25 strengthen the power, but it is discretionary, of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 81</p>	<p>1 a minority form of worship?</p> <p>2 A. The problem is, because we have this -- remember, it is</p> <p>3 an act of imagination, the confessional thing is just</p> <p>4 something that the church has instituted. Because we</p> <p>5 have this, and it absolutely can't be touched -- so</p> <p>6 anyone who has spoken to their bishop -- Robert Coles</p> <p>7 speaking to Wallace Benn -- telling them about what</p> <p>8 happened, around the kitchen table. If that happens,</p> <p>9 when is that confessional not a confession? I have seen</p> <p>10 time and again examples from MACSAS where people were</p> <p>11 knowingly talking over the kitchen table with the bishop</p> <p>12 where the bishop has then said to the police, "I cannot</p> <p>13 tell you this because it is under the seal of</p> <p>14 the confessional".</p> <p>15 Now, it doesn't have to be in a box, you see,</p> <p>16 anymore, because they have gotten rid of boxes in the</p> <p>17 churches, but it can be at the kitchen table, and it</p> <p>18 depends on the interpretation of the people in that room</p> <p>19 at that space.</p> <p>20 Q. Well, that's the evidence -- the evidence that</p> <p>21 Bishop John gave us was that people say it is</p> <p>22 confessional over the kitchen table, but it isn't</p> <p>23 because the sacrament of confession is only when you are</p> <p>24 appropriately robed, you have advertised the period, you</p> <p>25 have said that this is the express purpose. Otherwise,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 83</p>
<p>1 course. I don't get that.</p> <p>2 Q. So you think that it should be mandatory?</p> <p>3 A. Well, MACSAS thinks it should be mandatory.</p> <p>4 Q. Not you, MACSAS?</p> <p>5 A. I do personally think that, but MACSAS certainly does</p> <p>6 think it should be mandatory.</p> <p>7 Q. "Diocesan/religious authorities should disclose all</p> <p>8 information ..."</p> <p>9 This I think is a variation of recommendation 6 in</p> <p>10 a way, isn't it?</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. We have already dealt with that. Risk assessments,</p> <p>13 I think we have dealt with that, that's</p> <p>14 recommendation 9.</p> <p>15 Let's move on to recommendation 10, which is the</p> <p>16 seal of the confessional.</p> <p>17 Now, I know that this is written as an all-church</p> <p>18 issue. We heard from Bishop John yesterday that the</p> <p>19 sacrament of confession is practised not only -- or most</p> <p>20 usually within the Anglo Catholic community within the</p> <p>21 Anglican Church and, therefore, for significant numbers</p> <p>22 of communicant members of the Church of England,</p> <p>23 confession is not -- the sacrament of confession, which</p> <p>24 is the only circumstance, Bishop John tells us, where</p> <p>25 the seal of the confessional applies, really is</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 82</p>	<p>1 it is confessional, but not the seal of the confession.</p> <p>2 A. Chaos. Chaos. Anywhere where there is doubt and</p> <p>3 a blurring of boundaries in child abuse cases,</p> <p>4 specifically, that is where you are going to get a coach</p> <p>5 and horses running through it. The problem with the</p> <p>6 church -- it is true across churches, we have even had</p> <p>7 it in the Methodist Church, we don't have confessionals,</p> <p>8 but, there you are, it was a confession made to someone,</p> <p>9 and they're going, "Okay, now we have chaos let loose</p> <p>10 because the people are being put under that obligation</p> <p>11 somehow, and who is to determine what happened in the</p> <p>12 conversation?" Any bishop could say, "Well, it was</p> <p>13 still in the confessional, can't say anything". Any</p> <p>14 member of clergy could say, "You can't say anything</p> <p>15 because I was confessing to you". Where do we stand</p> <p>16 then? What can the police do? They can't intervene.</p> <p>17 Because the church, these two people who form the church</p> <p>18 in that moment have said, "Sorry, we can't tell you</p> <p>19 anything". That doesn't help at all in this situation.</p> <p>20 By defining it as something sacred with a tassel</p> <p>21 around your neck and all kinds of things isn't actually</p> <p>22 helping us because, actually, confession isn't that.</p> <p>23 The seal of confession is, if someone truly believes</p> <p>24 they are telling someone who can absolve them of sin in</p> <p>25 God's name that they have committed an offence. It</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 84</p>

1 **certainly cannot be seen -- you can't see it. It is**
 2 **a relational -- it is relational.**
 3 Q. Recommendation 11:
 4 "All credible allegations of child sexual abuse
 5 should be reported to the Independent Safeguarding
 6 Authority ..."
 7 **A. They are not there anymore.**
 8 Q. They don't exist anymore, but obviously --
 9 **A. Whatever creature.**
 10 Q. -- they should be referred to the appropriate vetting
 11 and barring service, the DBS, which currently does that.
 12 I'm not sure we need to trouble further about that.
 13 **A. No.**
 14 Q. "Where a priest ... or other church official has been
 15 convicted of sexual offences ..." they should not be
 16 allowed to continue in ministry, in effect, and they
 17 should be permanently removed from such?
 18 **A. We had the past case review to indicate, even in its 13**
 19 **cases, that all 13 cases were still in ministry**
 20 **notwithstanding allegation -- we have Chichester to show**
 21 **that people were in ministry and notwithstanding --**
 22 Q. By "ministry" you include permission to officiate?
 23 **A. Yes.**
 24 Q. So the retired clergy's licence?
 25 **A. Because, actually, members of the public don't**

Page 85

1 **distinguish at all or in any way.**
 2 Q. Recommendation 13, "Must keep written records". Again,
 3 I think what the church would say, we have clear
 4 guidance now about that -- I think they issued guidance
 5 in 2015 about safeguarding and keeping records in
 6 particular and the bishop's guidance identifies that.
 7 That's a routine problem across all institutions, isn't
 8 it?
 9 **A. Yes, it is.**
 10 Q. That's not a church -- that's just everybody should keep
 11 good written records. Most of the time people do, but
 12 usually at the time of greatest crisis you forget?
 13 **A. But what we were trying to get at was that the DPA, that**
 14 **wonderful, benign piece of legislation that was meant to**
 15 **help us all, was being used to fillet the files. We**
 16 **kept seeing burning files and smoking embers left over**
 17 **and, you know, shredding machines full and people coming**
 18 **in with them and saying, "What do you mean there is**
 19 **nothing on the files?" This wasn't just in Chichester,**
 20 **this was everywhere, in Catholic Church,**
 21 **Anglican Church, it didn't matter where you went, there**
 22 **were examples of it. They used the DPA to say, "We are**
 23 **not allowed to hold on to any stuff where things could**
 24 **be incriminating", I suppose, "that haven't been proved"**
 25 **or something, and it was all blurry. It was used to**

Page 86

1 **destroy evidence.**
 2 **Now, we don't know how much was destroyed because it**
 3 **was a practice, but we kept getting told it was to do**
 4 **with the DPA. So one of the things I was trying to say**
 5 **in there was, keep the records. What's the DPA got to**
 6 **do with it, really? That wasn't articulated there but**
 7 **we did say that in other situations: why would DPA stop**
 8 **you keeping records of a safeguarding nature?**
 9 Q. I think possibly since recommendation 13 there's been
 10 some more governmental guidance about record keeping and
 11 information sharing anyway --
 12 **A. There has.**
 13 Q. -- which applies across the board and Working Together
 14 is certainly clear about the need, within any
 15 institution, both to keep that and also to pass the
 16 information on, which brings us neatly on to
 17 recommendation 14, which is about -- I think they are
 18 called parish safeguarding officers -- I'm sure I'll be
 19 corrected if I'm wrong -- should be informed of anyone
 20 who has recorded allegations and the outcome of any risk
 21 assessments?
 22 **A. Yes, because that wasn't happening.**
 23 Q. Right.
 24 **A. I'm not 100 per cent sure it's happening now. It was**
 25 **kind of a "need to know" basis. At best practice it was**

Page 87

1 **"need to know" and the fewer people who knew the better.**
 2 **That's the kind of wisdom thinking. But the idea that**
 3 **it was at the church level that you had to safeguard the**
 4 **child from the person who had these allegations didn't**
 5 **seem to be filtering right down to, where is this**
 6 **practically effective? It is effective where people**
 7 **know.**
 8 Q. Because, for example, there are -- and we have seen
 9 examples already of safeguarding agreements having been
 10 put in place which say, "You have to sit in this row"
 11 and we understand from the evidence that Bishop John
 12 gave yesterday that in fact there is somebody -- I can't
 13 remember the name of the individual -- whose job it is
 14 to tell you where to sit in church and in fact
 15 apparently has the power to say, "You have to sit in
 16 this row, or you can't sit in this row, or we can eject
 17 you".
 18 **A. Yes.**
 19 Q. That's more a case, again, of enforcing the practice
 20 which the church already has?
 21 **A. Yes.**
 22 Q. So, again, that's about practical enforcement rather
 23 than necessarily a change in legislation or a change in
 24 practice?
 25 **A. Well, it is about communication -- sharing information.**

Page 88

<p>1 Q. It is about information sharing?</p> <p>2 A. And that "need to know" doesn't stop at the top. It is</p> <p>3 not that the bishop needs to know -- certainly the</p> <p>4 bishop should know.</p> <p>5 Q. Yes.</p> <p>6 A. But there are people that, for the practical purposes of</p> <p>7 safeguarding, would need to know.</p> <p>8 Q. It is probably more important that the parish</p> <p>9 safeguarding officer knows than the bishop knows, some</p> <p>10 people may say, in terms of practically setting up an</p> <p>11 arrangement whereby those individuals can still profess</p> <p>12 their faith without causing risk to children?</p> <p>13 A. We did have members of church -- people on PCCs did</p> <p>14 contact MACSAS to say they didn't know anything about</p> <p>15 certain situations that were coming up in the press and</p> <p>16 we found that shocking.</p> <p>17 Q. Recommendation 15:</p> <p>18 "National safeguarding adviser ... should collate</p> <p>19 a record of all allegations ..."</p> <p>20 In other words, there should be a sort of central</p> <p>21 audit trail so that those are recommended. Now, I can't</p> <p>22 entirely remember whether that's been done or not.</p> <p>23 I think a national case management system is being</p> <p>24 trialled which will then enable that to take place?</p> <p>25 A. Yes.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 89</p>	<p>1 a diocesan level?</p> <p>2 A. Well, that was part of that conversation that came out</p> <p>3 of -- in this thing, because that was what we were</p> <p>4 seeing, if it went above the diocese and the bishops and</p> <p>5 the institution and went above those dynamics that</p> <p>6 stopped, then we could see -- of course, Elizabeth Hall</p> <p>7 already told me she had no information. I thought that</p> <p>8 was a shocking gap.</p> <p>9 Q. So your view would be, or MACSAS's view would be,</p> <p>10 rather, that if there is to be internal safeguarding</p> <p>11 rather than what you in your witness statement</p> <p>12 identified, which in effect is some kind of national</p> <p>13 safeguarding body which would, I think, supervise or</p> <p>14 monitor all institutions, if there needed to be</p> <p>15 strengthening internally in terms of the church putting</p> <p>16 its own house in order, MACSAS's preference would be</p> <p>17 a national system rather than a diocesan system?</p> <p>18 A. Yes, and that would --</p> <p>19 Q. Is that for consistency reasons?</p> <p>20 A. If each church had that, then you could indeed have the</p> <p>21 national overarching institutional thing, because you'd</p> <p>22 have these bodies working above their institutional</p> <p>23 levels that could talk into each other. At the moment,</p> <p>24 they can't.</p> <p>25 Q. The disadvantage of that, however, isn't it,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 91</p>
<p>1 Q. But as yet, I don't think the processes are in place.</p> <p>2 I think some parishes have undertaken audits, but again,</p> <p>3 that is parish related. So you would like the collation</p> <p>4 of all evidence on a national level?</p> <p>5 A. Yes, and for that, I think there was something happening</p> <p>6 in the Catholic Church when COPCA was there, where they</p> <p>7 did collate all this evidence and put them into reports</p> <p>8 annually for transparency purposes, all anonymised and</p> <p>9 everything. It was partial -- that's why I put that in</p> <p>10 "The Stones Cry Out", but the idea of an independent</p> <p>11 body/place where this information was -- of course, the</p> <p>12 bishops, when this was first put to them in the</p> <p>13 Church of England, absolutely refused point blank to</p> <p>14 engage in a conversation because they said that would</p> <p>15 take the power from them and their dioceses and place it</p> <p>16 beyond them. So when they explored having a supra</p> <p>17 structure for safeguarding, where the national</p> <p>18 safeguarding adviser sat above and beyond --</p> <p>19 Q. That was one of the recommendations that came out of</p> <p>20 the Cahill Report, which we are not dealing with</p> <p>21 directly within the context of this hearing, but which</p> <p>22 the chair and panel have access to. It is a key report</p> <p>23 that we have asked various institutional members of</p> <p>24 the church about, one of which recommendations was that</p> <p>25 safeguarding should be run at a national rather than</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 90</p>	<p>1 Ms Lawrence, that you then have people who are not</p> <p>2 taking ownership -- sorry to use management speak -- of</p> <p>3 safeguarding so it becomes somebody else's problem?</p> <p>4 A. No, and it's not, because if the system is a creature of</p> <p>5 the institution and if the bishops have to agree this,</p> <p>6 the structure of the Church of England is it would have</p> <p>7 to have --</p> <p>8 Q. The synod would have to agree this?</p> <p>9 A. Yes, and the House of Bishops are in it, and if you</p> <p>10 don't get two-thirds of the House of Bishops, you don't</p> <p>11 get anything past anyway. It is a bit like all of them,</p> <p>12 they all have to have a number. So if it were agreed --</p> <p>13 this is what Cumberlege said in the Catholic Church, as</p> <p>14 a side thing, that she put it back to the bishops</p> <p>15 because they didn't take ownership. Well, fine. But it</p> <p>16 was the very bishops that had failed to report and</p> <p>17 respond that were now being given ownership back. It</p> <p>18 stopped any conversation with survivors at all. So in</p> <p>19 the same way, if the institution -- if the</p> <p>20 Church of England had an overarching safeguarding body,</p> <p>21 then they would have something that sits above the</p> <p>22 dynamics that seem to be distorting.</p> <p>23 Q. If there is no -- one of the other difficulties is,</p> <p>24 there is no legislative power at the moment for any</p> <p>25 bishop to be disciplined or, in effect, so the national</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 92</p>

<p>1 safeguarding body would have to have -- canons or 2 measures would have to be passed which in effect 3 permitted them, firstly, to intervene, secondly, to take 4 appropriate steps, because there isn't -- the way that 5 the structure of the church works, having a national 6 safeguarding body in and of itself wouldn't do anything. 7 You would need the legislative changes that came from 8 that in order to make that effective? 9 A. You couldn't just create it, and that's what we really 10 did understand from the conversations. But if someone 11 collated -- so coming back to the recommendation was, 12 who is looking to see what's happening? We have got the 13 SCIE auditing, but is there something that's holding all 14 this information and assuring and assessing and 15 determining to feed back into the bishops and the House 16 of Bishops? We felt that that was far safer and better 17 than the current situation that applied then and 18 possibly still does apply. 19 Q. If we turn over to recommendations 16, 17, 18 and 19 and 20 20, all of these are really to do with non-recent 21 cases -- 22 A. Yes. 23 Q. -- rather than current practices in respect of children. 24 It is practice in respect of adults who come forward and 25 report abuse. Not meaning to minimise the different</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 93</p>	<p>1 is such that it takes around about 20 years to report 2 cases of child abuse, around about, that's the average. 3 So you're looking at this sense of, this is the nature 4 of it. There is no point pretending that we can do it 5 in a day. It is this relational thing. 6 Q. But, again, I think we are clear about the complexities 7 of trying to develop an appropriate situation in respect 8 of the relationship between spiritual adviser and 9 individual, in whatever way you wish to put it. I use 10 that term advisedly, to encompass all sorts of people in 11 positions of power. 12 But, again, are you envisaging that this is every 13 diocese should do this or there should be the sort of 14 non-recent cases bit of the national safeguarding body? 15 A. I think there should be a body that's set up that deals 16 with this independently of the diocese, that's where you 17 put to that -- in Ireland, they had the Redress Board, 18 of course. We looked at that as a kind of option as 19 a model. Now, the Redress Board was writ through with 20 problems, but it did effectively enable and investigate, 21 even where people had died, the abusers were dead. It 22 allowed for people to bring cases to them, balance of 23 probability tests applied, they were able to bring their 24 evidence, they were able to bring supporting evidence 25 and there was a determination made by a group of people,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 95</p>
<p>1 recommendations, but as a whole, it seems to me that 2 what they are trying to say is there need to be specific 3 national processes to deal with non-recent cases where 4 adults come forward. There should be appropriate codes 5 of conduct to deal with that. Clergy needs to have 6 appropriate training in managing those allegations and 7 in recognising the seriousness of them, and they need to 8 be investigated. 9 A. Yes, because over 75 per cent of the allegations that 10 will come in of abuse in the church will come from 11 non-recent allegations. So if you want to deal 12 seriously with the prevalence of abuse, you need to deal 13 seriously with those that report that it's happened. 14 You are not going to impact any change when we all know 15 that most children, when they are abused, do not report. 16 This has been time and again told -- it has been told to 17 this panel until blood pours from the ears that this 18 just doesn't happen. Therefore, how do we take 19 seriously cases, if we are not listening to what 20 happened in the past, because that's the only place from 21 which people can report because of the nature of 22 the trauma? And so what we said is, if you only look at 23 the few per cent that come forward at the time, you are 24 never, ever going to deal with the actual dynamics of 25 abuse that mean one of the actual -- the nature of abuse</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 94</p>	<p>1 a panel -- and there were a number of panels of course 2 in Ireland -- but a panel of people who said, "Right, we 3 have heard this, we see this and we get it". 4 Q. Those people should be independent of the church? It 5 would be like an ombudsman-type service in effect? 6 A. Yes. It is not that they are completely independent, 7 ie, detached so much so that they are not a church 8 institution, but that the people they appoint to that 9 panel are appointed because of their independence, and 10 so, you know, again, it can't be beyond the ken of 11 the church to enable that to happen. Maybe, and one of 12 the things we were thinking about was, should that apply 13 for all churches in the country? But then I thought, 14 getting churches to work with themselves is hard enough 15 without getting them to work with others. So this was 16 just recommending really that there is an independent 17 panel that assesses all cases that are brought of 18 non-recent abuse where the police do not investigate or 19 no other process determines that case for them. 20 Q. I think the difficulty that the church would say is, 21 "Well, that's all well and good, but we are not an 22 institution which is an investigative body. We are not 23 the best people to deal with or manage that situation?" 24 A. That's right, but at the moment they are doing nothing. 25 The problem was, when I wrote this, that's -- yes, "We</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 96</p>

<p>1 are not investigators, I don't want to be Sherlock 2 Holmes in the Church of England, it is hard enough being 3 a bishop", but if they haven't got a mechanism, a set of 4 procedures, by which all cases are referred that aren't 5 either prosecuted or dealt with by any other means to 6 determine -- now, that can be Social Services, it could 7 be anyone, but if there is nothing else and you have 8 this huge number of cases, where are they going to get 9 a determination -- where are the victims going to go and 10 how is the church to understand what's happening in 11 these cases? They don't know. So what we could see was 12 that no-one knows in these cases. They are coming 13 forward, lots of people coming forward with these 14 allegations. Where they are not prosecuted, nothing was 15 happening. We said, that can't be right.</p> <p>16 Q. But that's changed slightly, hasn't it, because you have 17 now got the core group process, which obviously, in the 18 Bishop Bell situation, that was what happened, there was 19 a core group, so there was -- there has been movement 20 within the church in terms of a level of investigative 21 engagement in these sorts of cases?</p> <p>22 A. But they seem to be one-off. George Bell was a huge 23 case. I mean, it's just -- it was -- it shook the 24 church, really, to hear this case. So they had to have 25 something, really, that matched the shock and scandal</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 97</p>	<p>1 Thank you.</p> <p>2 MR ROGER MEEKINGS (affirmed)</p> <p>3 Examination by MS McNEILL</p> <p>4 MS McNEILL: Good afternoon, Mr Meekings. Can you just 5 confirm that you are Mr Roger Meekings?</p> <p>6 A. I am.</p> <p>7 Q. You have produced a witness statement for this inquiry 8 which was dated 9 February 2018 and runs to 25 pages.</p> <p>9 A. Correct.</p> <p>10 Q. When you signed that statement, did you confirm whether 11 or not it was true to the best of your knowledge and 12 belief?</p> <p>13 A. Yes, I did.</p> <p>14 Q. Have you had a chance to review it before your evidence?</p> <p>15 A. I have.</p> <p>16 Q. Chair, the URN for that document is ANG000210. I am 17 going to ask that that be put on the website.</p> <p>18 As with all witnesses -- I don't wish to be 19 repetitive -- we don't propose, therefore, to take you 20 through it line by line, but, as I have explained 21 outside court, to deal with some core issues.</p> <p>22 Chair, before I start asking questions, there is 23 just one matter that I will raise for all core 24 participants. In relation to a meeting of 25 5 November 2009 referred to in Mr Meekings' statement</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 99</p>
<p>1 that it brought on both -- all over the place. We are 2 talking about people -- Reverend Tommy Two Shoes and the 3 choirmaster Who-de-doodly, who no-one cares about really 4 because they have never heard of them. But for the 5 victims, an absolutely profound impact, and in terms of 6 how the church has ever responded, that needs to be 7 determined, but there is no place to determine it unless 8 there is an inquiry. We have had the Moira Gibbs 9 inquiry, we've had the Ian Elliott inquiry. We keep 10 getting these inquiries into individual cases, but there 11 are thousands of cases, most of which are undetermined 12 by anyone.</p> <p>13 MS SCOLDING: Thank you very much, Ms Lawrence. Chair and 14 panel, I don't know whether you have any questions?</p> <p>15 THE CHAIR: No, thank you, Ms Scolding. Thank you very 16 much, Ms Lawrence.</p> <p>17 (The witness withdrew)</p> <p>18 MS SCOLDING: Chair, if I may, I will pass back to 19 Ms McNeill, who will be taking the next witness, which 20 is Mr Roger Meekings.</p> <p>21 MS McNEILL: Chair, I'm entirely in your hands. I have just 22 looked at the time. It is 12.30 pm now. I know we sat 23 early. Would you like me to start with Mr Meekings or 24 take an early lunch? I'm entirely in your hands.</p> <p>25 THE CHAIR: No, I think we will proceed until 1.00 pm.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 98</p>	<p>1 between himself, John Stapleton and Philip Jones -- we 2 heard a little bit of evidence from Philip Jones, you 3 might remember, about this meeting -- Mr Meekings has 4 a handwritten note of this meeting. It is two sides. 5 I have been handed it this morning.</p> <p>6 What I am going to suggest, out of fairness to 7 everybody -- it doesn't really raise new ground -- is, 8 I have had copies made, I will pass them out at the 9 lunch adjournment and I will hold any questions I have 10 in relation to that until the afternoon, if I may. That 11 way, anybody can let me know if it raises anything.</p> <p>12 THE CHAIR: Thank you.</p> <p>13 MS McNEILL: Mr Meekings, it might mean we go slightly out 14 of chronological order, but so you know, we will deal 15 with that after the afternoon break, if that is okay.</p> <p>16 A. Sure.</p> <p>17 Q. Mr Meekings, this panel has heard that from 2008 to 2009 18 you were the independent reviewer appointed by the 19 Diocese of Chichester for the national past cases 20 review; is that correct?</p> <p>21 A. That's correct.</p> <p>22 Q. So we get it correct, you produced three reports in 23 total. You produced a report for the past cases review, 24 a narrative report; yes?</p> <p>25 A. Yes.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 100</p>

25 (Pages 97 to 100)

<p>1 Q. You produced an addendum, a short addendum, to that 2 report -- 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. -- into Roy Cotton and Colin Pritchard? 5 A. Yes. 6 Q. And then you produced a fuller report into the cases of 7 Roy Cotton and Colin Pritchard? 8 A. Yes. 9 Q. I would like to talk a little bit, before we delve into 10 the detail about your qualifications and your 11 background, about your experience that you brought to 12 that report. Is it right that you qualified as a social 13 worker in 1975? 14 A. Yes. 15 Q. You worked thereafter as a social worker until you 16 became the head of children's services for East Sussex 17 County Council? 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. You were there 1997 until 2000 in that post? 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. After that, you became an independent social work 22 consultant? 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. Turning to your appointment by the Diocese of 25 Chichester, is it right that you had acted as the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 101</p>	<p>1 although possibly more contact for other reasons. 2 Q. There is no mystery about this because the panel heard 3 evidence yesterday from Philip Jones, who raised 4 a question about your independence: did you feel that 5 your role as Mrs Hosgood's professional supervisor 6 affected your independence for the purposes of the past 7 cases review? 8 A. Not at all, really. I have been involved in a variety 9 of pieces of work, both the local authorities when 10 I worked for them and when I was working independently, 11 and I act currently, and have done for the last 12 10 years, as an independent chair of the adoption panel 13 in Hampshire. 14 Over many years, I have had to manage staff who have 15 been carrying out tasks, and from time to time I have 16 had to intervene and deal with a variety of issues, 17 whether they are challenging reports or taking 18 disciplinary action. So I'm capable of I think 19 operating independently, whether it is a very small 20 operation or a very big operation. 21 Q. What might be perhaps the real thrust of it, was there 22 anything you had heard from Mrs Hosgood that would have 23 given you any preconceptions about the diocese before 24 you undertook your work? 25 A. Not from Shirley Hosgood, no.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 103</p>
<p>1 diocesan safeguarding adviser and Mrs Hosgood's 2 professional supervisor prior to your appointment? 3 A. Yes, that's correct. Historically, I had worked as her 4 professional supervisor when she was working in the 5 Roman Catholic Church, and when she moved to the new 6 diocese, the Diocese of Chichester and the 7 Church of England, at some point after that she invited 8 me to consider being her professional supervisor there. 9 Q. What is the role of a professional supervisor? 10 A. It is really to help a social worker reflect on the work 11 they are doing and to be a soundboard to help I think 12 pick up directions they are taking and check whether 13 they are going in the right ones. 14 Q. So it is not supervisor as in line manager? 15 A. No. 16 Q. You are an external person that they can touch base with 17 and use as a soundingboard? 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. How frequently do you do that? 20 A. Well, that would have varied in the course of the time 21 I was there because -- I mean, the object would have 22 been, ideally, about monthly. But at the beginning of 23 the appointment, we were very much involved in the past 24 cases review. That was quite time consuming. So it 25 would have probably been less frequent at that point,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 102</p>	<p>1 Q. Did you undertake the work with any preconceptions from 2 anyone else? 3 A. I had knowledge of previous child abuse events or 4 scandals, particularly around the cathedral. 5 Q. What we will do is, when we look at the recommendations, 6 I might come back and ask you whether you think your 7 prior knowledge affected the conclusions that you drew. 8 Why don't we just do it now. Do you think that your 9 knowledge of the scandals within the cathedral had 10 affected the conclusions you drew in your report 11 subsequently? 12 A. Not at all. 13 Q. I'd like to turn to talk to you about how the past cases 14 review was carried out. We have heard that it was 15 largely a paper exercise. Would you agree with that? 16 A. Yes, absolutely. Yes. 17 Q. You reviewed the blue files -- 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. -- that were held in the diocese. Did you review any 20 safeguarding files? 21 A. Yes. 22 Q. Were you aware that area bishops held their own files? 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. Were they reviewed also? 25 A. I cannot be clear about that now.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 104</p>

<p>1 Q. I would take you to your statement to assist you, but it 2 doesn't cover it in your statement, which is why I ask 3 you the question. 4 A. Okay. 5 Q. So you can't be clear now. We heard evidence from one 6 of the victims/survivors, Mr Philip Johnson, the other 7 day that he had wanted to meet with you as part of your 8 past cases review -- I'm still on the past cases 9 review -- but that you had said it wasn't part of your 10 terms of reference; is that correct? 11 A. Yes, the House of Bishops protocol was fairly clear 12 about the nature of the task and it did not involve 13 interviewing or enquiring of witnesses in that 14 particular past case review exercise. It was a matter 15 of identifying issues and then passing them on for 16 either the diocese safeguarding board to deal with or 17 the safeguarding adviser to deal with. 18 Q. Two questions, I think, arise from that. The first is, 19 was it within your remit to go outside those terms of 20 reference? Could you have said, "That's what they say, 21 but, no, actually, Mr Johnson, I would like to meet with 22 you"? 23 A. I guess in some ways that was addressed by the 24 confidential addendum that I produced because it had 25 highlighted a number of issues that I felt were required</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 105</p>	<p>1 within the diocese. Can you help as to where you got 2 the list of the known cases? 3 A. Well, they would have been generated by the diocesan 4 officers and Shirley, Shirley Hosgood. 5 Q. There was a process, wasn't there, where you sent out 6 also some letters? 7 A. The House of Bishops protocol identified that the 8 diocesan bishop should send out to past and present 9 clergy and senior clergy and officials to ask them to 10 identify whether they can recall any cases that ought to 11 be brought to my attention as the independent reviewer. 12 Q. Paul, can we have a look on screen, please, at 13 ANG000167_017. This is an appendix to your original 14 report. 15 A. Yes. 16 Q. Paul, can we look at the table, please. This is a list 17 of the individuals who received letters? 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. I just want to draw out a couple that we might well have 20 heard of. A letter was sent to Peter Ball, if you 21 scroll down, keep going; to the Right Reverend 22 Eric Kemp; keep going down, please, and we see a letter 23 was sent to the Right Reverend Bishop Wallace Benn; keep 24 scrolling, Philip Jones. Can we go over the page, 25 please, Paul. We see that in addition to letters being</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 107</p>
<p>1 to be addressed, so it was an opportunity for the 2 diocese to think about, I think, stepping outside the 3 past cases review and looking at a separate inquiry. 4 Q. I don't want to misquote you. Are you essentially 5 saying that you think -- you recognised that the voices 6 of victims and survivors was useful and that's why you 7 put it in at the Roy Cotton/Colin Pritchard report 8 stage? 9 A. Not just useful, but needed to be heard and demonstrated 10 to be heard. 11 Q. There are a couple of questions that have been raised by 12 our core participants and I would like you to help us as 13 much as you can. Did you feel you were given full 14 access to the information held by the diocese? 15 A. At the time, I did, yes. 16 Q. Again, it might be a difficult one for you to answer, 17 but did you have any cause to believe that information 18 was being withheld from you -- 19 A. No, I didn't. 20 Q. -- in any way? 21 A. No. 22 Q. Obviously you can only speak to what you did review, not 23 what wasn't there? 24 A. Indeed. 25 Q. We know that there was a list of known cases identified</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 106</p>	<p>1 sent directly to bishops themselves, you also sent 2 letters to their secretaries, so we see the names 3 Linda Savage, Shirley Steers, Sandra Medway, secretaries 4 to various bishops? 5 A. Correct. 6 Q. Again, I don't know if it was your decision. What was 7 the purpose of sending letters both directly to the 8 bishops but also to their secretaries? 9 A. It was either something in the procedures that required 10 it or it just happened. There was no particular reason 11 for that, other than it probably was in the protocol. 12 Q. What you have said at paragraph 12 of your statement -- 13 I don't ask you to turn it up -- is that you then 14 identified certain cases that you wished to discuss with 15 senior clergy. How did you identify the cases that you 16 wanted to discuss further? 17 A. That would have been a result of either the letters 18 I got back from any individuals who had replied or from 19 the search through the case file, the blue files, where 20 I would have identified cases where there were issues 21 that needed to be explored further. 22 Q. To your recollection, did you speak to the diocesan 23 bishop and both of the area bishops about certain cases? 24 A. Yes. 25 Q. Did you find them cooperative and able to give you much</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 108</p>

<p>1 information during those meetings?</p> <p>2 A. They seemed cooperative, yes.</p> <p>3 Q. My second question was, were they able to offer much</p> <p>4 information or did they refer you to perhaps others who</p> <p>5 might be better placed? It is not in your statement, so</p> <p>6 if you can't --</p> <p>7 A. No, I think I probably felt that I was given information</p> <p>8 at the time.</p> <p>9 Q. Can we take a look at your report again -- I think it is</p> <p>10 ANG000183. If we can take a look, please, over the</p> <p>11 page, at paragraph 6, please -- mine has a page 2. Not</p> <p>12 to worry. It is about record keeping. One of</p> <p>13 the conclusions you reached was that the record keeping</p> <p>14 was poor in the diocese. We have heard from others</p> <p>15 about the issue, the blue files being in one location</p> <p>16 and the area files in another and the safeguarding</p> <p>17 files.</p> <p>18 During your review, how significant did you think</p> <p>19 the potential effect of this poor record keeping was?</p> <p>20 A. I think it was one of the sort of priority</p> <p>21 recommendations that I was concerned about. As you say,</p> <p>22 there were records being kept in different locations,</p> <p>23 and certainly some of the key people weren't accessing</p> <p>24 all the data on those files. You may come on to it</p> <p>25 later. For example, the issuing of PTO wasn't always</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 109</p>	<p>1 and I don't know if that is deliberate or not. Was the</p> <p>2 outcome of this conversation that you began to believe</p> <p>3 that CRB information was removed as part of this</p> <p>4 filleting or that there was a policy of not keeping the</p> <p>5 CRB and the files were filleted?</p> <p>6 A. I probably haven't put that clearly enough, then.</p> <p>7 I think there was a policy of not recording all the CRB</p> <p>8 information on the file. I believe it was kept</p> <p>9 elsewhere, at Church House, rather than on the blue</p> <p>10 files. I don't think it was necessarily filleted as</p> <p>11 a universal action on the files that were held at</p> <p>12 Bishop's Palace.</p> <p>13 Q. Did you reach the conclusion that it was inconsistent as</p> <p>14 to what was held were?</p> <p>15 A. It was inconsistent because a lot of files had CRB</p> <p>16 checks on them, others didn't, some were thick, some</p> <p>17 were thin, when they should have -- given the length of</p> <p>18 appointment that people had had in the diocese, they</p> <p>19 should have been a bit thicker, I would have thought.</p> <p>20 Q. Can we move to talk about the cases of concern that you</p> <p>21 identified in your report. Paul, can we put on the</p> <p>22 screen, please, ANG000149. "Review case summary".</p> <p>23 These are the cases you considered there were still some</p> <p>24 concerns around following your review; is that correct?</p> <p>25 A. That's correct.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 111</p>
<p>1 done by reference to the person's blue file, which would</p> <p>2 have held much more information than perhaps at a local</p> <p>3 level.</p> <p>4 Q. Rather than make poor Paul search for the document I'm</p> <p>5 trying to get on screen, can you take a look at</p> <p>6 paragraph 16 of your witness statement, please, which is</p> <p>7 page 4 of the statement?</p> <p>8 A. Sorry, which paragraph?</p> <p>9 Q. Paragraph 16. I'm not going to read the whole thing but</p> <p>10 I would like to touch on some of the key ones. You have</p> <p>11 said there was no real consistency about what was likely</p> <p>12 to be in each file?</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. Not all files had CRB checks or equivalent?</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. What you go on to say is, when you enquired about the</p> <p>17 CRB forms, you were informed that a policy had developed</p> <p>18 of not retaining the CRB data on file, but you don't</p> <p>19 remember who had told you this?</p> <p>20 A. Correct.</p> <p>21 Q. Another thing -- what you say in the very next sentence</p> <p>22 is:</p> <p>23 "I remember being told that a previous bishop may</p> <p>24 have had a habit of 'filleting' the blue files ..."</p> <p>25 The two are obviously juxtaposed in your statement</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 110</p>	<p>1 Q. One of the names we see is Peter Ball. You summarised</p> <p>2 that there had been an allegation in 1992.</p> <p>3 Essentially -- I'm not going to read it all out -- there</p> <p>4 had been a caution issued, it wasn't clear the range and</p> <p>5 extent of the Gloucester Police investigation and</p> <p>6 whether there were other victims, "issues may well arise</p> <p>7 as a result of the court case in July re Colin Pritchard</p> <p>8 and Peter Ball", and Philip Johnson is said to have</p> <p>9 involved Peter Ball in those.</p> <p>10 In relation to Peter Ball, we have heard, or we will</p> <p>11 hear from other witnesses, that amongst the information</p> <p>12 held in Chichester was a significant correspondence file</p> <p>13 in relation to Peter Ball. Were you aware of that file?</p> <p>14 A. I was aware of a file on Peter Ball because I looked at</p> <p>15 it.</p> <p>16 Q. That was the file, was it, that you summarised this</p> <p>17 information from?</p> <p>18 A. Indeed.</p> <p>19 Q. Can we please put on the screen, Paul, ACE026148, and we</p> <p>20 will have the first page first.</p> <p>21 The inquiry received a correspondence file in</p> <p>22 relation to Peter Ball that was subsequently sent to the</p> <p>23 palace. It is a very large file, running to 470 pages,</p> <p>24 I think, by my last count. To be fair to you, I should</p> <p>25 say you haven't seen the entirety of this file in the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 112</p>

<p>1 preparation of your witness statement, have you? 2 A. No, I haven't. 3 Q. I am going to ask you about a couple of extracts and, 4 again, out of fairness to you, you only saw those this 5 morning? 6 A. Indeed. 7 Q. I should emphasise, this is a very large document, 8 476 pages, and 180 of those postdate your review, but 9 either way, it is a sizeable document. Was the file you 10 looked at -- can you remember -- a sizeable document? 11 A. It wasn't anywhere near as big as either of those 12 numbers. 13 Q. Can we in this document, please, skip forward to 14 page 330. We can see here a letter -- I don't need any 15 part of it to be zoomed, Paul -- from the Reverend 16 Brian Tyler to the Bishop of Chichester, who at that 17 time was Bishop Eric Kemp. I'm not going to go through 18 every page here. I know you had a chance to look 19 through it briefly. We know, and so that everybody 20 following can understand, Reverend Brian Tyler conducted 21 some investigations during the first police 22 investigation into Peter Ball in 1993, or thereabouts, 23 and sent some conclusions to the Diocese of Chichester. 24 As far as you are able to remember, having looked at it 25 this morning, was this information included within the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 113</p>	<p>1 that would have changed your conclusions in relation to 2 Peter Ball in the past cases review? 3 A. Well, my conclusions were that action needed to be 4 taken, but I think this would have given a heightened 5 attention to it, perhaps a red light flashing around it. 6 Q. I don't propose to take that any further, and I think 7 that's about as much as you can help us, thank you. 8 Can we turn back, please, Paul, to the document we 9 were on before, the list of names, ANG000149, and if we 10 can go over on to page number 3. At the bottom there, 11 don't worry about zooming it in, we are going to go over 12 the page in a moment: 13 "Robert Coles. Resigned 1997. However, previous 14 archdeacon ..." 15 That's Nicholas Reade; is that right? You spoke 16 with him during the review? 17 A. Yes, indeed, Nicholas Reade. 18 Q. "... has written re Robert Coles' interview with the 19 police. Unclear what the matter was, but possibly 20 homosexual relationship with an underage boy." 21 He goes on to say he may or may not have been linked 22 to the Roy Cotton and the Colin Pritchard cases. 23 I think that's because of the location. 24 A. Yes. 25 Q. Were you aware during the past cases review, as far as</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 115</p>
<p>1 file that you reviewed during the past cases review? 2 A. I think I can be pretty certain it wasn't. The reason 3 I say that is because the name Peter Ball was a name 4 known to me from having worked in East Sussex, and 5 I think I mention that in the statement. So I think 6 I would have been fairly vigilant in looking through 7 a file of someone about whom suspicions had been raised 8 in the community, so there is no reason I wouldn't have 9 drawn attention to that in my findings. 10 Q. Again, I don't think I need to go through every page, 11 but it summarises some investigations that were carried 12 out and some concerns that were raised about him. Paul, 13 can we look at page 347 of that same document. Can we 14 zoom in, please, on the third paragraph, and 15 specifically the sentence beginning "Unfortunately", if 16 you could just highlight that one: 17 "Unfortunately, I came to the conclusion he had been 18 involved in abusing not only his office but very many 19 young men who passed through his care. He desperately 20 needs help." 21 Again, I don't know how much further you can take 22 us. We know this material was there in 2009/2010 when 23 Kate Wood undertook a review. Bearing in mind we have 24 just looked at the summary that you gave in your report 25 of Peter Ball, had you read this sentence, do you think</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 114</p>	<p>1 you can remember, that at the time of the previous 2 police investigation, Robert Coles had admitted to 3 Bishop Benn, Archdeacon Nicholas and Janet Hind what 4 would now be considered a sexual assault against a young 5 boy? Was that level of detail provided to you? 6 A. I can't say I recall it, but -- 7 Q. If it had been, would that be the kind of thing you 8 would have included in that summary? 9 A. I would have included that, yes, as a piece of 10 information. 11 Q. If you had been told that there had been an admission 12 but no subsequent investigation, would that be one of 13 the cases you may have recommended further action on, or 14 can you not say? 15 A. Indeed, if it was on the blue file, I think I would have 16 recorded it. 17 Q. Can we take that down now, please, Paul. Thanks. 18 There are a number of names that aren't in that 19 document, which is why I don't keep it on the screen, 20 that this inquiry has heard about, one of which is 21 Canon Gordon Rideout. The inquiry know that by the time 22 of your review, Canon Rideout had been subject to court 23 martial proceedings and two police investigations for 24 allegations around child sexual abuse. Was his name 25 provided to you during the course of your review?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 116</p>

1 **A. No, it wasn't.**
 2 Q. Was his file one that you reviewed?
 3 **A. Yes, it was.**
 4 Q. Was there any information on that file in relation to
 5 the previous allegations at the time of your review?
 6 **A. I have got a note of having reviewed it, and there being**
 7 **nothing of concern on it.**
 8 Q. One last name is Vickery House. Vickery House is
 9 somebody who was an associate of Peter Ball and
 10 subsequently convicted of child sexual offences. We
 11 know his name crops up in the Brian Tyler report we have
 12 just looked at as someone who may require some further
 13 investigation. Was his name provided to you during the
 14 review?
 15 **A. Yes, it was.**
 16 Q. Was his name provided to you as somebody of whom there
 17 were concerns?
 18 **A. His name was provided to me as being on the list.**
 19 Q. On the list of people within the diocese?
 20 **A. Yes. It wasn't -- his name wasn't provided separately**
 21 **to that, by any individual.**
 22 Q. So his name wasn't provided about one of those about
 23 whom there might be concerns?
 24 **A. No.**
 25 Q. I'm sorry to ask an obvious question: if you had

Page 117

1 reviewed the Brian Tyler file we have just looked at and
 2 it had raised concerns about Vickery House in it, would
 3 you have expected to include his name in your review?
 4 **A. Absolutely, yes.**
 5 Q. We touched at the beginning that you also produced
 6 a confidential addendum to this report. Paul, can we
 7 look at it, please, at ANG000130. Chair, it is behind
 8 tab 8 of your bundle. I apologise, I have been rather
 9 slack at bringing you to the pages. I have been
 10 trotting along. So I am sorry.
 11 ANG000138. Was this confidential addendum requested
 12 by the diocese or did you produce it of your own
 13 initiative?
 14 **A. Again, my memory is not terribly clear about that, but**
 15 **I suspect it's more than likely that I would have**
 16 **suggested it, perhaps even informally, and then**
 17 **formalised it.**
 18 Q. What I want to ask -- you might be able to help us --
 19 is, when you reviewed Roy Cotton's blue file, we know
 20 that he had a conviction in 1954 for indecent exposure.
 21 Was there information on the file in relation to that
 22 conviction?
 23 **A. There were a number of letters over a period of time**
 24 **that identified that people were writing in connection**
 25 **with his previous offence.**

Page 118

1 Q. Professor Sir Malcolm Evans, I hope we can then try to
 2 deal with the question you raised the other day.
 3 Insofar as you can tell us, there was information on
 4 the file in 2008 when you reviewed it about the
 5 conviction?
 6 **A. Absolutely, yes.**
 7 Q. We might look again at your chronology to try to narrow
 8 down a little bit more when that information was put on
 9 the file.
 10 As a result of this confidential addendum,
 11 Bishop Hind asked you to carry out a further review into
 12 the handling of those two cases; is that correct?
 13 **A. Yes.**
 14 Q. Was there any discussion at that stage about the purpose
 15 of your further review?
 16 **A. Well, at that point, it was about reviewing the actions**
 17 **and decisions of the dioceses, officers of the dioceses,**
 18 **to see what could be learnt, basically.**
 19 Q. You, in the confidential addendum, had -- chair, I note
 20 the time. I will finish this one question, since I have
 21 started it, and then I will suggest perhaps we break.
 22 You had noticed some key possible findings in your
 23 confidential addendum which, as we have said, had
 24 details on his blue file of the previous conviction?
 25 **A. Mmm.**

Page 119

1 Q. You had already noted that. You had already noted that,
 2 at the time of Roy Cotton's 1997 arrest, the child
 3 protection adviser, Mrs Hind, did not have access to the
 4 blue file; is that right?
 5 **A. That's correct.**
 6 Q. You had already noted that the area bishop, Bishop Benn,
 7 who was involved directly in Roy Cotton's case, did not
 8 have access to the blue file?
 9 **A. Correct.**
 10 Q. You had noted that the police were not aware, as far as
 11 you could tell, of the previous conviction during the
 12 1997 investigation?
 13 **A. Correct.**
 14 Q. You noted that, in 1999, Roy Cotton was granted PTO
 15 without reference to the blue file?
 16 **A. Correct.**
 17 Q. And you expressly say the wisdom of that should be
 18 considered?
 19 **A. Yes.**
 20 Q. Finally, that you asked the question in relation to
 21 Colin Pritchard why his PTO had not been suspended
 22 during the subsequent police investigation?
 23 **A. Yes.**
 24 Q. It was those areas that you were going to look into
 25 further in your report specifically into Cotton and

Page 120

<p>1 Pritchard?</p> <p>2 A. They were certainly areas I identified in the previous</p> <p>3 trawl that generated this confidential addendum, but</p> <p>4 I wouldn't have felt constrained just to keep to that.</p> <p>5 It would have been examining the whole range of issues</p> <p>6 that might have emerged from a further in-depth look.</p> <p>7 MS McNEILL: That might be, chair, a convenient moment. We</p> <p>8 will talk about that in-depth look after lunch.</p> <p>9 If the core participants' representatives could just</p> <p>10 see me before they leave, I will give them the document</p> <p>11 I told them about earlier.</p> <p>12 And please do remember you are under oath.</p> <p>13 A. Indeed.</p> <p>14 (1.00 pm)</p> <p>15 (The short adjournment)</p> <p>16 (2.00 pm)</p> <p>17 MS McNEILL: Thank you, chair. Before I begin with more</p> <p>18 questions, Mr Meekings, I am asked to make one</p> <p>19 correction that I got wrong and one clarification.</p> <p>20 The first is, I said earlier, chair, in relation to</p> <p>21 the Peter Ball file, the Brian Tyler documentation we</p> <p>22 looked at was on there when it was reviewed by</p> <p>23 Kate Wood. I think I said 2009. I should have said</p> <p>24 2012. I apologise for that slip of the tongue.</p> <p>25 The second is a point of clarification, Mr Meekings,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 121</p>	<p>1 Ian Gibson and Shirley Hosgood?</p> <p>2 A. Correct.</p> <p>3 Q. You also spoke to a number of individuals over the</p> <p>4 phone, one of which was Nicholas Reade, by then Bishop</p> <p>5 of Blackburn, but previously Archdeacon of Lewes and</p> <p>6 Hastings. Is it right that, whilst you were speaking</p> <p>7 with individuals, you kept contemporaneous handwritten</p> <p>8 notes of the meetings?</p> <p>9 A. Yes, it is.</p> <p>10 Q. Before the meetings, you prepared in advance a typed-up</p> <p>11 list of questions or areas you wanted to go through with</p> <p>12 them?</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. Paul, can we have on screen -- I'm hoping this will</p> <p>15 work -- ANG000178. Can I have side by side page 1 and</p> <p>16 page 4 of that document.</p> <p>17 We are talking about a meeting between yourself and</p> <p>18 Bishop Wallace on 16 March 2009. Do we see on the</p> <p>19 right, is this your list of questions or topics you</p> <p>20 prepared in advance?</p> <p>21 A. Yes, it is.</p> <p>22 Q. Do we see on the left your handwritten notes?</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 Q. Chair, if you prefer the document copy, it is at tab 11</p> <p>25 of your bundle. It is just a bit more difficult to have</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 123</p>
<p>1 again in relation to Peter Ball. Your note in your past</p> <p>2 cases review said Peter Ball had permission to officiate</p> <p>3 in Chichester Diocese. You might not know, but the</p> <p>4 records tell us he in fact had permission to officiate</p> <p>5 granted elsewhere and he was permitted to perform</p> <p>6 services within the diocese occasionally and that there</p> <p>7 is a distinction between the two. I'm not sure you</p> <p>8 would have known that at the time, would you?</p> <p>9 A. Probably not.</p> <p>10 Q. I think that's clarified. We will go back in our</p> <p>11 chronology, then, to your completion of the report into</p> <p>12 Roy Cotton and Colin Pritchard specifically. In your</p> <p>13 witness statement -- chair, if you are following, it</p> <p>14 starts at paragraph 44 on page 11. We touched on it</p> <p>15 slightly this morning, but in terms of methodology, for</p> <p>16 the Cotton and Pritchard report, it was a detailed paper</p> <p>17 exercise but you also carried out interviews as well; is</p> <p>18 that correct?</p> <p>19 A. That's right, yes.</p> <p>20 Q. Do we see in paragraph 44 a list of the individuals that</p> <p>21 you spoke with?</p> <p>22 A. Yes.</p> <p>23 Q. Amongst them was Mr Philip Johnson, an individual with</p> <p>24 a cipher we call A31, who was another complainant as</p> <p>25 against Roy Cotton, Janet Hind, Bishop Wallace,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 122</p>	<p>1 the two side by side in hard copy.</p> <p>2 I'm not going to go through all of this, but there's</p> <p>3 obviously a very key area around the conviction of</p> <p>4 Roy Cotton in 1954 that I think we should look at. We</p> <p>5 can see, looking on the right, your fourth bullet point</p> <p>6 is:</p> <p>7 "Did he make you aware of the previous conviction?"</p> <p>8 I have told you outside court I mean no disrespect</p> <p>9 when I say this, but your handwriting is not necessarily</p> <p>10 the easiest to read.</p> <p>11 A. No, it is quite small.</p> <p>12 Q. Can you help us with the document on the left with where</p> <p>13 you recorded the answers in relation to this topic? It</p> <p>14 is tab 11 of your bundle. Can you help us with that?</p> <p>15 A. I can try to help you. I think it starts off with</p> <p>16 "1" -- I have different page here, sorry.</p> <p>17 Q. No, I have the wrong tab now. That's why. It is</p> <p>18 tab 10. It is my fault. I apologise, chair, I have</p> <p>19 confused everybody. Tab 10 is the first meeting of</p> <p>20 16 March. Paul has it right on the screen, as usual.</p> <p>21 I see on the third line down something that looks</p> <p>22 like "First knew 12/97"?</p> <p>23 A. Yes, that's right:</p> <p>24 "Did not know about police investigation until the</p> <p>25 end, ie, 1999. First knew 12/97. Nicholas Reade knew</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 124</p>

<p>1 there was ... he'd been the rural dean." 2 Q. If we go down, there seems to be, for want of a better 3 word, at the second paragraph "Asked NR to look into 4 RC." Can you read the rest of that for us? 5 A. "There was no protocol at that time for this and we 6 [discussed] something on file a long time back". 7 Q. Can you remember what the "something on file" referred 8 to now or not? 9 A. That was I think Bishop Wallace's "something", not my 10 "something". 11 Q. We can see it reads on – it looks like it says: 12 "We became concerned, whilst on police bail, he was 13 guilty." 14 A. "... he was guilty -- but no proof. We pushed him, 15 therefore, into retirement. He wanted to carry on -- 16 accept we pushed him." 17 Q. I want to talk about the discussion you had in relation 18 to PTO: 19 "We were keen to get him out of parish", does that 20 say? 21 A. Yes, "out of parish ministry". 22 Q. Can you read the rest of that section for us, please? 23 A. "Police had ceased and we had no grounds to not give 24 PTO". 25 Q. And the next bit?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 125</p>	<p>1 were discussing an old conviction as opposed to an old 2 allegation? 3 A. The word "allegation" had not been used at all in this 4 particular meeting, it was all about a conviction. 5 Q. I'm going to ask you do the same exercise again, if 6 I can, for the second meeting. This time it is tab 11, 7 chair, I hope, ANG000179, pages 4 and 5 are the 8 handwritten. Can we start at page 4, please, at the 9 same time as page 1 I think makes sense. 10 On the left, you have a box. What was the purpose 11 of going back to Bishop Wallace for a further interview? 12 A. The reason for going back was that I wasn't at all clear 13 that the information I had got was sufficiently robust 14 to be able to incorporate in a report at that point. 15 Q. The issue you have highlighted is specifically the 16 awareness of Roy Cotton's conviction? 17 A. Yes. 18 Q. What we can see there is, having spoken to various 19 people, that's your perception of their -- I don't want 20 to say "evidence", but account to you so far? 21 A. Yes, indeed. 22 Q. If we can go down to page 4 to "Questions arising from 23 above accounts", you wanted to go back and specifically 24 ask Bishop Wallace: 25 "1. Did you know during the '98/'99 investigations</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 127</p>
<p>1 A. "Anglo Catholic, therefore, right to hold sacraments, 2 more important than other aspects. Both NR and 3 Bishop Wallace felt uneasy." 4 Q. If we can pause there, were you ever told during this 5 meeting that PTO had only been granted because 6 Bishop Eric had directed Bishop Wallace to grant it 7 during this meeting? 8 A. I don't recall whether it was at that meeting. I think 9 other comments had been made about that later on, 10 certainly. 11 Q. But it is not in your note of the meeting? 12 A. No. 13 Q. Also, what we see is, were you told during this meeting 14 that Roy Cotton was unwell and granted his PTO into 15 a nursing home, or anything to that effect? 16 A. "By the time PJ" -- that is Philip Johnson -- "came to 17 see Bishop Wallace -- Roy Cotton was in an old people's 18 home and very ill and not fit/well and unable to 19 minister". 20 Q. That's all I intend to take you to on that page. My 21 question in relation to it is, how confident are you of 22 the accuracy of your notes? 23 A. Pretty sure. 24 Q. As far as you were concerned, and you can only speak for 25 yourself, how clear was it during this meeting that you</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 126</p>	<p>1 Roy Cotton had a conviction? 2 "2. How did you know ...? 3 "3. Did you see the blue file ...? 4 "4. Did Bishop Eric tell you ...?" 5 Can you help us again with deciphering a little bit 6 your notes on the right and how they relate to those 7 questions? Paul, you can leave the one on the left as 8 it is. 9 A. Reading from the top line, this is what I would have 10 been recording Bishop Benn's comments: 11 "Think/couldn't swear if something came to light. 12 Nicholas Reade. Nicholas Reade -- that's significant." 13 I think at this point what I'm recording is a lot of 14 vagueness, impreciseness and inability to get into the 15 kind of answering mode, really. Then it goes on to say: 16 "I think I knew then ... but may. 17 "My memory is Nicholas Reade I found out. 18 "Not Bishop Eric. 19 "I came in '97, after building trust 2 to 3 years 20 Bishop Eric, getting old -- [I was] being allowed to do 21 more in area. [Bishop Eric was] Not as hands-on. 22 "Senior staff meeting. 23 "Bishop Wallace -- hazy about when told [but] knew 24 it was by NR." 25 Q. Just so I'm clear, were you specifically, as per the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 128</p>

<p>1 questions you set out in advance, asking about 2 a conviction? 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. Do we surmise from the parts you read out, he's saying 5 he was told by Nicholas Reade? 6 A. Essentially, yes. 7 Q. Thank you, Paul, we can take that down. 8 You subsequently produced, for the purposes of your 9 report, a chronology; is that right? 10 A. Yes, I did. 11 Q. If you need your report, it is behind tab 9 of your 12 bundle. Did you, as part of that chronology -- I'm 13 looking at page 12, chair -- Paul, perhaps we had better 14 put it on screen, ACN022270_012. I'm looking at the 15 1997 to 1999 entry. Essentially, you concluded, did you 16 not, that Nicholas Reade knew -- was not told by Cotton 17 that he had appeared in court and had a conviction for 18 a sex offence? 19 A. Yes. 20 Q. I'm not going to go through this in detail, but I think 21 this copy is actually the finalised report, not your 22 first report, so we can take that back down. 23 In the chronology that you circulated to 24 Bishop Wallace, did it record your understanding that he 25 knew of the conviction in 1997 from the police --</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 129</p>	<p>1 diocese on 29 May 2009; is that correct? 2 A. Yes. 3 Q. Is it fair to say that you were rather critical of 4 Bishop Wallace, amongst others in the diocese, in 5 relation to this? 6 A. Yes, there was a clear criticism to be made, I thought. 7 Q. I am going to summarise rather than go through it, but 8 tell me if I summarise incorrectly. Some of your main 9 conclusions were that Bishop Benn knew about 10 Roy Cotton's 1954 conviction in 1998. 11 A. Yes. 12 Q. That was one conclusion you reached? 13 A. Yes. 14 Q. That Bishop Benn did not tell Mrs Hind about the 1954 15 conviction at that time -- 16 A. Yes. 17 Q. -- but should have done? 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. This meant that in 1998 Sussex Police did not know about 20 Roy Cotton's past, which you thought might have had an 21 effect on their enquiries? 22 A. Yes. 23 Q. That when the blemished disclosure of Roy Cotton's 24 conviction was submitted in 2001, it was not shared with 25 Tony Selwood --</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 131</p>
<p>1 A. It did -- 2 Q. -- investigation? 3 A. -- yes. 4 Q. Yes? 5 A. I believe so. 6 Q. I talked over you. It is my fault. Why did you 7 specifically circulate that chronology to Bishop Wallace 8 before finalising your report? 9 A. I thought I'd had a number of different accounts from 10 Bishop Wallace about how and when he knew about the 11 offence, and by sending him the chronology at that 12 point, I was asking him, really, to confirm the accuracy 13 of it. 14 Q. Did he raise any queries about that chronology at that 15 time? 16 A. Not relevant to what we are talking about here. He did 17 make one comment, I think, which I can't remember, which 18 I incorporated without a problem. 19 Q. So you believed he'd checked the chronology because he 20 raised one point? 21 A. Oh, yes, yes. 22 Q. But he didn't raise any question about this part, about 23 the conviction? 24 A. No, he didn't. 25 Q. You submitted your initial draft of the report to the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 130</p>	<p>1 A. Correct. 2 Q. -- who was the diocesan safeguarding adviser at the 3 time. And that Mr Selwood did not take any action when 4 approached by a further complainant -- AN-A37, we are 5 going to call him -- who met with Bishop Benn and 6 Mr Selwood in 2003? 7 A. Yes. 8 Q. In relation to Colin Pritchard, you concluded that PTO 9 was issued to Colin Pritchard in February 2007 during an 10 ongoing investigation in which you thought it should not 11 have been granted? 12 A. Correct. 13 Q. That the suspension of Colin Pritchard was late in the 14 day, given that it was not suspended until partway 15 through the ongoing investigation? 16 A. That was my view. I think there was some contention 17 about that, but yes. 18 Q. Overall, some of the comments you made, sort of 19 overarching, were that the responsibility owed to the 20 victims could be perceived to have been adversely 21 affected by the way this information was dealt with? 22 A. Yes. 23 Q. Why did you conclude that the responsibility owed to the 24 victims may not have been? 25 A. Well, I think there's a distinction between -- if I have</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 132</p>

<p>1 got the question right -- about laying responsibility 2 with the perpetrators, on one hand, but there being 3 a corporate act, on another, which, on occasion, if 4 things go wrong, there is a shared responsibility for 5 the failures there. 6 Q. The failure specifically, putting aside the 7 perpetrators, was that the failure to appropriately 8 share information? 9 A. Yes, and act on it. 10 Q. And act on it. You also raised a question about the 11 issuing of PTO to both priests? 12 A. Yes. 13 Q. When you had your first report, so May 2009, I think 14 I just said, with whom did you share a copy at that 15 stage? 16 A. Bishop John. 17 Q. Did you give a copy, at that stage, to anybody else? 18 A. No, not to my recollection. 19 Q. The panel heard evidence yesterday from 20 Shirley Hosgood -- not yesterday, the day before. She 21 said that she had received a copy of your report 22 directly from you. Do you remember sharing that with 23 her? 24 A. I believe it was shared at the very end so that would 25 have been a December report. It seemed to me that it</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 133</p>	<p>1 about all of the detail of the backwards and forwards 2 between yourself and Bishop Benn around the factual 3 disputes. Is it fair to summarise there were some -- 4 quite a number of objections raised by Bishop Benn to 5 your report? 6 A. Yes, there were a number of objections, and I think 7 they're set out in one of the appendices. 8 Q. Yes, we end up with a table, pretty much, of what he 9 says and your response? 10 A. Exactly. 11 Q. We looked at a section of that this morning. With whom 12 was your contact within the diocese during the process 13 of trying to agree this report? 14 A. Well, it probably was Archdeacon Philip Jones -- or it 15 was Philip Jones. 16 Q. Did you feel that during that period he was acting as 17 a neutral sort of intermediary, or did you feel that he 18 was advocating on behalf of either you or 19 Bishop Wallace? 20 A. Well, my view was that he was Bishop Wallace's 21 mouthpiece, really, and advocating for him and acting 22 for him. 23 Q. When I asked questions of Philip Jones, I asked him 24 whether the discussions and his submissions, for want of 25 a better word, in relation to your report were factual</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 135</p>
<p>1 was right that the diocesan safeguarding adviser should 2 have a copy of a report that was affecting safeguarding. 3 Q. We have jumped ahead in the chronology, but while we are 4 there, December 2009, that's when you finalised the 5 report as far as you were concerned? 6 A. Yes. 7 Q. So the version that you shared with Mrs Hosgood, was 8 that the finalised version? 9 A. That was the finalised version. 10 Q. Did you share with her any of the earlier versions? 11 A. Not to my knowledge. 12 Q. When you shared it with her in December 2009, were you 13 aware that she hadn't yet seen any of the other 14 versions? 15 A. Well, by implication, I must have been aware, yes. 16 I hadn't shared any of them with her. 17 Q. The reason I ask is, why did you think it was so 18 important for the diocesan safeguarding adviser to see 19 the report? 20 A. Well, first of all, she was the key person carrying 21 safeguarding responsibilities. I had made an 22 assumption -- obviously wrong -- that she would be 23 involved in discussions about how the issues I was 24 raising were going to be taken forward. 25 Q. I'm not going to ask you, and we might hear from others,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 134</p>	<p>1 or were they relating to conclusions arising from your 2 expertise in safeguarding. Which of the two would you 3 say that you were receiving representations about, or 4 both? 5 A. Well, both. I would take the view that the meeting we 6 had on 5 November, if I'm not moving ahead too fast -- 7 Q. No, that's okay, please. 8 A. -- looked at -- the note of the meeting certainly 9 reflected what the outcomes were they hoped to -- felt 10 they'd achieved. My note of that meeting, which I think 11 you circulated this morning -- 12 Q. I'm just going to pause you there. I have realised -- 13 chair, I apologise -- I distributed to all of the CP 14 representatives and I didn't pass it up to yourself or 15 the panel. It is entirely my fault. May I ask that it 16 is passed up now. I do again apologise. I completely 17 forgot. In case it helps you to refer to it -- I don't 18 prepare to go through it in detail, but I do ask you to 19 give me your account of what happened in that meeting? 20 A. Okay. The meeting started by -- 21 Q. Just pause and maybe let's let the panel have a copy of 22 it before we start. 23 A. Of course. 24 Q. Chair, what we will do is have this uploaded onto 25 Relativity and disclosed properly and have it be given</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 136</p>

<p>1 a URN to go onto the website. Again, I apologise. 2 We don't necessarily need word for word? 3 A. No, I will go through some of the key points that are 4 important, really. It was clear that the officers 5 wanted an end product they could take to the 6 Bishops' Council that included measurement points of 7 action and a document available to victims. 8 Q. I'm sorry, the purpose of the discussions were that you 9 thought that Archdeacon Philip wanted the document to be 10 in a form that could be shared with victims? 11 A. That's what I recorded, yes. That point was followed by 12 the question about whether Bishop Eric had signed PTO 13 for Cotton in 2001 and was there a letter or a copy on 14 file, Bishop Wallace says he has a copy. I was told 15 that the report cast a slur on his professional 16 reputation. I was advised that it would be important to 17 consider the impression of the institution, the church, 18 from the outside. Libel was talked about. 19 Q. When libel was talked about, can you remember now in 20 what circumstances? Why were you talking about libel? 21 A. Bishop Wallace had obviously talked to his colleagues 22 about the report being libellous and wanting to take 23 action, which was what I was advised in this meeting. 24 I was advised, I think, that my approach had something 25 of a Scout mentality -- I'm not quite sure what that</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 137</p>	<p>1 received, on 18 September, a copy of the draft points of 2 action, which was the diocese's approach to responding 3 to your reports? 4 A. Yes, that's correct. I think I probably had taken the 5 view at that point that this might have been the 6 combination of points of action from the original 7 historic review and also taking account of some of 8 the points that I had made in the Cotton/Pritchard 9 report. 10 Q. Did you think that the draft points of action 11 sufficiently addressed both sets of recommendations? 12 A. Well, no, I didn't. 13 Q. Why was that? 14 A. I thought there were deficiencies on a number of fronts, 15 really. I think one of my problems about it was that 16 there had been -- I had made the point about, if there 17 was going to be a sharing of the information in the 18 review, there needed to be a discussion about how that 19 would be shared and what would be shared. I think it 20 was becoming clear that there wasn't any sharing 21 planned. 22 Q. By "sharing", sharing with whom? 23 A. With victims and survivors. 24 Q. Why did you think it was so important for information to 25 be shared with victims and survivors?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 139</p>
<p>1 meant -- and it was suggested I should be posing 2 questions rather than making statements of fact. 3 Q. It looks to me on the next page, where we see "RM", that 4 the agreed way forwards was -- 5 A. Yes, I should reconsider drafting the report, do tracked 6 changes and revise, try and free up the report so it's 7 not log-jammed by libel action, and to note the impact 8 on Bishop Wallace has been acute. 9 Q. So the objective of that meeting, was that in order to 10 reach some agreement about the report so that it could 11 be circulated to victims and survivors and others, as 12 far as you were concerned? 13 A. Well, I think there were two different agendas here. 14 I think I wanted to talk about the areas of dispute, or 15 disagreement, and though I did touch on those, I think 16 clearly my notes cover the agenda that the diocese 17 wanted to pursue. 18 Q. In terms of -- whilst we are talking about 19 Archdeacon Philip, can we look on the screen, please, 20 Paul, at ACE022267. Chair, it is behind tab 1 of your 21 bundle and it is the very last page of tab 1 of your 22 bundle. I would start at the second-to-last page. 23 We can see here that you wrote an email on 24 23 September 2009 to the Bishop of Chichester and 25 others. By the time you had sent this email, you</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 138</p>	<p>1 A. I think, by this stage, we had had a number of court 2 cases where it was very clear that there were major 3 issues for the diocese and ongoing investigations as 4 well. I felt that there was a real need for openness 5 and transparency, rather than a tightening up and 6 closing down. 7 Q. Did you think that openness and transparency could only 8 be achieved by sharing the full report or did you think 9 there was a middle ground? 10 A. No, I never suggested that the full report should be 11 shared. Indeed, when I originally submitted it in May, 12 I did make the point that it would need to be thought 13 about at that stage, about how it could be shared, and 14 offered to be part of that process. But I was aware 15 it's a sensitive issue. 16 Q. So you didn't necessarily think they had to push it out 17 as is, but you thought that something reflecting the 18 findings of that report should go out; is that a fair 19 summary? 20 A. Yes, absolutely. Yes. 21 Q. Looking specifically at a couple of the lines in here, 22 I want to look at the -- about the fourth paragraph 23 down, which says, "In a situation" at the end. I just 24 wonder if this summarises the view. I'm just going to 25 read it out for the record:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 140</p>

<p>1 "In a situation where difficult information appears 2 to be reluctantly provided, or emerges bit by bit after 3 enquiry, in a way that does not convey openness and 4 transparency [suggestive of learning from the past] it 5 tends to place one on the 'back foot' and in a defensive 6 position." 7 Is that what you were trying to explain to us 8 a minute moment ago -- 9 A. Yes, it probably is. 10 Q. -- the concerns? 11 A. Yes, absolutely. 12 Q. You also, at the bottom of that page -- can we look at 13 the one that begins number 2, please, Paul -- raised 14 concerns here specifically about the delegation, for 15 want of a better word, to Philip Jones, the 16 responsibilities in relation to safeguarding. What you 17 say is you can see the benefits of that, in that 18 additional senior staff will become more familiar with 19 the issues and be in various positions to create 20 positive influence. What is not clear is whether this 21 affects the safeguarding adviser's line of 22 accountability or requires formal arrangements for the 23 sharing of information to ensure effectiveness. Why 24 were you so concerned about the decision, or were you 25 particularly concerned?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 141</p>	<p>1 a conflict of interest, given he was the Archdeacon of 2 Lewes. Can you explain your concerns there? 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. And Hastings, I should say; the Archdeacon for Lewes and 5 Hastings. He corrected me yesterday. 6 A. Indeed. Again, from a public perception point of view, 7 if you have a bishop who is, as it were, in my report 8 being heavily criticised and those cases going on in 9 that part of the world, and you have got the diocese 10 appointing the archdeacon, it will be regarded, I think, 11 by the general public that that archdeacon is 12 accountable in some way to his local bishop. That seems 13 like a conflict of interests, really. 14 I noticed in Archdeacon Jones' statement that he was 15 clearly put in a number of difficult positions by the 16 bishop, including having been briefed by Wallace Benn to 17 present his script to the BBC and sort of finding it 18 unravelling. 19 Q. One question I am asked to ask on behalf of those 20 representing Bishop Hind and others is, do you accept 21 that the scrutiny of the evidential basis of your 22 conclusions was fair and reasonable, given the 23 seriousness of the implications for Bishop Benn, at the 24 very least? 25 A. I would have liked, after my report was sent to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 143</p>
<p>1 A. Yes, I was concerned. I felt that at what was 2 a difficult time and has continued to be a difficult 3 time, I felt it was important that, if you like, the 4 chief executive, the bishop, Bishop John, should be seen 5 to be the person who was directing and responding. If 6 it was going to be delegated, in my view, and it is an 7 outsider's view, so it is not technical, the next person 8 down would be a local bishop, not an archdeacon. So 9 I felt it had jumped a management line almost. 10 Q. Again, as an outsider from the church, was your concern 11 mainly about presentation, or the way it looks, being an 12 archdeacon as opposed to a bishop, or were you thinking 13 specifically in terms of power -- 14 A. Yes, both those. I mean, from the outside, people 15 perceive the bishop to be the person that is fronting 16 the church and fronting the main issues. 17 Q. Is that why you thought it was important that he seemed 18 also to be fronting safeguarding, so that it becomes 19 a main issue? 20 A. Yes, indeed. If it couldn't be him, then someone of not 21 too junior seniority. 22 Q. You also -- it is not in this email and I don't intend 23 to bring it up -- later raised concerns about whether 24 Philip Jones specifically was the right person to be 25 doing it and you queried whether he might have</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 142</p>	<p>1 Bishop John, for there to have been a discussion. Given 2 how significant the points that I was making were, 3 a discussion about how verifiable they were and whether 4 someone else should be brought in to actually establish 5 whether they could stand or not, that would have been 6 the right thing to do, I think, at that point. 7 Q. That covers all the questions I have in relation to that 8 topic. What I would like to ask you about is -- 9 I suppose what I will do, sorry, out of fairness to 10 those behind, is put up ANG000147. I'm asked to show 11 you Bishop Hind's response to that email. A later 12 response to similar concerns. If we just zoom in the 13 top there. If I want to look down to paragraph 4, he 14 says: 15 "Having made your report, you do not have any 16 ongoing responsibility for it. It is now my 17 responsibility to act on your report and 18 recommendations, in the best interests of victims, the 19 diocese and the wider church ..." 20 He goes on: 21 "However, I do of course understand the personal 22 interest you will continue to take in the results of 23 your work and shall certainly share the outcomes with 24 you in confidence, if need be, as fully as possible. 25 "Your findings and recommendations have already</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 144</p>

<p>1 proved very useful ..."</p> <p>2 This wasn't in response to the email we just looked</p> <p>3 at, it was actually in response to a further email you</p> <p>4 sent in which you raised the concerns about</p> <p>5 Bishop Benn -- Archdeacon Philip. Is that right? We</p> <p>6 have the timeline. I don't think it is necessarily in</p> <p>7 dispute. My question is whether this response provided</p> <p>8 you with any reassurance?</p> <p>9 A. This was after I'd completed the --</p> <p>10 Q. That's right.</p> <p>11 A. And had left the diocese.</p> <p>12 Q. Yes.</p> <p>13 A. It did not provide me with any greater assurance than</p> <p>14 I had before, really. It was business as usual, as far</p> <p>15 as I could see.</p> <p>16 Q. You reached a point where you wrote and said, "I don't</p> <p>17 think that I can professionally, in line with my own</p> <p>18 professional obligations, continue to be involved with</p> <p>19 the diocese". Why was that?</p> <p>20 A. Well, I found that I was, I guess, being pushed around</p> <p>21 quite a lot with regard to the report. Having given it</p> <p>22 quite a lot of time for the diocese, between May and</p> <p>23 effectively November, to kind of reach a view about how</p> <p>24 it was going to try to take it forward or, if not, how</p> <p>25 to provide additional information that would help me</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 145</p>	<p>1 on how to address the findings of the report ..."</p> <p>2 I just query that one with you. We know now you did</p> <p>3 actually give Shirley Hosgood the report. I just wonder</p> <p>4 why the fact that she didn't have a copy of the report</p> <p>5 was one of the concerns you've raised?</p> <p>6 A. Well, she wasn't given a copy of the report by the</p> <p>7 diocese and, as a result of that, was not formally aware</p> <p>8 of what the recommendations were or formally involved in</p> <p>9 any of the discussions or debate about how they might be</p> <p>10 considered.</p> <p>11 Q. The other bullet points essentially are largely about</p> <p>12 sharing the report; is that fair?</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. The second bullet point, sharing the report anywhere</p> <p>15 within the diocese; third bullet point, sharing it with</p> <p>16 the safeguarding management group?</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. And then accountability for safeguarding appears to be</p> <p>19 the subject of much change -- that's what we have talked</p> <p>20 about -- with Archdeacon Philip taking a greater role,</p> <p>21 and then some other areas.</p> <p>22 What I want to ask, in relation to how you came to</p> <p>23 form this opinion, how much were you involved in the</p> <p>24 day-to-day running of the diocese and how much of this</p> <p>25 was information you received via Shirley Hosgood?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 147</p>
<p>1 improve the report, I felt I had to bring it to an end</p> <p>2 and I took advice from my professional association, who</p> <p>3 agreed that that was the thing to do at that point.</p> <p>4 It felt to me like there was work yet to be done</p> <p>5 that I could have been involved in to actually help</p> <p>6 resolve some of these problems.</p> <p>7 Q. Could we have ACE023553_002. Chair, it is behind tab 16</p> <p>8 of your bundle. This is actually the letter we have</p> <p>9 been talking about. It is attached to an email dated</p> <p>10 24 April 2010, which we don't need to put on screen.</p> <p>11 I only want to draw out a couple of them. One was</p> <p>12 that in the fourth paragraph, you have become</p> <p>13 increasingly concerned at the possible lack of priority:</p> <p>14 "The approach that seems to have been taken could be</p> <p>15 seen as cherry picking the more convenient</p> <p>16 recommendations in the report; whilst the more</p> <p>17 challenging aspects for the diocese, that are actually</p> <p>18 fundamental to the way in which safeguarding of children</p> <p>19 has [or has not] been carried out in parts of</p> <p>20 the diocese, do not seem to be addressed."</p> <p>21 You have put at the bottom of the page and the</p> <p>22 beginning of the next page -- at the same time, please,</p> <p>23 Paul -- at the bottom bullet point:</p> <p>24 "The safeguarding adviser ... was excluded from</p> <p>25 having sight of the report and excluded from discussions</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 146</p>	<p>1 A. I received this information over time, really. I had</p> <p>2 met a number of people who had worked or were working</p> <p>3 with West Sussex County Council and were associated with</p> <p>4 the diocese either in a clerical role or in an advisory</p> <p>5 role. I had also had contact with Philip Johnson.</p> <p>6 I may have seen Shirley at adoption training events, and</p> <p>7 I would have asked her how things were going. Beyond</p> <p>8 that, no.</p> <p>9 Q. The reason I ask, I'm asked by those who sit behind me</p> <p>10 on behalf of Bishop Hind and others to ask, it is fair,</p> <p>11 isn't it, that you wouldn't have known all of the steps</p> <p>12 that were being taken --</p> <p>13 A. Oh, correct.</p> <p>14 Q. -- within the diocese?</p> <p>15 A. Indeed.</p> <p>16 Q. And there would have been engagement with victims and</p> <p>17 implementation actions put in place you wouldn't</p> <p>18 necessarily have known about?</p> <p>19 A. I think there was no visible signs of movement. I did</p> <p>20 speak to Philip Johnson as one of the victims, and</p> <p>21 I didn't get a great sense of satisfaction.</p> <p>22 Q. So do we go back, then, to the point you made earlier,</p> <p>23 that doing this in an open and transparent way is almost</p> <p>24 as important as doing it at all?</p> <p>25 A. It is, but if you don't start off being clear about what</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 148</p>

<p>1 you intend at the end, you lose control of it. I think 2 that's what's happened in this particular review. 3 Q. We know that a subsequent review was carried out of your 4 review by Baroness Butler-Sloss. Did you have any 5 involvement in that? 6 A. I was asked if I wanted to be involved in the process. 7 I declined. 8 Q. Why did you decline? 9 A. I felt fairly removed and fairly hurt, really, 10 I suppose, by everything that had gone on. I didn't 11 really want to be going through the same exercise again. 12 Although I was contacted by Elizabeth Butler-Sloss, 13 I did respond to her, although I didn't meet her, and 14 I submitted a draft to her. 15 Q. You submitted some comments on her draft; is that -- 16 A. Yes. 17 Q. Can we turn to your bundle tab 19, chair, ANG000143 for 18 the screen. I'm not going to go through all of this but 19 this is essentially the comments and factual corrections 20 that you raised. As we have mentioned earlier, we don't 21 want to get too bogged down in the detail for the 22 purposes of my questioning. What I do want to ask is 23 about your more general comments at the end. It begins, 24 "As more general comments": 25 "What I have found most difficult to understand in</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 149</p>	<p>1 have touched on it but I think we should say it 2 explicitly: did you consider the Diocese of Chichester 3 as a whole to be receptive to comments in relation to 4 safeguarding? Again, I am trying to separate factual 5 disputes from safeguarding unless you tell me we can't. 6 Do you think the diocese was receptive to your comments 7 on safeguarding procedures? 8 A. I find it quite hard to answer, really, without linking 9 it to this particular aspect of the investigation. 10 There were times when I met with the senior staff group 11 and they appeared responsive, in other words, making 12 very correct noises of concern and interest; at other 13 times, particularly in the ones I've described with 14 regard to more to do with fact, the relations were not 15 quite so receptive and were quite difficult. 16 Q. If you could take a look for me at paragraph 95 of your 17 witness statement, which is page 24 of the statement, 18 chair. 19 A. Yes. 20 Q. You say: 21 "I believe that over a period of many years 22 a culture or climate has developed in the Diocese of 23 Chichester that has allowed the introduction or 24 appointment to parishes and other positions of people, 25 priests, whose records would elsewhere I hope have</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 151</p>
<p>1 the narrative around 2001 self-disclosure of the 1954 2 conviction is the stunning lack of action." 3 I'm going to pause there. We spent a lot of time 4 earlier talking about 1997, but in fact, the inquiry and 5 the chair has heard that Roy Cotton submitted a 2001 6 form, as he was required, setting out that he had been 7 convicted, so whether or not Bishop Wallace knew in 8 1997, he certainly did in 2001, and that's what you are 9 raising your concerns about here? 10 A. It is. I think the difficulty about this is, as I put 11 it in the narrative, I think Bishop Wallace Benn would 12 say that there was disclosure, it did arrive at his 13 office. I think he said at one point it may have been 14 misfiled. It was also stated that it was then sent to 15 the Bishop's Palace in Chichester, where it also 16 appeared to be misfiled or mislaid or there was a lot of 17 confusion about it at the time. 18 I found it hard to believe that if it was seen first 19 by his secretary or PA that it wouldn't have been a red 20 flag, that she would not have kind of immediately come 21 in and drawn it to his attention. 22 Q. That concludes my questions about what I call sort of 23 the factual narrative. I would like to just ask you 24 a few reflecting questions on your interactions with the 25 diocese, the first of which is, overall -- we may well</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 150</p>	<p>1 attracted more careful scrutiny and weeding out. 2 Sometimes such people have managed to move to work or 3 live close by others with similar outlooks, as in the 4 cases of Roy Cotton and Colin Pritchard." 5 A. Yes. 6 Q. My question is, you say over a period of many years 7 a culture has developed. Are you giving your view there 8 on the current situation within Chichester or the 9 situation as it was in 2009 to 2011 where you spent most 10 of your time? 11 A. I guess it is much more in respect of the earlier stage 12 because I think since -- more recently, I think more 13 attention has been given to looking with greater 14 scrutiny at who is coming into the diocese. I think 15 with the cessation of the area bishops scheme being able 16 to award PTO without reference to the blue file, that's 17 been an improvement. 18 Q. What you also say is: 19 "The dominant or prevailing culture of the Diocese 20 of Chichester with regard to women may have had 21 a significant influence in this regard." 22 Again, are we talking currently or 2009 to 2011, 23 when you were involved? 24 A. I can only comment about the earlier stage. I think 25 a number of people would probably say the view of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 152</p>

<p>1 Chichester Diocese with regard to the ordination of 2 women is a factor in that and not supporting it, to my 3 understanding. 4 Q. This is something you have heard from others rather than 5 a view that you reached yourself -- 6 A. No, it is a view I have reached myself. I would also 7 tend to take the view in retrospect, benefit of 8 hindsight, that Shirley's uphill struggle was possibly 9 born out of that kind of issue and problem, really. It 10 was a very male-oriented environment. I'm not sure 11 whether Bishop Hind may have called it in the course of 12 these proceedings "muscular" in some way. I think, 13 faced with a female safeguarding officer who was working 14 to a degree of authority, because she was aware of 15 the law and was not prepared to accept less than 16 appropriate action, provided a challenge to male 17 authority in some ways. 18 Q. I have concluded my questions for you. Before I turn to 19 the panel and the chair to see if they have any 20 questions, you are somebody who has worked for a long 21 time within the safeguarding roles and within the areas 22 of East and West Sussex. Do you have anything else that 23 you would like to add specifically that might assist the 24 panel in reaching any recommendations that they may wish 25 to consider?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 153</p>	<p>1 MS McNEILL: Thank you, Mr Meekings. Chair, do you or the 2 panel have any questions for Mr Meekings? 3 Questions by THE PANEL 4 THE CHAIR: Yes. Can I just ask you about the process of 5 commissioning your report, Mr Meekings. Was there any 6 agreement about who should receive the final version of 7 it -- 8 A. No. 9 THE CHAIR: -- and how many people it should be distributed 10 to? 11 A. No. 12 THE CHAIR: So you felt free to give a copy to Mrs Hosgood 13 because you thought it was important she should have it, 14 rather than there was any agreement with anyone? 15 A. Correct. 16 THE CHAIR: Can I ask you if you continued your professional 17 supervision of Mrs Hosgood? 18 A. No, I ceased that when I -- I ceased doing that when 19 I removed myself from the diocese at the end of 2009. 20 THE CHAIR: I see. Given there were a lot of tensions 21 around at the time, did you cease that contact with her 22 in an amicable way? 23 A. Oh, no, the only reason I left was because of my 24 disagreement with the church over its handling of 25 the outcome of the review, really. I felt I couldn't be</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 155</p>
<p>1 A. There are one or two things I would like to say, chair. 2 I think there have been a number of crises and 3 difficulties that the Church of England have 4 experienced, and I think it probably is time for some 5 fairly radical action to be taken by the church, and 6 I know they are thinking carefully about that, but 7 I think my problem is the amount of time it does seem to 8 be taking. 9 I would like to ask a question, really, about 10 whether they should be stripped of their exemption under 11 the Equality Act to help stamp out a culture of abuse 12 and homophobia and sexism, because under the 2010 Act, 13 the church, as a religious institution, has special 14 permission to insist that those it appoints are 15 Christians, but it can also discriminate over sex, 16 sexuality, marital history and gender identity if they 17 conflict with strongly held religious convictions. 18 Secondly, I would probably support the development 19 now of an independent safeguarding body. Operationally, 20 I'm surprised that the church has not already set up 21 a national database to record cases of concern and to 22 upload case notes and allow a proper audit trail. 23 I think I said in my witness statement I think that 24 the Clergy Discipline Measure does require a complete 25 overhaul to be able to hold people to account.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 154</p>	<p>1 honest by continuing to support someone working in that 2 situation. 3 THE CHAIR: So there were no tensions arose with 4 Mrs Hosgood? 5 A. No, not at all. 6 PROF SIR MALCOLM EVANS: Just picking up perhaps on one or 7 two of those last points, did Shirley Hosgood ask you 8 for a copy of the report? 9 A. I couldn't tell you. I don't know. 10 PROF SIR MALCOLM EVANS: So what caused you to decide to 11 give it to her? 12 A. She was the safeguarding adviser. 13 PROF SIR MALCOLM EVANS: Indeed, I understand that, yes. 14 A. And why not? 15 PROF SIR MALCOLM EVANS: Okay. Thank you. Could I ask 16 another question, and I am sorry if I failed to pick 17 this up from what was said, but obviously what seems to 18 be emerging as a key point is the comments about 19 Bishop Wallace's knowledge in relation to Cotton in 20 around the state of his knowledge in 1998 around this. 21 Could you just recall on what basis it was that you 22 reached the conclusion that he did have knowledge of 23 the conviction at that time? 24 A. I think I have set it out somewhere. I'm racking my 25 brain to try to draw it to my recollection. Yes, I have</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 156</p>

<p>1 found it here, in fact. So after the second interview 2 I reviewed the information Bishop Wallace had given me. 3 I formed the view that Nicholas Reade's enquiries had 4 thrown up some real concerns about a matter in Cotton's 5 past, that Nicholas Reade shared this information with 6 Bishop Wallace. Bishop Wallace asked Roy Cotton about 7 his past and I came to the conclusion that Roy Cotton 8 had told him of the conviction but described it to him 9 as a false accusation. 10 So I took the view that, as Cotton had used that 11 approach previously to be open about his conviction but 12 described it as a false accusation or, "I did it to take 13 the pressure off other people", I formed the view that 14 he'd done it again. 15 PROF SIR MALCOLM EVANS: And that that came from information 16 that flowed to him through Nicholas Reade? 17 A. No, I took the view that it was divulged directly from 18 Roy Cotton to Bishop Wallace in probably the second 19 interview he had with him in 1999. 20 PROF SIR MALCOLM EVANS: Thank you. 21 MS SHARPLING: We have heard, of course, today from 22 Archdeacon Philip, who said in the latter part of his 23 evidence that one of the problems that he associated 24 with the diocese was the dominance of large 25 personalities -- I'm truncating what he said. Is that</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 157</p>	<p>1 the same with you. 2 A. I think it probably is. 3 MR FRANK: On the page 002, I think it is a record of 4 a discussion on 20 April 2009, looking at the top of 5 the page. 6 A. Yes. 7 MR FRANK: I think about a third of the way down, you have 8 got handwritten, about four lines down: 9 "Believed NR [Nicholas Reade] told me." 10 Is that the bishop telling you that Nicholas Reade 11 had told him about this information? That's where he 12 got his information from? 13 A. Yes. 14 MR FRANK: Then you have made a further note just a few 15 lines down: 16 "NR has forgotten!!" 17 Can you just help us with that? 18 A. I think at that interview I advised Bishop Wallace that 19 I'd spoken to Nicholas Reade and that he had no 20 knowledge of that. 21 MR FRANK: There is a further marginal note there saying, 22 "Probably did know. Even if he didn't, I can recall 23 conversation." 24 Can you help us with what that refers to? 25 A. I'm a bit lost on the page, I'm afraid.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 159</p>
<p>1 a phrase that you would agree with? 2 A. I suppose his position in the diocese was very different 3 from mine. Mine was very specific. It was peripheral. 4 You know, by probably May my role had started to 5 considerably diminish and I wasn't involved other than 6 in providing professional supervision to Shirley. 7 I was aware from Shirley's meetings with me that 8 there were difficulties, but I wasn't aware that that 9 dominated. 10 MS SHARPLING: How did Shirley, as you describe her, 11 Ms Hosgood, describe those difficulties to you? 12 A. Well, she described them in terms of the cases that were 13 under consideration by her. In some instances, I think 14 she'd taken matters to Bishop Wallace and hadn't felt 15 that he'd wanted to hear what she was saying or taken 16 the action she felt was appropriate. 17 MR FRANK: Just going back to the question of the source of 18 information regarding the difference there appears to 19 have been between Bishop Wallace and how he got 20 information about the conviction that we have spoken 21 about, I wonder if you can just help us to understand 22 from your handwritten note, because that's probably 23 contemporaneous, if we could put up ANG000179, and in 24 particular page 002, it is behind tab 11 of your 25 evidence as I have got it. I don't know whether it is</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 158</p>	<p>1 MR FRANK: It's the same page, it has 002 at the bottom. It 2 is ANG000179, the note of the conversation on 3 20 April 2009. 4 A. Does it have a "2" at the top of the page? 5 MR FRANK: It does indeed. It is also on your screen, 6 I think, to help you. 7 A. Oh, yes, thank you. 8 MR FRANK: In relation to the marginal note "probably did 9 know", it looks as if it is pointing to "NR" and "Even 10 if it didn't, I can recall conversation with 11 Roy Cotton". Can you help us with that? 12 A. Basically Bishop Wallace was saying Nicholas Reade has 13 forgotten. Bishop Wallace senses that -- 14 Bishop Wallace's information came from Nicholas Reade 15 and he was aware of conviction from the past. 16 MR FRANK: On the following page, 003 at the bottom 17 right-hand corner. 18 A. Yes, I have it. 19 MR FRANK: The penultimate paragraph -- so it is the same 20 conversation, indeed, and we see: 21 "Seen a number of people reputations blackened 22 unnecessarily. Listened to people ..." 23 A. "... take the hump because of a trivial thing they've 24 done". 25 MR FRANK: "It's not that important. You can't write off</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 160</p>

1 a good guy because of a bad day".
 2 Who said that?
 3 **A. Bishop Wallace.**
 4 MR FRANK: And what was he referring to?
 5 **A. He was talking generally.**
 6 MR FRANK: If we could turn on, then, to a later
 7 conversation also with Bishop Wallace, I think,
 8 ANG000182_001, which should be behind your tab 12,
 9 22 April.
 10 **A. Yes.**
 11 MR FRANK: About a third of the way down:
 12 "Would appear that this information on conviction
 13 remained with Bishop Wallace. Would not appear to have
 14 been shared with Nicholas Reade ..."
 15 Can you help us about that?
 16 **A. Well, Nicholas Reade was much clearer in the**
 17 **conversation I had with him about what he knew and what**
 18 **he didn't know. He was very clear, he had no knowledge.**
 19 MR FRANK: In terms of being clear, can you tell us, what
 20 impression did you clearly have about what the source of
 21 Bishop Wallace's information was?
 22 **A. I formed the view that he'd had a discussion with**
 23 **Roy Cotton, and in all probability in the second**
 24 **discussion, which was one of the things he told me,**
 25 **although changed it at some point, that Cotton had told**

Page 161

1 **him that he had a conviction, Bishop Wallace was shocked**
 2 **and horrified, Cotton is reported to have called it an**
 3 **allegation.**
 4 MR FRANK: Thank you very much. That's all I ask you.
 5 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr Meekings.
 6 (The witness withdrew)
 7 Housekeeping
 8 MS McNEILL: Chair, can I address you on a housekeeping
 9 matter at this stage? We are at 3.00 pm. We have two
 10 further witnesses listed today, as I know you're aware.
 11 We have Canon Ian Gibson and Angela Sibson, who was the
 12 diocesan secretary at one of the stages.
 13 For logistical reasons, we have decided to take
 14 Canon Ian Gibson first, unless you or your colleagues
 15 have an objection. My question is whether you would
 16 like me to start Ian Gibson's evidence now or take
 17 a slightly earlier break?
 18 THE CHAIR: We will take our break now and then we can start
 19 after the break.
 20 MS McNEILL: Thank you, chair.
 21 (3.02 pm)
 22 (A short break)
 23 (3.20 pm)
 24 MS McNEILL: Before the witness is sworn, chair, if I can,
 25 at the risk of making it a habit, just one

Page 162

1 more housekeeping matter. As I know you're aware,
 2 Angela Sibson has been waiting, but looking at the time
 3 a decision has been made to put her evidence over until
 4 tomorrow morning, if that is okay with you and your
 5 colleagues. After we have concluded Ian Gibson's
 6 evidence today, we will hear the read evidence of
 7 Kate Wood, chair, if that is all right?
 8 CANON IAN GIBSON (sworn)
 9 Examination by MS McNEILL
 10 MS McNEILL: Good afternoon. Can I confirm that you are
 11 Canon Ian Gibson?
 12 **A. I am indeed.**
 13 Q. I know that we have spoken outside the room and you are
 14 content for us to either refer to you as Canon Ian or
 15 Canon Gibson.
 16 **A. Fine.**
 17 Q. You provided a witness statement to the inquiry on
 18 11 January of this year. It runs to 25 pages. Have you
 19 had the opportunity to review your statement to confirm
 20 whether it is true, to the best of your knowledge and
 21 belief?
 22 **A. Yes, I have.**
 23 Q. Can you confirm that it is?
 24 **A. It is.**
 25 Q. Chair, the reference for that statement is WWS000070.

Page 163

1 I ask if it can be put onto the website so, as usual, we
 2 don't need to take the witness line by line through the
 3 entire statement.
 4 Canon Gibson, is it right that you were chaplain to
 5 Bishop Hind between 2004 and 2013?
 6 **A. It is right, yes.**
 7 Q. In addition, in 2009, you also took on the role of
 8 episcopal vicar for ministry and Canon Treasurer of
 9 Chichester Cathedral?
 10 **A. I did.**
 11 Q. You remained in that role until 2015 when you retired?
 12 **A. Absolutely right.**
 13 Q. Something we may return to later: is it right that in
 14 addition to your roles within the diocese, you have
 15 a significant amount of management experience?
 16 **A. Yes, I have.**
 17 Q. In fact, you were a national field sales manager for
 18 Martini Rossi for some years?
 19 **A. Correct.**
 20 Q. You spent 10 years as a management consultant?
 21 **A. Correct.**
 22 Q. Both of which were prior to your role as chaplain but
 23 not prior to your ordination?
 24 **A. That's right. I was a non-stipendiary ministry whilst**
 25 **doing those jobs.**

Page 164

<p>1 Q. I'm grateful. You also have, I understand, specific 2 Masters degrees in management and HR-related matters? 3 A. That's right. I have a Masters degree in Strategic 4 Human Resource Management and a Masters degree in 5 specifically looking at changes in Church of England 6 human resource management, notably the clergy terms of 7 service. 8 Q. You are actually quite softly spoken. I don't know 9 whether it is because you are far away from the 10 microphone. If you could just keep your voice up so 11 that the stenographers can get a note? 12 A. Is that better? 13 Q. Much better, thank you. Can you explain again in brief 14 terms -- I don't expect your full role description -- 15 what the role of a bishop's chaplain is? 16 A. Sure. The majority of bishops' chaplains, and my role 17 specifically for John Hind, was to help him with 18 liturgical services, to plan specifically when he was 19 going out to parishes for confirmations, licensings, 20 that sort of thing, but also very much in this case to 21 be his -- I suppose you could call it chief of staff at 22 the office, to run what we called the Bishop's Palace 23 staff, which was different from the bishop's senior 24 staff, and then make sure the administrative details and 25 the management of the staff, that was really the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 165</p>	<p>1 A. Yes. 2 Q. Probably more the records of it as opposed to the actual 3 carrying out of the checks? 4 A. Later we took on the actual checks ourselves as well as 5 Church House, Hove. That wasn't until after the 6 recommendations of the historic cases review. 7 Q. We will explore that, if we may, in a moment. You 8 handled the licensing records and the issues of notices? 9 A. Yes. 10 Q. Does that cover permission to officiate? 11 A. It did. 12 Q. It does? 13 A. Yes. 14 Q. Again, we will touch on the way that that changed 15 slightly after the recommendations. 16 A. Sure. 17 Q. You wrote "safeguarding officer management and record 18 management in liaison with safeguarding officer". Can 19 you explain that one for us a little bit more? 20 A. We obviously liaised with the diocesan safeguarding 21 adviser as and when. I was perhaps the first line of 22 contact if something happened that needed to be told to 23 the bishop. If the bishop wasn't there, for example, 24 then information would be passed through to me and then 25 I would pass it on to the bishop. But it was only</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 167</p>
<p>1 chaplain's role. So it was a liturgical role as well as 2 an administrative role. 3 Q. So there is no confusion, can you explain for us the 4 difference between the Bishop's Palace staff and the 5 bishop's senior staff? 6 A. The senior staff consisted of himself, the two area 7 bishops, the three archdeacons, dean of the cathedral, 8 diocesan secretary and me there as virtual note taker, 9 but also, as part of that team, sometimes I was asked my 10 opinion. So that's the senior staff. 11 The palace staff was myself, a full-time secretary, 12 a part-time clerical assistant and also the financial 13 and resources -- premises resource manager. That was 14 the person that looked after the care of the palace, 15 which of course, being a listed building, took some 16 care, and there was also during Bishop John's time 17 a gardener who was on a full-time basis. So I was in 18 charge of them as line manager. 19 Q. Again, I'm not minimising it, but having looked at your 20 job description, I'm going to pull out some of the key 21 headings for what I read as your responsibilities: 22 management of the blue folders, which we have heard 23 about? 24 A. Yes. 25 Q. CRB management?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 166</p>	<p>1 really as an interim. It wasn't a management of 2 diocesan safeguarding advisers at all. Safeguarding 3 advisers were in their own position and they held that 4 position responsible to both the bishop, on one hand, 5 but also to the diocesan secretary, who was their line 6 manager. So it was the liaison rather than any form of 7 management. 8 Q. That's the reason I seek the clarity. It wasn't put in 9 another chain of command? 10 A. No. 11 Q. You were the middle man between herself or himself and 12 the bishop? 13 A. Yes. 14 Q. You also recorded management of the Clergy Discipline 15 Measure process. 16 A. Yes. 17 Q. Again, were you physically involved in making the 18 decisions of whether to bring Clergy Discipline Measures 19 or management of the process? 20 A. The management of the process. 21 Q. We have heard a lot of evidence so far about the blue 22 files. 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. We have already had an explanation of generally what was 25 included in them and who managed them. You have also</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 168</p>

<p>1 given a lot of detail in your statement. What I would 2 like to explore is the status of those blue files when 3 you took up post in 2004. 4 A. Right. 5 Q. Could you tell us about that? 6 A. Yes. When I arrived at the office itself to take up the 7 job, the filing, shall we say, was in a bit of 8 a disarray. In fact, it was in great disarray. The 9 secretary that was in charge of the office at the time 10 had failed to do a lot of filing on the excuse that she 11 needed somebody else to help her because she was very 12 much involved in secretarial tasks rather than filing 13 tasks, and she felt that she needed somebody else to do 14 it. 15 So there were a lot of files, not necessarily all of 16 the blue files, but there were some files which I found 17 in a separate filing place which related to people that 18 had either left the diocese or had died, and we still 19 had records. Those files needed to be pushed onto 20 somebody else. 21 Q. That's what I was going to pick up. Is the implication 22 of the first the fact that you have blue files for 23 individuals no longer in the diocese? 24 A. Yes. 25 Q. Does that mean they potentially had PTO or were still</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 169</p>	<p>1 because obviously, if they were interviewing people on 2 a local basis, they may need some information about 3 them, but what we really needed to do is to make sure 4 that we had all the relevant information in original 5 documents. So I specifically asked the area officers to 6 send me any original documents so that they could be 7 placed on the new file so that we had records. 8 Q. Was that request in 2009? 9 A. Yes. 10 Q. One effect of the area files system, was it not, was 11 that permission to officiate was being granted by area 12 bishops within the area -- 13 A. Yes. 14 Q. -- without sight of the blue files? 15 A. Yes. 16 Q. If we can take a look on screen at an email, WWS000090. 17 It is just one page. If we look at the bottom half, 18 please, this is an email from you to various diocesan 19 staff: 20 "The staff meeting yesterday requested that all 21 holders of PTO in the diocese must have current CRB 22 clearances ..." 23 At November 2009, is this one of the actions that 24 occurred as a result of the Meekings Report? 25 A. Yes, it was.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 171</p>
<p>1 ministering in other dioceses without sight of that blue 2 file? 3 A. That could have happened, yes. 4 Q. Is it fair that you took significant steps to organise 5 the filing within? 6 A. Yes, very much so. A temporary secretary was employed 7 to help me and during the early months of my tenure 8 I went about making sure that all of the blue files were 9 in order and any blue files that were left behind were 10 either sent to what we thought was the sending diocese, 11 having looked up that person in Crockfords, the clerical 12 directory, as such, making sure that those files were 13 passed on and any files of any person we knew had 14 deceased, again referring to Crockfords, were sent to 15 Lambeth for archiving. 16 Q. In terms of the changes that happened in response to 17 Meekings' recommendations, that was about trying to put 18 all the files together in one location, was it not? 19 A. Yes. All of the blue files were in one location, they 20 were at the palace, but we knew some of the area bishops 21 specifically were holding their own files. The one 22 thing I wanted to make sure of is if there were any 23 original letters, that they were sent to the palace 24 office to be placed in the blue file for that person 25 concerned. They could keep copies if they wanted to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 170</p>	<p>1 Q. What you found was: 2 "I have looked through the list in the online 3 directory and about 90 per cent have never been through 4 a CRB check or are over five years with their last 5 check." 6 That's 90 per cent of people with PTO? 7 A. Not necessarily 90 per cent of people with PTO. 8 90 per cent of people that we had necessarily records of 9 as being -- as part of our mailing list. It might not 10 necessarily have been that they had PTO. There is an 11 assumption that if they were acting within the diocese, 12 that they did have PTO, but what we had to make sure of 13 is that everybody was covered and therefore that's why 14 I did that as a general letter. 15 Q. So the 90 per cent, did that include active clergy as 16 well as retired clergy? 17 A. It could well have done, yes. 18 Q. 90 per cent total within the diocese? 19 A. Yes, remembering -- not people in the diocese, 20 necessarily, but people -- not in full-time clergy work. 21 They were possibly PTO or people we knew as retired. 22 There were people that came to the diocese who didn't 23 seek PTO because they were in retirement, and therefore 24 they didn't want any active ministry. Of course, under 25 Canon B8, I think it is, there are people who could be</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 172</p>

<p>1 invited to preach once or twice under the supervision of 2 the local incumbent, if they wanted to, without the need 3 for permission to officiate, provided they were 4 accompanied within the action they were doing. But as 5 far as the five years were concerned, remembering five 6 years was the gap which we expected people to renew 7 a PTO within. 8 Q. So what you were saying is the 90 per cent isn't 9 necessarily as bad as it might look at first blush, but 10 nonetheless, were you very concerned by this finding? 11 A. Yes, absolutely. 12 Q. Were you surprised by this finding? 13 A. Yes, I think I was. 14 Q. Was action taken to make sure that everybody's checks 15 were brought up to date as a result? 16 A. Yes. Anybody on our PTO current list was sent a letter. 17 I also made sure that each parish priest was notified to 18 say that, as far as we are concerned, if you have 19 anybody within your parish that you think either has PTO 20 or requires PTO, then we need to know about it because 21 PTO then had to be issued through the palace. 22 Q. We know, as do you, that the archbishop's visitation -- 23 the commissaries had a look at the clergy files held 24 within the diocese. 25 A. Yes.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 173</p>	<p>1 cases review, was he given access to all of the blue 2 files -- 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. -- that were in existence at that time? 5 A. Yes. All of the blue files that were in existence, he 6 had access to. 7 Q. Were any blue files hidden away -- 8 A. No. 9 Q. -- or amended or documents removed from them? 10 A. No, not at all. 11 Q. I don't know if you heard the evidence this morning, but 12 we talked a little bit about Peter Ball. 13 A. Yes. 14 Q. First of all, is it right that there was no blue file 15 for Peter Ball within the Diocese of Chichester? 16 A. No. Peter Ball was a bishop. As far as we are 17 concerned, we don't hold -- or never held bishops' files 18 at the palace. Bishops' files, their blue folder 19 equivalent, would be held at Lambeth, not at palace 20 level, so we didn't have any bishops' files as such. So 21 there wasn't a blue file for Bishop Peter Ball. 22 Q. What file for Peter Ball did the diocese hold? 23 A. There was a file which I think was put together by 24 Bishop Eric Kemp and his staff which consisted -- it was 25 quite a thick file which we found when we were asked by</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 175</p>
<p>1 Q. One of the findings in their report was, at that time, 2 138 clergy files were without a current CRB check. Can 3 you respond to that? 4 A. It depends on what they understand by "current". I was 5 surprised by the number. I think "current" means, was 6 it done yesterday or current within five years. Now, 7 most CRB checks were done through area offices 8 originally or through Church House or eventually through 9 palace. I know for a fact that everybody was covered 10 that was required to be covered if they had a previous 11 CRB. Certainly anybody coming into the diocese would 12 have had to go through CRB or eventually DBS. So in 13 terms of that number, I was very surprised they felt 14 there were those people outstanding. I think probably 15 due to be renewed, but certainly not outstanding or had 16 never been done before. 17 Q. Chair, obviously Canon Bursell is coming to give 18 evidence. Perhaps that's something we can clarify with 19 him when he comes. 20 I would like to move on to talk, if I can, about the 21 past cases review only to a very limited extent. For 22 want of a better word, you were the gate keeper to the 23 blue files during your tenure; is that right? 24 A. Yes. 25 Q. When Roger Meekings was asked to carry out the past</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 174</p>	<p>1 Lambeth during the investigations later into Peter Ball 2 that we provided all of the contents for. A lot of 3 those contents were to do with newspaper cuttings, 4 allegations and things happening to the trial or the 5 accusation that he had in Gloucester when he was 6 Bishop of Gloucester. 7 Q. My question is, you say that it was found. Where was it 8 found? 9 A. It was found in a cabinet just outside of the palace 10 door. It was there, but it wasn't noted as a blue file. 11 Q. So it wasn't stored with all of the other blue files? 12 A. No. No, not at all. 13 Q. Was that file, as far as you could tell, provided to 14 Roger Meekings? 15 A. Yes. 16 Q. Were there any amendments to that file before it was 17 handed to Roger Meekings? 18 A. No, not at all. 19 Q. Mr Meekings' evidence this morning was that some 20 material within that file by Brian Tyler was not in the 21 file at the time that he reviewed it? 22 A. I can't see how it couldn't have been. I'm almost 23 certain -- because that file was never tampered with, if 24 that was the accusation. That file was complete -- 25 I never even saw it -- I never even looked at it until</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 176</p>

<p>1 after we got the request from Kate Wood regarding the 2 Lambeth investigation. 3 Q. When you received the request, did you take a look 4 through the file? 5 A. I did. 6 Q. Was the Brian Tyler material within it at the time that 7 you reviewed it? 8 A. It was there. 9 Q. Are we talking 2012? 10 A. Yes. 11 Q. Moving forward, if I can -- I don't propose to ask 12 you -- the chair and panel may well have questions -- 13 about the implementation of the recommendations of 14 the Meekings Report, but I think we have heard a lot of 15 detail about that from others and you have set it out in 16 your statement. 17 I want to talk to you about whether you felt that 18 the change within the diocese had been significant by 19 the time that the Archbishop's Visitation was 20 announced? 21 A. Yes, very much so. We took on board a lot of 22 the recommendations as far as Roger Meekings' report and 23 also the subsequent report by Elizabeth Butler-Sloss. 24 We realised there were some failings. I think those 25 failings have been acknowledged. We went -- not out of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 177</p>	<p>1 a visitation to take place which highlighted the fact 2 that there was a lack of communication between senior 3 staff within the diocese. 4 Q. From your perspective, specifically, of course, you were 5 Bishop John's chaplain. Can you help us to understand 6 why there was such a lack of communication between the 7 bishop's senior staff? 8 A. Yes. The area scheme that had been put in place by 9 Bishop Eric Kemp allowed Bishop Wallace in the east of 10 the country, on the east of the diocese, to take a lot 11 of responsibility almost as a mini diocesan bishop. For 12 example, the number of parishes that were in 13 Bishop Wallace's area was approximately the same amount 14 of parishes there was in the whole Diocese of Leicester, 15 for example. So it was more or less a mini diocese. 16 Bishop Eric, when he was getting towards, shall we 17 say, the end of his tenure, regarded that part of 18 the diocese as Bishop Wallace's domain and allowed 19 Bishop Wallace, I think, the freedom to do the things 20 that he felt was necessary. 21 When Bishop John came to the role of bishop in 2001, 22 Bishop John didn't like the way that the area scheme was 23 running. He felt that it didn't need an area scheme, it 24 would be better for a diocesan and two suffragans to 25 work underneath him and it would work more effectively.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 179</p>
<p>1 our way, but as far as our normal procedure was 2 concerned, to make sure they were re-enacted and 3 certainly during the time of the end of Bishop John's 4 tenure when he was either on sabbatical or before he 5 left, and as he left, then Bishop Mark would make sure 6 that they were implemented and they were implemented. 7 We had -- you know, a lot of the recommendations were; 8 without any problem. 9 Q. What you have said exactly at paragraph 70 of your 10 statement is that you did not think that the 11 safeguarding situation in Chichester did not warrant 12 a visitation? 13 A. I thought the visitation was warranted because of a lack 14 of relationship between the senior staff rather than the 15 fact that the safeguarding procedures at that time were 16 at fault. Yes, I'm sure that the safeguarding 17 procedures in the past had been at fault, but we went 18 out of our way to make sure that implementation from the 19 historic cases review was in place. 20 Q. Just so I understand your answer, do you agree that 21 a visitation was necessary but just not on the grounds 22 of the safeguarding procedures? 23 A. A visitation was necessary not only on the grounds of 24 investigating the safeguarding procedure. I think the 25 safeguarding procedure was an adjunct which allowed</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 178</p>	<p>1 He wasn't in favour of the area scheme. But because 2 Bishop Wallace was appointed before Bishop John by 3 Bishop Eric to an area bishopric, then he felt that he 4 couldn't change Bishop Wallace's status at the time. He 5 did, however, when Bishop Mark arrived, state 6 categorically that it was his intention, should the 7 occasion arise, to do away with the area scheme and make 8 sure they were back to a suffraganship, which he 9 consequently did under Bishop Martin Warner. 10 Q. Archdeacon Philip this morning gave us some evidence 11 about the effect of personalities within the diocese and 12 Ms Sharpling asked our last witness a question about the 13 effect which that had on the diocese. Do you think the 14 difficulties in what you describe of communication 15 between the bishop's senior staff were caused by the 16 individual personalities involved or inherent within the 17 area scheme or perhaps both? 18 A. I think it was probably both. Basically, because 19 Bishop Wallace felt that he had the authority to do what 20 he felt he needed to do rather than consulting with the 21 diocesan bishop. The diocesan bishop obviously felt 22 that he had a responsibility for the whole of 23 the diocese. Consequently, there was sometimes a clash 24 of personalities, and also a lack of communication 25 between the two areas, and I think that was an important</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 180</p>

<p>1 factor in terms of relationships, and I think that was 2 one reason why, when it came to the visitation, the 3 visitation picked up that there was a dysfunctionality 4 within the diocese. The dysfunctionality was basically 5 between certain people because of their attitude towards 6 certain things. 7 Q. Who were those certain people? 8 A. Bishop Wallace Benn and Bishop John and also the 9 safeguarding adviser, the diocesan secretary and 10 Archdeacon Philip. This aspect as far as, "If you do 11 anything, then I might bring a libel case against you", 12 that obviously caused a lot of tension. 13 Q. The panel have a witness statement from Ian Sandbrook 14 who carried out a report into the diocese. One of his 15 conclusions was that there was significant cultural 16 variation across the diocese, specifically as regards to 17 safeguarding. From what you have just told us, would 18 you agree with that conclusion? 19 A. It's difficult to put it in whether it related 20 specifically to safeguarding. I think I've explained in 21 my witness statement that Bishop Eric always appointed 22 a different tradition to each of the area bishops to 23 make sure there was some form of balance -- by 24 "tradition" I mean whether Anglo Catholic or 25 evangelical. If Bishop Wallace, as an evangelical,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 181</p>	<p>1 it. We know that Canon Gordon Rideout had been in the 2 diocese for some time? 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. He had been through a court martial and two police 5 investigations? 6 A. Yes. 7 Q. When did you first become aware of these previous 8 allegations against Gordon Rideout? 9 A. When the allegations, the later allegations, came out, 10 which actually put him on trial eventually. That's the 11 first time I knew. I had never gone through his blue 12 file, for example. 13 Q. We know there was a blemished disclosure received in 14 relation to Canon Rideout on 6 September 2010. Before 15 we go any further, can you explain what a blemished 16 disclosure is? 17 A. Yes. When a disclosure comes through from the DBS/CRB 18 aspect, it usually mentions when there is a case either 19 that's been proven or an allegation against somebody 20 regarding some behaviour. It doesn't necessarily have 21 to be on the safeguarding process, it could be criminal, 22 for example, if somebody had been involved with drugs 23 when they were at university or something, or they'd 24 been in a protest march or something like that. But 25 that blemish came through and that's what that blemish</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 183</p>
<p>1 would have a broad Catholic archdeacon working with him; 2 if Bishop Horsham was a Catholic, they would have an 3 evangelical archdeacon working with him; and with 4 Bishop John, well, his own archdeacon was of a smaller 5 area in any case. I think what we are looking at there, 6 the tradition as far as they were concerned may have had 7 a different aspect not towards safeguarding, but to do 8 with the way that people who perhaps needed safeguarding 9 instruction or advice was handled. So in other words, 10 Bishop Wallace was much more of a one-to-one 11 relationship and talking to a person perhaps rather than 12 reporting something that may have happened that needed 13 to be reporting. 14 Q. So you're saying there were varying levels of this 15 cultural variation. There is mode of worship, there is 16 personality and management style, for want of a better 17 word? 18 A. Very much so, yes. 19 Q. Can you help us: did that have an effect on 20 safeguarding, which is the big question? 21 A. I think it must have done, but I didn't have any 22 specific evidence, apart from the obvious example 23 regarding Gordon Rideout and the request of 24 Bishop Wallace later. 25 Q. Let's talk about Canon Rideout whilst you have raised</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 182</p>	<p>1 was examined. If it was a safeguarding blemish, then 2 obviously it needed to be highlighted to the DSA. 3 Q. Let's go through that. So the blemish -- you have 4 explained what a blemished disclosure is. Did the one 5 in relation to Gordon Rideout come about during the 6 usual five-year renewal process? 7 A. Yes. The CRB/DBS, whatever it was at the time, was 8 handled through Bishop Wallace's office and it had come 9 through Bishop Wallace's office and his PA down there 10 had reported that there was a blemish on it which hadn't 11 been picked up before. It wasn't on a previous CRB or 12 DBS and that's when Bishop Wallace notified Bishop John 13 or talked to Bishop John after that blemish had been 14 disclosed. 15 Q. I'm just taking it slowly, piece by piece. The 16 five-year process worked, essentially, that 17 a disclosure -- a blemished disclosure came back? 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. It went initially to the area office, as it should? 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. What was the correct process once the area office 22 received such a blemished disclosure? 23 A. The correct procedure should be to let the palace office 24 know and the diocesan safeguarding adviser know. If 25 there was a blemish that was regarding safeguarding, not</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 184</p>

1 necessarily if it was a criminal offence other than
 2 safeguarding, if you see what I mean.
 3 Q. Obviously Canon Rideout's blemished disclosure was
 4 a safeguarding issue?
 5 A. Yes.
 6 Q. Can you tell us what happened or the circumstances in
 7 which that was brought to the attention of the palace?
 8 A. It was mentioned -- no, it came through to Bishop John
 9 at the palace as such, and shortly afterwards there was
 10 a senior staff meeting. In fact, I think it was within
 11 a day or so of the senior staff meeting, and at the end
 12 of that senior staff meeting, Bishop Wallace asked to
 13 see or talk to Bishop John when he mentioned to
 14 Bishop John that, "You know about Gordon Rideout's
 15 blemished CRB and the comments that were made. Do we
 16 have to report this to a DSA because, after all, he is
 17 a friend and a trusted man and one of" -- I can't
 18 remember the exact words. It's in the bundle.
 19 Q. Is it right that you made a note of this conversation?
 20 A. I did.
 21 Q. WWS000060. Chair, it is within your bundle at tab 3.
 22 The first question must be -- you say this conversation
 23 occurred on September 6, 2010?
 24 A. Yes.
 25 Q. The very bottom we see "End note IG, December 17, 2010"?

Page 185

1 A. Yes.
 2 Q. Is that the date that you made this note?
 3 A. That's the date I made that note.
 4 Q. So it is not wholly contemporaneous?
 5 A. No, and shall I tell you the reason why I made that note
 6 on that date?
 7 Q. You anticipate me. Please do.
 8 A. It was either Baroness Butler-Sloss or I think it may
 9 have even been the registrar of -- John Rees who asked
 10 me to ratify that in fact I had heard those --
 11 I mentioned this to Elizabeth Butler-Sloss and she asked
 12 me to make a note, I'm almost certain. It was at that
 13 date that I actually made it. But I remember it
 14 specifically.
 15 Q. That is the next question: how sure are you of
 16 the accuracy of this note?
 17 A. I'm very sure.
 18 Q. Let's just look through it, I think, for the purposes of
 19 the record:
 20 "At the conclusion of the senior staff meeting
 21 on September 6, Bishop Wallace spoke to Bishop John
 22 about a blemished CRB disclosure his office had
 23 received ... he asked Bishop John if he could not
 24 disclose the information to the safeguarding officer for
 25 the diocese as he is a friend and a much respected

Page 186

1 person'. Bishop John then requested that Bishop Wallace
 2 to go with him into his room and discuss the matter.
 3 The rest of the conversation was held between the two of
 4 them. Bishop John came back into the room where I was
 5 present after the conversation and expressed his alarm
 6 at what Bishop Wallace had asked for. I agreed that it
 7 went beyond the bounds of our procedure in the diocese.
 8 The above is a record of my remembrance, no notes were
 9 taken at the time but I vouch for the accuracy ..."
 10 Was this the first or only time you had received
 11 such a request from anyone within the diocese?
 12 A. For, sorry?
 13 Q. Sorry, that was inelegantly put. Before this, had
 14 anyone within the diocese ever requested that
 15 a blemished CRB not be passed to the diocesan
 16 safeguarding adviser?
 17 A. No. No, this was the first time. I think that's why
 18 there was quite a shock. I know Bishop John was very
 19 shocked at the time when he heard it, and I perhaps
 20 think that Bishop Wallace shouldn't have said it in my
 21 presence, although there I'm a witness to it. I don't
 22 know what happened in the conversation afterwards
 23 because Bishop John took him into his office privately
 24 and spoke to him and, when he came out, he said he was
 25 disgusted.

Page 187

1 Q. Your role was managing blemished disclosures, at least
 2 the admin that arose from them?
 3 A. Yes.
 4 Q. As far as you were aware, how well known was it within
 5 the diocese that the correct procedure was to pass it to
 6 the palace and then it must be passed to the diocesan
 7 safeguarding adviser?
 8 A. Yes, this was the procedure that we had set out post the
 9 Meekings Report to make sure that everything went
 10 through the palace, to make sure that anything that came
 11 through as a blemished disclosure was placed on the blue
 12 file.
 13 Q. Have you ever had occasion to discuss this conversation
 14 with Bishop Wallace?
 15 A. Yes. It was discussed at a meeting with me present,
 16 with Bishop John, with the diocesan registrar at the
 17 time, safeguarding adviser, and also Mrs Benn and
 18 Wallace Benn at the time, and that was discussed then.
 19 Q. Did Bishop Wallace accept the accuracy of your
 20 recollection?
 21 A. No, he called me a liar.
 22 Q. Did he say that this conversation didn't happen at all?
 23 A. He called me a liar and said it didn't happen. That was
 24 me, my record, not necessarily the conversation he had
 25 with Bishop John.

Page 188

<p>1 Q. Of course. Thank you, we will take that back down. 2 What I would like to ask you about now is cultural 3 issues arising in the diocese that we haven't already 4 touched on. Then I would like to conclude by asking 5 about management-related issues. 6 You have mentioned, and I think we have largely 7 touched on it, so I just want to check in case there is 8 anything you want to add, that it is very difficult to 9 talk in terms of "the diocese" and that, when we ask you 10 questions about "the diocese", it is very difficult to 11 describe what they are? 12 A. Yes. 13 Q. Is that because of the issues we have already discussed 14 around the area scheme and the different modes of 15 worship within the diocese or are there other issues you 16 would like to draw out that make it very difficult to 17 generalise across the Diocese of Chichester? 18 A. It is looking at the size of the diocese in any case, as 19 I said before, it is equivalent, really, to two 20 ordinary-sized dioceses. Because of the difference that 21 the palace is at one end of the diocese, Church House is 22 at another end of the diocese and, in fact, the extreme 23 of the diocese from one end to the other, from 24 Chichester through to Canberra, is a matter of 77 miles, 25 it's quite a distance. The number of things that go on</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 189</p>	<p>1 A. Yes, on a monthly -- well, ten times a year. 2 Q. You were the note taker? 3 A. I was the note taker and setter of the agenda. I used 4 to send out the agenda in advance and pass the minutes 5 on afterwards. 6 Q. We heard from Bishop John and there is some mention in 7 Bishop Wallace's statement that, as bishops, they had 8 a lot of hats to wear and one of those hats involved 9 national work? 10 A. Yes. 11 Q. And another hat international work? 12 A. Yes. 13 Q. Do you think that, given the number of roles that they 14 had to fulfil, the bishop's senior staff meeting was an 15 adequate way of them collaborating together? Were they 16 often enough, did they work well enough? 17 A. The bishop's staff meetings were really an 18 information-passing process. The purpose of the meeting 19 specifically was to look at appointments, to look at any 20 issues that happened to be around, basically with the 21 fulfilling of parishes. A lot of the admin stuff, a lot 22 of the introduction of new legislature, for example, 23 clergy discipline, clergy -- 24 Q. Did they touch on safeguarding? 25 A. Safeguarding was always a part of it, but I don't</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 191</p>
<p>1 within each of the areas which the area bishops and the 2 archdeacons were involved in was obviously difficult. 3 Local management was obviously a priority prior to the 4 fact that we started centralising things. There wasn't 5 necessarily a great deal of involvement by Bishop Eric 6 in either of the two areas. He had his own very small 7 episcopal area which was basically Brighton and Hove and 8 Worthing and Chichester -- not even Worthing: Brighton 9 and Hove and Chichester, as such, which he took care of 10 as a bishop. 11 May I give an example? When I was a parish priest 12 myself up in the north of East Sussex, I don't think we 13 ever saw the diocesan bishop up there. It was left to 14 the area bishop. 15 Q. What about under Bishop John's tenure? Do you think he 16 had sufficient engagement throughout the diocese? 17 A. I think Bishop John himself left quite a lot to the area 18 bishops to look after. But whenever he was called upon 19 to visit, or to go out and do, he would always go out 20 and do. So he would go to specific parishes that asked 21 for licensing or to ask for a confirmation or something 22 like that. He wasn't loath in going out. He tried to 23 spread himself around the diocese. 24 Q. You have told us about the bishop's senior staff. Is it 25 right they had bishop's senior staff meetings?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 190</p>	<p>1 suppose it took as much priority as it did when the 2 bishops talked themselves, because Bishop John would 3 meet with Bishop of Lewes, Bishop of Horsham separately 4 and also the three archdeacons separately. 5 Q. But informally? 6 A. As a formal basis rather than an informal basis. 7 Q. Formally? 8 A. Once or twice a year we had social occasions -- a summer 9 event and a Christmas event -- which was more of 10 a social event rather than a formal event, usually after 11 a meeting. 12 Q. The wrap-up question on that would be, do you think that 13 the bishop's senior staff meeting augmented by these 14 other meetings you have described were adequate in order 15 to properly manage ongoing safeguarding issues? 16 A. Yes. Sorry, thinking about it -- I was just thinking of 17 reasons why it shouldn't be. But yes, it was. 18 Q. My final question, then, and I imagine the question may 19 be short, but the answer not. You say at paragraph 34 20 of your statement: 21 "The Church of England has failed in the past to 22 accept that people in senior positions within the clergy 23 also need the skills required of such roles, identical 24 in many ways to those skills needed by senior managers 25 in commerce or industry. We promote or prefer clergy to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 192</p>

<p>1 senior roles in many cases without basic training needed 2 to equip them to be people managers or managers of 3 a large organisation." 4 A. Yes. 5 Q. Can you explain that for us, please? Can you explain 6 why you think management experience is or should be 7 important for a bishop? 8 A. Remember, I'm slightly biased in that I come from 9 a management background rather than I do a clergy 10 academic background. In the past and probably now, 11 presently, a lot of our bishops are academically 12 qualified, very much so. When we thrust people into 13 senior positions such as diocesan bishops, very few of 14 them -- and that's a generalisation, I admit, but very 15 few of them have actually had first-class management 16 experience or training. Before anybody in a commercial 17 environment or in an industrial environment can take on 18 a senior management position, they usually go through 19 either stages of management process or at least 20 management training, and ongoing management training in 21 terms of continuing professional development. 22 The majority of bishops and especially the bishops 23 that we had in the diocese, they hadn't had that 24 background, although an opportunity is sometimes given 25 when -- they are what we call "baby bishops". When they</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 193</p>	<p>1 Q. -- amongst the desirable qualities, for want of a better 2 word; or that the existing factors remain but management 3 training is provided. 4 A. Yes. 5 Q. Do you think that they are alternatives, do you think 6 there is one would be preferred over the other? 7 A. Taking it one step back, which looks at bishops being 8 the pastoral head of a community, not just of people -- 9 not just of clergy but obviously as far as their people 10 are concerned, I think it should be an ongoing process 11 in terms of continual professional development for any 12 person in any senior role, whether it is a bishop, 13 a canon, a residentiary or an archdeacon, to go through 14 some form of training or areas of training where they 15 don't feel they have the skills to do. When I was part 16 of the episcopal vicar for ministry role in post 17 ordination training years 5 and 6 for clergy, it was my 18 job to make sure that those people that were being 19 trained for incumbency roles had management experience 20 and training in things like communication, running 21 meetings, administration, project management, team 22 working together. 23 Q. Can I pause you there just to ask you, the decision to 24 provide those in training for incumbency roles that sort 25 of management training, did that come centrally or was</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 195</p>
<p>1 are first appointed to a first bishopric, then they go 2 through a scheme at St George's, Windsor. Now there is 3 a leadership scheme that's in part 4 the Church of England which attracts younger ordination 5 people to actually go through some form of management 6 experience and leadership experience. 7 But it is a very difficult job to take on, as 8 a bishop, the management of a senior management team, in 9 the case of Chichester, two area bishops or suffragan 10 bishops, three archdeacons, rural deans, 21 of them, 11 which, technically speaking, you are in overall control 12 of, especially as you're not an employer, which of 13 course a bishop isn't in the Church of England, and by 14 doing that, to manage them effectively and to lead them 15 in the way that perhaps they should be led. 16 If I could ask for any recommendation, it would be 17 that leadership and management training was certainly 18 part of a curriculum for any person that is being 19 considered for preferment to senior management in the 20 church. 21 Q. There's two possibilities arising: either management 22 experience or management ability, albeit not necessarily 23 experience, is included as a consideration during the 24 recruitment process -- 25 A. Yes.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 194</p>	<p>1 that on your imperative? 2 A. It wasn't necessarily through mine, but it was certainly 3 part of the Diocese of Chichester where we were looking 4 for qualification within management experience before 5 people went into incumbency. I think it's now being -- 6 sorry, being retired for the last three years, I don't 7 know if it is part of the Church of England process to 8 do so. I'm not 100 per cent certain. 9 Q. Do you think there would be some resistance within 10 senior clergy to start acting like managers, for want of 11 a better word? 12 A. Oh, yes. I think sometimes the word "management", 13 albeit with a small "m" or a big "M", is considered 14 a bit of anathema to people who are in a ministerial 15 role, especially when it is a pastoral role. 16 Q. Have you experienced that level of resistance when you 17 were delivering the training that you were just 18 describing? 19 A. Oh, yes, people are sort of saying, "Why do I need these 20 skills?" What I tried to do is, by giving them some 21 experience, by doing tasks, actually -- not specific but 22 just in practice during the lessons, to sort of say, 23 well, where do you think this might come in handy and 24 putting it into a theological and ministerial context 25 rather than a separate context, "Oh, you've got to be</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 196</p>

1 a manager". When you think that somebody as an
 2 incumbent is running a parish or parishes, which has got
 3 the responsibility for -- and perhaps a building that's
 4 worth £1 million, that's listed, that you have to have
 5 historical significance for, that you are in a situation
 6 where you are running a management team, whether it is
 7 church wardens and parochial church council members and
 8 you're also doing volunteer management. All the people
 9 that help in the church are usually needing some form of
 10 leadership. If you haven't got those skills, it's
 11 sometimes very difficult to get the job done.

12 MS McNEILL: Thank you very much. That concludes my
 13 questions. You have given quite a long answer to my
 14 last. Is there anything you would like to add before
 15 the chair and panel ask their questions that you think
 16 would assist them?

17 **A. No, I don't think there is. I think we've covered it,
 18 thank you.**

19 MS McNEILL: Chair, do you have any questions for this
 20 witness?

21 Questions by THE PANEL

22 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much, Canon Gibson. Could you
 23 clarify for me the issue of the process around blemished
 24 disclosures -- this is in general terms not relating to
 25 any specific one, but I think you told us that if

Page 197

1 a blemished disclosure came in, there was a process for
 2 reporting it to the palace. What happened to it after
 3 that?

4 **A. The blemished disclosure was put on file and recorded on
 5 file, but not until after a safeguarding adviser had
 6 actually been informed about it. So the bishop was
 7 aware of what was going on, but the DSA would also be
 8 aware. Sometimes it would have come through
 9 Church House rather than necessarily through the palace
 10 and then they would have been informed before it reached
 11 the palace.**

12 THE CHAIR: Was there any intention or did it actually occur
 13 that there was a discussion as to whether this affected
 14 the suitability of the individual to be performing the
 15 work they were doing?

16 **A. Yes, very much so. If there was a blemished disclosure
 17 regarding safeguarding, then very often, if not always,
 18 the appointment would not have taken place.**

19 THE CHAIR: Would that have the formality of a meeting which
 20 was minuted? How was the decision made?

21 **A. If a blemished disclosure came through during the
 22 appointment process, then the person who had been
 23 interviewed and perhaps even been put up for the job, it
 24 would have been said to them that they would have to go
 25 through a DBS procedure or a CRB procedure and, subject**

Page 198

1 to that procedure, a job offer would be made. The job
 2 offer would not be made if there was a blemished
 3 disclosure to do with safeguarding. If it was to do
 4 with another offence, perhaps, for example, a drug
 5 offence, or something like that, then there could have
 6 been consideration in terms of appointment. But the
 7 appointment would not have been made.

8 If a disclosure was made that was blemished on an
 9 existing appointment, then that person would be put into
 10 suspension. Now, suspension is a very difficult word to
 11 use. It was never used, "You are suspended"; it was,
 12 "You will cease from doing your duties whilst this is
 13 being investigated". You call it what you like. It
 14 wasn't necessarily garden leave. That person was not
 15 allowed to do anything during that time of suspension.

16 THE CHAIR: But there were clear criteria --

17 **A. Yes.**

18 THE CHAIR: -- as to how decisions were reached about
 19 blemished --

20 **A. Yes, that was agreed within the senior staff meeting.**

21 THE CHAIR: Is that recorded somewhere?

22 **A. Yes, there is a letter that the safeguarding procedure
 23 would have been instituted amongst the three bishops and
 24 the three archdeacons, and this is while it's happening.**

25 THE CHAIR: Thank you.

Page 199

1 MS SHARPLING: Just one question from me, and it is in
 2 relation to paragraph 84 of your statement. It is very
 3 short, so I will read it out:

4 "I'm aware that many years previously
 5 Bishop Wallace's friend had accompanied Rideout to the
 6 police station when he was charged and indeed tried not
 7 to disclose his blemished CRB. Subsequently, of course,
 8 Rideout was found guilty and served a prison sentence."
 9 How did you come about that awareness?

10 **A. He told us that he had accompanied on another
 11 occasion -- Bishop Wallace said that he had accompanied
 12 Gordon Rideout to the police station when he was
 13 under -- well, when he was cautioned by the police and
 14 under arrest to go to the police station. So he
 15 actually took him to the police station.**

16 MS SHARPLING: As far as Bishop Wallace was concerned, did
 17 you hear about this, that Rideout in fact had tried not
 18 to disclose his blemished CRB? Was that part of
 19 the conversation that you had with Bishop Wallace?
 20 That's in your statement.

21 **A. His blemished CRB in terms of --**

22 MS SHARPLING: Yes. It's just clarifying what you have
 23 written, Canon Gibson.

24 **A. Yes, I appreciate that.**

25 MS SHARPLING: "Bishop Wallace, as a friend, had accompanied

Page 200

<p>1 Rideout to the police station when he was charged and 2 indeed tried not to disclose his blemished CRB." 3 A. I think it was -- in that case, it was Bishop Wallace 4 that had tried not to disclose the CRB, and this was the 5 occasion that I recalled at the end of the meeting which 6 was recorded on there regarding -- it wasn't 7 Gordon Rideout had failed to tell Bishop Wallace, it was 8 Bishop Wallace wanted to not disclose the fact that he'd 9 had a blemished CRB. 10 MS SHARPLING: Was that at the police station he said he did 11 that? 12 A. No, no, this was Bishop Wallace that was saying it at 13 the meeting afterwards, not at the police station. 14 Sorry if that was confusing. 15 MS SHARPLING: Not at all. 16 THE CHAIR: Mr Frank? 17 MR FRANK: In summary, in your statement you point out there 18 came a point when there was what you called a breakdown 19 in relationship between Bishop John and Bishop Wallace 20 which became irreconcilable. 21 A. Yes. 22 MR FRANK: That's what you said. I'm not asking you for the 23 details of that. Can I ask you, was that before or 24 after the meeting on September 6 where you have recorded 25 that conversation taking place?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 201</p>	<p>1 A. The finished report was, yes. 2 PROF SIR MALCOLM EVANS: When would that have been 3 circulated to the DSA? 4 A. I think that's when Bishop John would have notified -- 5 no, actually, it may well have been that Roger Meekings 6 gave it to her at that stage, at the end of it. This 7 was the final report that was coming out, it wasn't the 8 interim report. So I would have thought it would have 9 been the final report. 10 PROF SIR MALCOLM EVANS: But you are not sure -- 11 A. Not 100 per cent. 12 PROF SIR MALCOLM EVANS: -- whether it was released by 13 Roger Meekings or circulated by the -- 14 A. I'm not certain. I'm not 100 per cent certain. 15 PROF SIR MALCOLM EVANS: Thank you. 16 Further examination by MS McNEILL 17 MS McNEILL: Chair, I have been nudged that there is one 18 question I was asked to ask and didn't ask. I apologise 19 if anything is arising of course and you and your 20 colleagues have some questions. 21 You might be able to help us, Canon Gibson, to 22 answer a question that Mr Frank asked of Bishop John 23 yesterday about the removal of documents from the blue 24 files. 25 A. Yes.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 203</p>
<p>1 A. No, it was after. I think there was a continuation 2 while Bishop Wallace was coming through the 3 Meekings reports and also Butler-Sloss reports that were 4 saying, you know, "You cannot disclose this because ..." 5 and he was threatening libel at everybody. I think 6 Bishop John had got past the stage of actually trying to 7 discuss with Bishop Wallace some sensible form that they 8 would actually get together regarding the safeguarding 9 reports, and I think that's when it came irreconcilable. 10 There was certainly a tension between both of them. 11 MR FRANK: So at the time of the meeting where the 12 conversation that you recorded on September 6, at that 13 stage there was no irreconcilable difference between 14 them? 15 A. Not that it was noticeable. Certainly not at staff 16 meetings which I attended. Whether or not there was 17 within a private meeting of each of them when they met 18 together without anybody else being there, I don't know. 19 MR FRANK: Thank you very much. 20 THE CHAIR: Sorry, one more question from Sir Malcolm. 21 PROF SIR MALCOLM EVANS: I'm sorry. In paragraph 64 of your 22 statement, and here we are talking about the past cases 23 review and the Meekings Report, ie on Cotton and 24 Pritchard, you said it was circulated to all senior 25 staff and to the DSA.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 202</p>	<p>1 Q. Bishop John told us that you there was some guidance 2 from the palace in relation to this but couldn't at the 3 time lay his hand on it. Can I bring up, please, 4 WWS000087, page 1 to begin with. WWS000087. This is 5 confidential files on clergy, guidance notes for bishops 6 and bishops' secretaries. This version is issued 7 June 2008. There is a little murmuring to my side, 8 chair, because this was, until today, the only version 9 that could be located in the system. I have just been 10 notified that helpfully those representing the 11 Archbishops' Council think they have found the 2001 12 version. Maybe we should deal with that with another 13 witness and I will just ask the question: you obviously 14 weren't in post in 2001, were you? 15 A. No. 16 Q. You weren't involved in the removal of any documents at 17 that time? 18 A. Certainly not. 19 Q. If we just quickly look at page 4 of this document, 20 obviously you would have been in post for the June 2008? 21 A. Yes. 22 Q. Can we zoom in on numbers 6 to 8: 23 "The blue files need to be kept up to date and 24 regularly reviewed in order to discard irrelevant and 25 out-of-date material, otherwise they lose much of their</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 204</p>

<p>1 value. Reviewing and thinning out of the right kind is 2 particularly important before a file is sent forward to 3 another diocese. 4 "Personal files should only contain information of 5 continuing interest to those concerned with the 6 minister's development, including pastoral care." 7 It goes on to say that any information that has been 8 received in confidence should be clearly marked 9 confidential. 10 Finally, number 8: 11 "Papers of an ephemeral nature, (eg relating to 12 visits by bishops to a parish for confirmation or other 13 purposes) or relating to other parish officers ... 14 should ideally be kept ... not in the personal file but 15 in a separate parish file." 16 Is this the guidance you followed during your time 17 in post? 18 A. Yes. If there was anything irrelevant -- if it was, for 19 example, "Thank you, Father X, because coming along you 20 were wonderful when you preached your sermon at our 21 son's wedding", that was not necessarily related to 22 a passing on if that person moved on to another diocese, 23 but it did go into what we call the parish file. We had 24 a file for every parish within the diocese and in that 25 file would have been such information.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 205</p>	<p>1 remember, the historic cases review was very much about 2 clergy and so the blue files would have taken priority. 3 Perhaps if anything had been found in the blue file 4 which was necessarily related to a parish event, if it 5 was to do with safeguarding or anything of particular 6 note, it would still be in the blue file. Anything that 7 was taken out would be in the parish file for review if 8 necessary. Sorry to sound so confusing. 9 MR FRANK: Am I right in understanding there might be 10 information about current clergy or past clergy that had 11 been transferred to a parish file in which their name 12 might be referred to in a document but which was not 13 regarded as central to their role as a clergyman in the 14 diocese? 15 A. Yes. 16 MR FRANK: In addition to that, have I understood this 17 right: blue file, parish file and something called a red 18 file? 19 A. Yes. 20 MR FRANK: For the sake of clarity, can you just explain 21 that? 22 A. Sure. Red file, I'm afraid, was my invention. If there 23 was some form of accusation or the hint of a blemish, 24 then I would make sure alongside the blue file would be 25 a red file. Sometimes it was information that we</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 207</p>
<p>1 Q. This guidance is June 2008. Does this reflect your 2 approach from 2004 onwards? 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. Or was this new guidance? 5 A. No, we would have covered that in any case. There was 6 nothing irrelevant necessarily in blue files. 7 Q. And ephemeral information, would that have ever included 8 anything such as CRB checks or other safeguarding -- 9 A. No. Anything that was of an important nature, what we 10 considered to be an important nature, CRBs, 11 safeguarding, would be in the blue file. 12 MS McNEILL: Chair, those are my questions. Are there any 13 questions from yourself or your colleagues arising from 14 this? Once we get the 2001 version, we will endeavour 15 to get that to you and through another witness. 16 Questions by THE PANEL 17 MR FRANK: Just one question, if I may. You have referred 18 to the parish files -- 19 A. Yes. 20 MR FRANK: -- into which the ephemera might be transferred. 21 A. Yes. 22 MR FRANK: That would be still kept and available for 23 inspection by anyone conducting a review who wished to 24 see it. 25 A. If anybody wished to see the parish file, then yes. But</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 206</p>	<p>1 gleaned from a DSA comment or a DSA note which would go 2 alongside a blue file. If it was found to be recordable 3 and worthy -- it doesn't sound an awful expression to 4 use -- then it would be included in the blue file, it 5 was never discarded, but if it was an allegation which 6 wasn't, for example, proved or it proved to be 7 malicious, for whatever reason, then sometimes the red 8 file would be taken out. There wasn't a red file for 9 everybody. It was only a red file on occasion. 10 MR FRANK: For completeness' sake, can I understand this: on 11 a review -- Meekings, Butler-Sloss, any other -- the red 12 file would have been available? 13 A. Yes. 14 MR FRANK: Thank you very much. 15 MS McNEILL: Are there any further questions for this 16 witness, chair? 17 THE CHAIR: No. Thank you very much, Canon Gibson. 18 (The witness withdrew) 19 MS McNEILL: Chair, we are now at 4.15 pm. We had 20 considered doing some reading to conclude the day until 21 4.30 pm when we last talked about it. The witness we 22 are going to read is Kate Wood. It will take more than 23 15 minutes to read it in full, but we could make a start 24 on it until 4.30 pm, if you would like to finish on 25 another occasion, or we could rise now.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 208</p>

<p>1 THE CHAIR: How long will Ms Wood's statement take to be 2 read? 3 MS McNEILL: I think the estimate is half an hour to read it 4 in full. 5 THE CHAIR: We could do half of it just now, then, but we 6 need to conclude at 4.30. 7 MS McNEILL: Thank you, chair. If I could pass over to 8 Ms McCaffrey who is going to read it out. I think you 9 have a bundle called "Read bundle", that has a copy in 10 it. 11 Statement of MS KATE JUDITH WOOD (read) 12 MS McCAFFREY: Chair and panel, a selection of the most 13 pertinent evidence from the witness Kate Wood will now 14 be read into the record. Her full statement can be 15 found at ACE025951 and a paper copy of the statement is 16 behind tab B1 of the read bundle. 17 Paul, may I ask that the statement be placed onto 18 the screen whilst it is being read, for everybody's ease 19 of reference. Thank you very much. 20 Chair, I should also say that the full statement of 21 this witness will be published on the website in due 22 course. 23 Kate Judith Wood has produced a signed statement 24 dated 22 January 2018 and it is endorsed with 25 a statement of truth. I begin at paragraph 4 on page 1</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 209</p>	<p>1 "In May 2007, I wrote to Reverend Pearl Luxon, the 2 joint national safeguarding adviser for the 3 Church of England ... and the Methodist Church at that 4 time. This was in response to a report in the national 5 media regarding the Church of England's recognition of 6 the need for an independent review of historic 7 allegations within the church. I asked to be considered 8 for this role. I received a favourable reply, with an 9 explanation that a model national guidance for the 10 review process was about to commence and once this was 11 completed I would again be contacted. 12 "In May 2008, I was contacted by Andrew Nunn, the 13 premises and administration secretary to the Archbishop 14 of Canterbury, who offered me the role of reviewing 15 files at Lambeth Palace. This is how I commenced my 16 work with the Church of England. I will elaborate on 17 the past cases review process at Lambeth Palace later in 18 this statement. 19 "My safeguarding work at Lambeth Palace evolved 20 significantly from 2008 when I started the past cases 21 review process until 2015 when I left this role. 22 "Throughout this period, I was self-employed as an 23 independent safeguarding consultant 'contracted' to 24 Lambeth Palace, although the contract was only ever 25 verbal. This was a part-time commitment as I had other</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 211</p>
<p>1 where the witness states as follows: 2 "I am an independent safeguarding consultant and 3 a retired detective inspector. 4 "I served as a Sussex police officer from 1985 until 5 2006. I specialised in criminal investigations with 6 a particular emphasis on the field of child protection. 7 This included several years investigating child abuse 8 and domestic abuse as a detective constable and then 9 managing a child protection team in Brighton as 10 a detective sergeant. This role involved investigating 11 serious crimes against children and young people, 12 reviewing complex cases and assessing risk of harm. 13 After this, I moved into a child protection policy and 14 strategic role as a detective inspector, before 15 returning to an operational role, managing serious crime 16 investigations, including investigations into 17 child abuse and domestic abuse. My final role within 18 Sussex Police was a review role as a detective inspector 19 in the performance review department. 20 "Throughout my service, I undertook several training 21 courses in criminal investigation, including the 22 investigation of serious sexual offences. I also 23 undertook single-agency and multi-agency training in 24 child abuse and domestic abuse on many occasions. 25 "My involvement with the Church of England.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 210</p>	<p>1 contracts for much of this time. 2 "During 2008 and 2009, my role at Lambeth Palace was 3 focused almost entirely on the review process. However, 4 from 2009 onwards, my role began to expand as it became 5 clear there was a need for a safeguarding adviser at the 6 palace to provide professional safeguarding advice in 7 a similar way to the advice given to dioceses by the 8 diocesan safeguarding advisers (DSAs). I worked closely 9 with Andrew Nunn who sought my advice on how to respond 10 to communications he received which involved, or were 11 connected to, safeguarding. Occasionally, I would deal 12 with the matter directly and liaise with the relevant 13 diocese or dioceses but in general my role at 14 Lambeth Palace during 2009 to 2011 was very limited and 15 consisted of more of an advisory role for Andrew Nunn. 16 "By 2011, it became apparent that there were certain 17 safeguarding concerns and issues, such as the number of 18 dioceses involved; the complexity of the case; the 19 sensitivity of the case; or the high profile of 20 the accused person, which meant that the case needed to 21 be handled either by the national safeguarding adviser 22 or by an adviser at Lambeth Palace. Some cases only 23 involved offering advice to the DSA on a diocesan case 24 but other cases, such as that of Peter Ball, were 25 complex and time consuming. The national safeguarding</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 212</p>

<p>1 adviser would decide which cases they or an adviser at 2 Lambeth Palace should manage, although this was always 3 negotiated with the dioceses involved. I am unable to 4 say how many cases this amounted to, but there were 5 usually a few ongoing at any given time. 6 "Previously, I had had virtually no contact with 7 Reverend Luxon, the then joint national safeguarding 8 adviser, and it would be true to say that I felt in an 9 isolated position, with my only point of contact being 10 Andrew Nunn, who is not a safeguarding professional. 11 The situation improved after the new adviser, 12 Elizabeth Hall, came into post and by 2011, a good 13 working relationship had been formed, with our 14 respective roles to some extent being established. 15 However, this was in some ways a distant working 16 relationship as both Elizabeth and I only worked part 17 time for the Church of England and Elizabeth was often 18 away due to her national role. 19 "The workload significantly increased from 2012 with 20 the investigation into Peter Ball and continued to 21 increase over the next three years with several other 22 complex high-profile cases. From 2013, I often worked 23 on these cases jointly with the new temporary national 24 safeguarding adviser, Jill Sandham. My role evolved 25 over time and involved working closely with the national</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 213</p>	<p>1 Church House) two or three times a week for core group 2 meetings or to meet with smaller groups. At other 3 times, it could be several weeks between visits to 4 Lambeth Palace as all of my work could be conducted 5 remotely via emails, teleconferences or telephone calls 6 during those periods. I had no administrative resources 7 allocated to me and I had no line manager. However, 8 Andrew Nunn assisted me greatly throughout my time at 9 Lambeth, with his immense knowledge of church systems, 10 procedures and personnel and my past cases review work 11 and casework management would have been virtually 12 impossible without this assistance, particularly in the 13 earlier years. 14 "I have concentrated so far on my work at 15 Lambeth Palace, however, since 2009 I have also 16 undertaken safeguarding work for dioceses. 17 "In 2009, I jointly undertook the past cases review 18 in both the dioceses of Southwark and St Albans. 19 "In 2010, for five months I covered the role of DSA 20 in the Diocese of Southwark. This involved taking prime 21 responsibility for and coordinating the response to new 22 and current safeguarding concerns and allegations 23 against church officers in line with diocesan policy; 24 advising and supporting parishes in response to 25 safeguarding concerns and allegations not involving</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 215</p>
<p>1 safeguarding adviser to undertake casework on complex 2 cross-diocesan cases and those involving bishops and 3 other senior figures in the church. As far as I'm 4 aware, Jill Sandham and I dealt with all of the cases 5 involving bishops. However, this approach was an 6 informal working practice that had been introduced in 7 2011 and was not a formalised process, at that time. 8 This involved advising the bishop at Lambeth who in turn 9 advised the archbishop when necessary. As part of my 10 role, I attended core group meetings and statutory 11 authority and police meetings, where relevant. On 12 occasion, I also provided safeguarding advice to DSAs. 13 "In relation to resources that were available to me, 14 it was only in the last couple of months of my time 15 working for Lambeth Palace that a desk and computer were 16 provided for me. Until then, I worked most of the time 17 remotely from my home office, only visiting 18 Lambeth Palace for meetings or to access files; when 19 required, I would also visit other dioceses. The 20 frequency of my visits to Lambeth Palace would vary 21 depending on the type of work I was conducting or the 22 stage that my current case or cases had reached. For 23 example, in the first stages of a complex case or at 24 a significant time during the management of the case, 25 I could be at Lambeth Palace (or Westminster</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 214</p>	<p>1 church officers; assessing positive CRB disclosures 2 including referrals to a risk assessment panel; working 3 with the police and parishes to negotiate new agreements 4 with offenders wishing to attend church; and responding 5 to complex queries regarding implementation of diocesan 6 safeguarding policies. 7 "Since 2010, I have been a safeguarding consultant 8 for the Diocese of Southwark undertaking complex 9 investigations, risk assessments and case and parish 10 reviews. 11 "In 2011, for four months, I covered the role of DSA 12 in the Diocese of Chichester on a part-time basis, which 13 involved managing particular current cases identified by 14 the safeguarding advisory group and any new allegations 15 involving church officers. I was asked to provide 16 a steady influence on safeguarding following the 17 sudden departure of the DSA and the concerns about the 18 lack of adherence to safeguarding procedures by 19 Wallace Benn. I then assisted with some review work in 20 connection with the Clergy Discipline Measure 21 investigation relating to Wallace Benn, also for the 22 Diocese of Chichester. 23 "In 2016, I assisted the national safeguarding team 24 with the past case review screening process. 25 "For a year across 2016 and 2017, I worked as</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 216</p>

1 a safeguarding consultant with the Diocese of Chichester
2 safeguarding team assisting with casework and case
3 review."
4 Chair, I note the time. I wonder if that would be
5 a convenient place to stop for today?
6 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much.
7 MS McCAFFREY: May I invite you, chair, to adjourn now until
8 10.00 am tomorrow?
9 (4.30 pm)
10 (The hearing was adjourned until
11 Friday, 9 March 2018 at 10.00 am)
12
13 I N D E X
14
15
16 ARCHDEACON PHILIP JONES (continued)1
17
18 Examination by MS McNEILL (continued)1
19
20 Questions by THE PANEL28
21
22 MS ALANA LAWRENCE (sworn)35
23
24 Examination by MS SCOLDING35
25

Page 217

1 MR ROGER MEEKINGS (affirmed)99
2
3 Examination by MS McNEILL99
4
5 Questions by THE PANEL155
6
7 Housekeeping162
8
9 CANON IAN GIBSON (sworn)163
10
11 Examination by MS McNEILL163
12
13 Questions by THE PANEL197
14
15 Further examination by MS McNEILL203
16
17 Questions by THE PANEL206
18
19 Statement of MS KATE JUDITH WOOD209
20 (read)
21
22
23
24
25

Page 218

A				
A1 1:20	academic 193:10	ACE026148 112:19	207:16	214:12
A31 122:24	academically 193:11	ACE05487 48:24	additional 141:18	advise 32:19
aberration 70:21	accept 19:10 22:18	achieved 14:16	145:25	advised 137:16,23
ability 10:2 194:22	57:6 125:16	136:10 140:8	address 9:8 44:23	137:24 159:18
able 6:12 13:6 30:3	143:20 153:15	acknowledged	47:13 147:1 162:8	214:9
41:23 43:10,16	188:19 192:22	177:25	addressed 17:11	advisedly 95:10
51:25 60:10,10	access 90:22 106:14	ACN022270_012	18:7 19:5 22:22	adviser 24:15 29:4
62:24 63:21 64:24	120:3,8 175:1,6	129:14	80:10 105:23	39:23 42:15 45:14
80:14 95:23,24	214:18	act 9:16 12:13	106:1 139:11	54:11 55:22 60:1
108:25 109:3	accessing 109:23	35:20 83:3 103:11	146:20	67:16 89:18 90:18
113:24 118:18	accompanied 173:4	133:3,9,10 144:17	addressing 17:17	95:8 102:1 105:17
127:14 152:15	200:5,10,11,25	154:11,12	adequate 191:15	120:3 132:2 134:1
154:25 203:21	account 16:24	acted 101:25	192:14	134:18 146:24
absence 10:11	52:14 127:20	acting 60:1 135:16	adhere 30:9	156:12 167:21
absolute 33:21 34:1	136:19 139:7	135:21 172:11	adherence 13:16	181:9 184:24
absolutely 15:3	154:25	196:10	216:18	187:16 188:7,17
18:15 27:17 31:6	accountability	action 10:16 38:3	adjourn 217:7	198:5 211:2 212:5
68:21 76:4 79:2	141:22 147:18	40:2 65:10 103:18	adjourned 217:10	212:21,22 213:1,1
83:5 90:13 98:5	accountable 143:12	111:11 115:3	adjournment 100:9	213:8,11,24 214:1
104:16 118:4	accounts 127:23	116:13 132:3	121:15	adviser's 141:21
119:6 140:20	130:9	137:7,23 138:7	adjunct 178:25	advisers 168:2,3
141:11 164:12	accumulated 49:13	139:2,6,10 150:2	admin 188:2	212:8
173:11	accuracy 5:8	153:16 154:5	191:21	advisers/commis...
absolution 15:23	126:22 130:12	158:16 173:4,14	administration	64:5 65:7 78:12
absolve 84:24	186:16 187:9	actions 48:20 65:8	195:21 211:13	advising 214:8
abuse 36:9 39:8	188:19	78:18 119:16	administrative	215:24
40:6,14,19 43:2,7	accusation 157:9	148:17 171:23	165:24 166:2	advisory 11:7
44:1 52:22 55:5	157:12 176:5,24	active 36:16 172:15	215:6	26:10 64:12 148:4
55:12,13 56:17	207:23	172:24	admission 116:11	212:15 216:14
57:3,22 58:20	accused 212:20	actively 43:14	admit 59:25 193:14	advocate 37:13
59:10 73:1,4,5,6	ACE 65:5	activity 22:12	admitted 4:20 6:6	advocating 135:18
74:6 75:16,18	ACE005487_174	actual 94:24,25	116:2	135:21
78:4 84:3 85:4	49:24	167:2,4	adopted 52:14	affair 63:3
93:25 94:10,12,25	ACE005487_178	acute 138:8	adoption 103:12	affect 58:3 63:7
94:25 95:2 96:18	75:14	adapted 14:25	148:6	81:4
104:3 116:24	ACE022267 138:20	add 26:25 27:4	adults 18:3 37:2	affiliations 17:8
154:11 210:7,8,17	ACE022267_375	153:23 189:8	93:24 94:4	affirmed 99:2
210:17,24,24	31:14	197:14	advance 123:10,20	218:1
abused 37:1 40:6	ACE023515_005	added 33:20	129:1 191:4	afoot 10:13
42:11 45:3 46:7	3:13	addendum 1:18	adverse 22:25	afraid 159:25
62:23 71:12 94:15	ACE023553_002	101:1,1 105:24	adversely 12:11	207:22
abusers 95:21	146:7	118:6,11 119:10	132:20	afternoon 99:4
abuses 73:7	ACE023815 24:9	119:19,23 121:3	advertised 83:24	100:10,15 163:10
abusing 114:18	ACE025951 209:15	addition 2:11 18:16	advice 146:2 182:9	age 52:24 62:13
		107:25 164:7,14	212:6,7,9,23	63:3,9

agency 66:5	65:9 68:13,14	215:8	anticipate 11:24	194:1
agenda 56:7,8	69:19 71:19 79:17	ANG000130 118:7	186:7	appointing 143:10
138:16 191:3,4	85:4 87:20 88:4	ANG000138	antiwoman 20:25	appointment 29:7
agendas 138:13	89:19 94:6,9,11	118:11	21:3	29:10 101:24
ages 63:13	97:14 116:24	ANG000143	anybody 9:1 12:3	102:2,23 111:18
ago 19:12 20:14	117:5 176:4 183:8	149:17	100:11 133:17	151:24 198:18,22
21:6 74:16,16,17	183:9,9 211:7	ANG000147	173:16,19 174:11	199:6,7,9
141:8	215:22,25 216:14	144:10	193:16 202:18	appointments
agree 21:3 72:16	alleged 53:21 75:16	ANG000149	206:25	191:19
92:5,8 104:15	allocated 215:7	111:22 115:9	anymore 38:12	appoints 154:14
135:13 158:1	allow 10:6 58:7	ANG000167_017	83:16 85:7,8	appreciate 30:3
178:20 181:18	154:22	107:13	anyone's 8:14	33:22 200:24
agreed 10:21 40:11	allowed 38:13	ANG000178	anyway 31:15	approach 11:25
92:12 138:4 146:3	43:22 47:7 85:16	123:15	39:14 47:5 75:2	14:7 15:8,9,13
187:6 199:20	86:23 95:22	ANG000179 127:7	78:15 87:11 92:11	17:7,23,23 29:21
agreement 138:10	128:20 151:23	158:23 160:2	apart 70:20 182:22	30:4,11,22 137:24
155:6,14	178:25 179:9,18	ANG000182_001	apologise 118:8	139:2 146:14
agreements 88:9	199:15	161:8	121:24 124:18	157:11 206:2
216:3	allows 71:18	ANG000183	136:13,16 137:1	214:5
ahead 134:3 136:6	alluvial 61:10	109:10	203:18	approached 59:14
Aid 41:18	alongside 45:8	ANG000210 99:16	appalling 22:14	132:4
aim 14:8 49:3	207:24 208:2	ANG000223-1	appallingly 22:17	approaching 12:3
aimed 60:15	alternative 4:18	35:25	apparent 34:18	appropriate 10:7
aims 25:4 49:4,21	alternatives 195:5	Angela 25:13,19,23	212:16	29:22 64:14 85:10
55:11 56:19	amazing 54:13	162:11 163:2	apparently 88:15	93:4 94:4,6 95:7
Akerman 31:17,18	amend 62:16	Anglican 82:21	appear 161:12,13	153:16 158:16
32:12	amended 36:11	86:21	appeared 44:2	appropriately
Alana 35:9,12	62:15 80:7 175:9	Anglo 14:1 16:12	129:17 150:16	17:18 21:11,12
217:22	amendments 81:19	82:20 126:1	151:11	41:23 83:24 133:7
alarm 187:5	176:16	181:24	appears 7:14 33:18	approximately
Albans 215:18	amicable 155:22	announced 34:10	141:1 147:18	179:13
albeit 194:22	amount 76:4,6	177:20	158:18	April 146:10 159:4
196:13	154:7 164:15	annual 38:16	appendices 135:7	160:3 161:9
align 55:10	179:13	annually 90:8	appendix 107:13	archbishop 23:13
alive 44:20 66:6	amounted 213:4	anonymised 54:19	application 30:7	211:13 214:9
all-church 82:17	amounts 49:13	90:8	applied 7:9,11,14	archbishop's
allegation 2:8	AN-A37 132:4	anonymous 48:11	29:15 93:17 95:23	173:22
30:11 43:18 65:23	analyse 69:11	53:23,24	applies 82:25 87:13	Archbishops'
73:15 74:2,3	anathema 196:14	another's 16:10	apply 14:15 29:6	204:11
80:18 81:18 85:20	and/or 25:13 39:5	answer 80:11	43:10 70:21 93:18	archdeacon 1:3,7
112:2 127:2,3	45:8 48:20 54:3	106:16 151:8	96:12	1:24 2:19 3:5,11
162:3 183:19	66:7,7,8	178:20 192:19	appoint 96:8	16:19 22:13 24:9
208:5	Andrade 76:14	197:13 203:22	appointed 24:19	24:21 28:6,20
allegations 2:12	Andrew 211:12	answering 128:15	25:20 96:9 100:18	30:16 35:4 115:14
30:5 40:1 62:25	212:9,15 213:10	answers 124:13	180:2 181:21	116:3 123:5

135:14 137:9	Arranging 5:19	80:5 82:12 87:21	authority 13:5 85:6	36:2,23 101:11
138:19 142:8,12	arrest 120:2 200:14	216:9	153:14,17 180:19	193:9,10,24
143:1,4,10,11,14	arrested 11:18	assist 1:19 3:15,19	214:11	backgrounds 37:1
145:5 147:20	arrive 150:12	13:6 27:2 105:1	available 49:14	backwards 135:1
157:22 180:10	arrived 169:6	153:23 197:16	137:7 206:22	bad 50:22 57:3,7
181:10 182:1,3,4	180:5	assistance 215:12	208:12 214:13	161:1 173:9
195:13 217:16	articulated 87:6	assistant 166:12	average 95:2	badly 22:15,17
archdeacons 8:10	aside 11:15,22 12:5	assisted 215:8	avoiding 16:2	bail 125:12
33:6 166:7 190:2	12:12 133:6	216:19,23	award 152:16	balance 30:8 31:10
192:4 194:10	asked 1:13 16:19	assisting 3:8 217:2	aware 2:9 10:16	53:3 78:16 79:12
199:24	24:7 34:20 44:10	associate 117:9	28:15,16 31:10	95:22 181:23
Archepiscopal	45:21,22,23 48:5	associated 148:3	65:24 104:22	Ball 70:18 76:11
10:18 177:19	51:11 52:6,9	157:23	112:13,14 115:25	107:20 112:1,8,9
archiving 170:15	67:13 90:23	association 146:2	120:10 124:7	112:10,13,14,22
area 1:16,24 5:19	119:11 120:20	assumed 39:25	134:13,15 140:14	113:22 114:3,25
6:3 23:19 104:22	121:18 125:3	assumption 134:22	147:7 153:14	115:2 117:9
108:23 109:16	135:23,23 143:19	172:11	158:7,8 160:15	121:21 122:1,2
120:6 124:3	144:10 148:7,9	assurance 145:13	162:10 163:1	175:12,15,16,21
128:21 152:15	149:6 157:6 166:9	assuring 93:14	183:7 188:4 198:7	175:22 176:1
166:6 170:20	171:5 174:25	attached 7:2 33:22	198:8 200:4 214:4	212:24 213:20
171:5,10,11,12	175:25 180:12	146:9	awareness 127:16	Baptist 13:21
174:7 179:8,13,22	185:12 186:9,11	attempt 65:2	200:9	Baroness 1:13,25
179:23 180:1,3,7	186:23 187:6	attempts 44:16	awful 208:3	2:16 3:6 5:8
180:17 181:22	190:20 203:18,22	attend 53:11 216:4		20:23 50:15 53:10
182:5 184:19,21	211:7 216:15	attended 41:1	B	149:4 186:8
189:14 190:1,7,14	asking 99:22 129:1	202:16 214:10	b 7:20	barring 20:9 85:11
190:17 194:9	130:12 189:4	attention 22:25	B1 209:16	barrister 36:4
areas 120:24 121:2	201:22	107:11 114:9	B8 172:25	base 102:16
123:11 138:14	aspect 151:9	115:5 150:21	baby 193:25	baseline 46:3
147:21 153:21	181:10 182:7	152:13 185:7	back 3:19 4:4 16:16	basic 193:1
180:25 190:1,6	183:18	attitude 181:5	23:5 24:4 26:5	basically 37:19
195:14	aspects 10:20 126:2	attitudes 14:22	35:18 43:2 49:6	47:4 119:18
argument 31:4	146:17	20:14 23:9	50:13 60:5 61:11	160:12 180:18
arisen 19:20	assault 116:4	attracted 152:1	66:13 70:8 76:24	181:4 190:7
arising 127:22	assess 74:14	attractive 27:15	92:14,17 93:11,15	191:20
136:1 189:3	assessed 28:9	attracts 194:4	98:18 104:6	basis 38:17 87:25
194:21 203:19	assesses 96:17	audit 45:10 89:21	108:18 115:8	143:21 156:21
206:13	assessing 16:25	154:22	122:10 125:6	166:17 171:2
arose 10:5 15:2	17:24 71:18 93:14	auditing 93:13	127:11,12,23	192:6,6 216:12
156:3 188:2	210:12 216:1	audits 90:2	129:22 141:5	BBC 5:7 143:17
arrange 11:15	assessment 17:1,7	augmented 192:13	148:22 158:17	Bearing 63:5
arranged 50:14	18:16,19 24:5	authorities 25:16	180:8 184:17	114:23
arrangement 89:11	29:9 30:10,13	26:2,12 28:10	187:4 189:1 195:7	becoming 34:18
arrangements	80:9,18 216:2	44:20 65:6 82:7	background 13:19	139:20
141:22	assessments 52:19	103:9	29:10 30:2 31:12	began 53:11 58:25

59:23 60:11 111:2 212:4 beginning 46:20 102:22 114:15 118:5 146:22 begins 141:13 149:23 behalf 32:23 35:10 37:14,17 135:18 143:19 148:10 behaviour 183:20 belief 35:22 99:12 163:21 beliefs 16:10,14 believe 6:24 15:4,6 18:6,20 36:11 38:11 46:18 58:18 68:25 72:20 73:21 106:17 111:2,8 130:5 133:24 150:18 151:21 believed 28:17 44:7 130:19 159:9 believes 84:23 Bell 97:18,22 benchmark 77:18 benefit 42:23 153:7 benefits 141:17 benign 86:14 Benn 2:23 3:2,22 11:25 14:6 30:5 30:24 31:19 83:7 107:23 116:3 120:6 131:9,14 132:5 135:2,4 143:16,23 145:5 150:11 181:8 188:17,18 216:19 216:21 Benn's 3:7 30:11 128:10 best 12:4 35:21 80:15,17 87:25 96:23 99:11 144:18 163:20	better 1:22 7:25 8:18 9:24 18:12 23:6,6,16 48:5 66:11 74:23 88:1 93:16 109:5 125:2 129:13 135:25 141:15 165:12,13 174:22 179:24 182:16 195:1 196:11 beyond 4:23 29:12 30:9 38:20 61:3 66:11 68:22 90:16 90:18 96:10 148:7 187:7 biased 193:8 big 31:24 64:20 103:20 113:11 182:20 196:13 bigger 51:10 bishop 2:7 3:7,18 3:25 4:1,8,11,13 4:17,19 5:4 6:23 7:14 11:4,10,25 12:7,10,19 13:3 13:10 14:6,20 15:25 16:8,20 23:15 24:19 27:21 30:24 33:10 52:1 53:12,14,15 56:4 57:1 60:1 64:19 71:14,19 78:19 80:8 82:18,24 83:6,11,12,21 84:12 88:11 89:3 89:4,9 92:25 97:3 97:18 107:8,23 108:23 110:23 113:16,17 116:3 119:11 120:6,6 122:25 123:4,18 125:9 126:3,6,6 126:17 127:11,24 128:4,10,18,20,21 128:23 129:24	130:7,10 131:4,9 131:14 132:5 133:16 135:2,4,19 135:20 137:12,14 137:21 138:8,24 142:4,4,8,12,15 143:7,12,16,20,23 144:1,11 145:5 148:10 150:7,11 153:11 156:19 157:2,6,6,18 158:14,19 159:10 159:18 160:12,13 160:14 161:3,7,13 161:21 162:1 164:5 166:16 167:23,23,25 168:4,12 175:16 175:21,24 176:6 178:3,5 179:5,9,9 179:11,13,16,18 179:19,21,21,22 180:2,2,3,4,5,9,19 180:21,21 181:8,8 181:21,25 182:2,4 182:10,24 184:8,9 184:12,12,13 185:8,12,13,14 186:21,21,23 187:1,1,4,6,18,20 187:23 188:14,16 188:19,25 190:5 190:10,13,14,15 190:17 191:6,7 192:2,3,3 193:7 194:8,13 195:12 198:6 200:5,11,16 200:19,25 201:3,7 201:8,12,19,19 202:2,6,7 203:4 203:22 204:1 214:8 bishop's 86:6 111:12 150:15 165:15,22,23	166:4,5 179:7 180:15 190:24,25 191:14,17 192:13 bishopric 180:3 194:1 bishops 8:9 13:15 22:9 47:7 54:17 56:20 74:1 77:25 78:8 80:14 90:12 91:4 92:5,9,10,14 92:16 93:15,16 104:22 105:11 107:7 108:1,4,8 108:23 152:15 166:7 170:20 171:12 181:22 190:1,18 191:7 192:2 193:11,13 193:22,22,25 194:9,10 195:7 199:23 204:5 205:12 214:2,5 bishops' 69:18 78:6 137:6 165:16 175:17,18,20 204:6 bit 14:2 20:16 45:21 50:3 53:20 57:20 59:17 72:6 92:11 95:14 100:2 101:9 111:19 119:8 123:25 125:25 128:5 141:2,2 159:25 167:19 169:7 175:12 196:14 Blackburn 6:23 123:5 blackened 160:21 blank 90:13 blemish 183:25,25 184:1,3,10,13,25 207:23 blemished 131:23 183:13,15 184:4	184:17,22 185:3 185:15 186:22 187:15 188:1,11 197:23 198:1,4,16 198:21 199:2,8,19 200:7,18,21 201:2 201:9 blessed 70:18 blew 6:8 blood 94:17 blue 104:17 108:19 109:15 110:1,24 111:9 116:15 118:19 119:24 120:4,8,15 128:3 152:16 166:22 168:21 169:2,16 169:22 170:1,8,9 170:19,24 171:14 174:23 175:1,5,7 175:14,18,21 176:10,11 183:11 188:11 203:23 204:23 206:6,11 207:2,3,6,17,24 208:2,4 blurb 49:5 blurring 63:4,8,10 63:13 84:3 blurry 86:25 blush 173:9 board 22:6 58:12 87:13 95:17,19 105:16 177:21 bodies 91:22 body 91:13 92:20 93:1,6 95:14,15 96:22 154:19 body/place 90:11 bogged 149:21 bold 64:3 bored 47:20 born 153:9 borne 16:18 bottom 3:16 75:15
--	--	---	--	---

115:10 141:12 146:21,23 160:1 160:16 171:17 185:25 boundaries 63:4 84:3 bounds 187:7 box 3:16 4:4,13 83:15 127:10 boxes 83:16 boy 115:20 116:5 brain 156:25 brave 70:24 breach 62:9,14 break 66:16,17,23 100:15 119:21 162:17,18,19,22 breakdown 201:18 Brede 5:23 Brian 113:16,20 117:11 118:1 121:21 176:20 177:6 brief 13:6 165:13 briefed 143:16 briefly 113:19 Brighton 190:7,8 210:9 brilliant 77:8,8 bring 29:11 62:25 95:22,23,24 142:23 146:1 168:18 181:11 204:3 bringing 118:9 brings 87:16 Britain 38:4 40:4 broad 49:21 182:1 brought 11:9 25:15 27:11 65:23 70:3 77:13,15 96:17 98:1 101:11 107:11 144:4 173:15 185:7 building 73:17	128:19 166:15 197:3 bullet 124:5 146:23 147:11,14,15 bundle 1:21 3:14 24:10 48:25 118:8 123:25 124:14 129:12 138:21,22 146:8 149:17 185:18,21 209:9,9 209:16 burden 30:8 burning 86:16 Bursell 174:17 business 145:14 Butler 53:14 55:14 55:17,25 56:4,10 57:11 Butler-Sloss 1:13 20:23 50:15,25 51:5 52:11 53:10 149:4,12 177:23 186:8,11 202:3 208:11 Butler-Sloss's 1:25 2:16 3:6 5:8 <hr/> C <hr/> c'est 74:7 ca 74:7 CAAG 27:10 cabinet 176:9 CAFOD 41:18 Cahill 90:20 call 41:18 44:14 46:17 47:25 50:11 61:9 71:1 122:24 132:5 150:22 165:21 193:25 199:13 205:23 called 13:13 37:6 58:13 75:24 87:18 153:11 162:2 165:22 188:21,23 190:18 201:18	207:17 209:9 calls 38:18,22,24 70:1 215:5 campaign 55:5,13 65:23 campaigning 46:4 Canberra 189:24 candidate 18:9 canon 15:15 116:21 116:22 162:11,14 163:8,11,14,15 164:4,8 172:25 174:17 182:25 183:1,14 185:3 195:13 197:22 200:23 203:21 208:17 218:9 canons 93:1 Canterbury 23:14 211:14 canvassed 12:8 capable 103:18 care 45:5 53:25 67:20 68:23,24 79:11 114:19 166:14,16 190:9 205:6 career 36:3 careful 152:1 carefully 154:6 cares 98:3 carried 104:14 114:11 122:17 146:19 149:3 181:14 carry 20:2 78:21 119:11 125:15 174:25 carrying 103:15 134:20 167:3 case 7:19,20 9:14 10:5 17:25 44:19 47:22 48:15 50:20 51:7 54:18 70:16 70:17,19 71:8	74:19 76:9,11,22 77:13,14,15 85:18 88:19 89:23 96:19 97:23,24 105:14 108:19 111:22 112:7 120:7 136:17 154:22 165:20 181:11 182:5 183:18 189:7,18 194:9 201:3 206:5 212:18,19,20,23 214:22,23,24 216:9,24 217:2 cases 17:21 39:12 39:19 46:5,11,19 46:22,25 47:2,4,6 52:1 56:21 73:17 73:25 77:3,4 78:24 79:14 80:21 81:11,22 84:3 85:19,19 93:21 94:3,19 95:2,14 95:22 96:17 97:4 97:8,11,12,21 98:10,11 100:19 100:23 101:6 102:24 103:7 104:13 105:8,8 106:3,25 107:2,10 108:14,15,20,23 111:20,23 114:1 115:2,22,25 116:13 119:12 122:2 140:2 143:8 152:4 154:21 158:12 167:6 174:21 175:1 178:19 193:1 202:22 207:1 210:12 211:17,20 212:22,24 213:1,4 213:22,23 214:2,4 214:22 215:10,17 216:13	casework 214:1 215:11 217:2 cast 137:15 categorically 180:6 category 41:16 cathedral 104:4,9 164:9 166:7 Catholic 14:1 15:22 54:25 82:20 86:20 90:6 92:13 102:5 126:1 181:24 182:1,2 Catholics 16:12 cause 54:1 72:21 106:17 caused 156:10 180:15 181:12 causing 89:12 caution 112:4 cautioned 200:13 CDM 11:3,10,16 12:1 31:19 cease 155:21 199:12 ceased 125:23 155:18,18 celebrate 3:3 cent 68:8,17 70:25 87:24 94:9,23 172:3,6,7,8,15,18 173:8 196:8 203:11,14 central 78:3 89:20 207:13 centralising 190:4 centrally 195:25 centre 5:11 certain 89:15 108:14,23 114:2 176:23 181:5,6,7 186:12 196:8 203:14,14 212:16 certainly 21:6 36:22 44:9 46:8 69:9 80:14 82:5
--	--	--	---	---

85:1 87:14 89:3 109:23 121:2 126:10 136:8 144:23 150:8 174:11,15 178:3 194:17 196:2 202:10,15 204:18 certainty 33:21 34:1 cessation 152:15 cetera 26:19,20 72:2,2 chain 66:2 68:23 69:2,20 168:9 chair 1:4,6,20 3:13 10:24 18:18 24:9 26:24 27:2,4 28:3 28:6,12,15,19 29:25 31:21 33:8 35:4,6,7,9 36:13 39:10 48:24 49:24 55:24 62:11 66:15 66:17 90:22 98:13 98:15,18,21,25 99:16,22 100:12 103:12 118:7 119:19 121:7,17 121:20 122:13 123:24 124:18 127:7 129:13 136:13,24 138:20 146:7 149:17 150:5 151:18 153:19 154:1 155:1,4,9,12,16 155:20 156:3 162:5,8,18,20,24 163:7,25 174:17 177:12 185:21 197:15,19,22 198:12,19 199:16 199:18,21,25 201:16 202:20 203:17 204:8 206:12 208:16,17	208:19 209:1,5,7 209:12,20 217:4,6 217:7 chaired 31:17 chairman 32:12,21 34:21 challenge 153:16 challenges 28:22 challenging 103:17 146:17 chance 99:14 113:18 change 27:6 29:20 30:23 31:25 32:4 33:12 56:6 57:24 58:1 68:16 74:7 75:3 88:23,23 94:14 147:19 177:18 180:4 changed 21:7 74:11 97:16 115:1 161:25 167:14 changes 21:25 22:2 27:8 29:19 93:7 138:6 165:5 170:16 changing 56:6 chaos 84:2,2,9 chaplain 164:4,22 165:15 179:5 chaplain's 166:1 chaplains 165:16 chapter 44:14,14 character 17:8 characteristics 17:10,24 charge 166:18 169:9 charged 200:6 201:1 chat 66:20 check 19:14,24 20:5,16,20 102:12 172:4,5 174:2 189:7	checked 19:25 130:19 checks 10:8 19:1,3 19:21 20:15,18 110:14 111:16 167:3,4 173:14 174:7 206:8 cherry 146:15 Chichester 16:11 20:25 22:3 24:13 33:10 46:21 47:1 51:12,24 56:12 63:13 76:1,8,16 76:17 77:1,17 85:20 86:19 100:19 101:25 102:6 112:12 113:16,23 122:3 138:24 150:15 151:2,23 152:8,20 153:1 164:9 175:15 178:11 189:17,24 190:8,9 194:9 196:3 216:12,22 217:1 chief 142:4 165:21 child 2:4 55:5,13 56:17 57:22 64:6 74:6,19,24 84:3 85:4 88:4 95:2 104:3 116:24 117:10 120:2 210:6,7,9,13,17 210:24 childhood 40:7 children 3:1 18:2 19:10,13 37:2 53:2 63:5 71:11 74:10 89:12 93:23 94:15 146:18 210:11 children's 63:10 101:16 choirmaster 98:3 chose 74:8	Christian 14:12 36:25 41:18 50:6 50:9 Christians 154:15 Christmas 192:9 Christopher 11:18 chronological 100:14 chronology 2:3 7:23 119:7 122:11 129:9,12,23 130:7 130:11,14,19 134:3 church 10:25 16:10 19:16 21:18 25:4 26:11 31:25 37:12 37:18,24,25 38:8 38:10,10 39:6,6 39:14,21,22,22 40:1,14 41:21 43:2,6,7,8,11,13 43:14,15,15,19 44:1,2,15 45:2,6 46:16,23 47:25 50:5,6,24 52:17 53:12 54:10,25 55:5,13,19,21,22 55:23,23 56:2,17 57:13,21,22 58:10 58:20,23 59:8,10 60:9,21 61:1,3,18 61:19 63:16 64:11 64:17 65:18,25 67:2,14,16,17,20 68:22,23 69:2,17 70:12 72:15 73:17 75:1,7 77:24 78:5 78:15,20 80:2,6 82:21,22 83:4 84:6,7,17,17 85:14 86:3,10,20 86:21 88:3,14,20 89:13 90:6,13,24 91:15,20 92:6,13 92:20 93:5 94:10	96:4,7,11,20 97:2 97:10,20,24 98:6 102:5,7 111:9 137:17 142:10,16 144:19 154:3,5,13 154:20 155:24 165:5 167:5 174:8 189:21 192:21 194:4,13,20 196:7 197:7,7,9 198:9 210:25 211:3,3,5 211:7,16 213:17 214:3 215:1,9,23 216:1,4,15 church's 45:25 58:7 61:7 church/religious 64:7 churches 37:10 38:2,4,6 40:3,5,7 49:14 50:7 56:21 63:23 74:1 79:15 79:22 83:17 84:6 96:13,14 cipher 122:24 circle 23:5 circulate 130:7 circulated 129:23 136:11 138:11 202:24 203:3,13 circumstance 28:15 82:24 circumstances 1:17 15:13 137:20 185:6 civil 30:7 31:10 33:24 clarification 24:7 121:19,25 clarified 122:10 clarifies 26:23 clarify 20:13 24:25 28:8 174:18 197:23 clarifying 200:22
--	---	--	--	--

<p>clarity 55:17 168:8 207:20</p> <p>clash 41:25 180:23</p> <p>clean 15:7</p> <p>clear 1:12 5:3 17:13 21:8 22:5 31:6 52:25 53:1 58:6 65:15 81:1 86:3 87:14 95:6 104:25 105:5,11 112:4 118:14 126:25 127:12 128:25 131:6 137:4 139:20 140:2 141:20 148:25 161:18,19 199:16 212:5</p> <p>clearances 171:22</p> <p>clearer 161:16</p> <p>clearly 51:21 68:21 111:6 138:16 143:15 161:20 205:8</p> <p>clergy 8:13 19:8 22:6,16 23:20 30:6 36:9 37:2 40:19 62:15,21 63:19 67:3,16 80:8 84:14 94:5 107:9,9 108:15 154:24 165:6 168:14,18 172:15 172:16,20 173:23 174:2 191:23,23 192:22,25 193:9 195:9,17 196:10 204:5 207:2,10,10 216:20</p> <p>clergy's 85:24</p> <p>clergyman 207:13</p> <p>cleric 64:8,9</p> <p>clerical 148:4 166:12 170:11</p> <p>Cleveland 51:9</p> <p>clever 68:19 72:25</p>	<p>climate 55:9 151:22</p> <p>Clive 24:21</p> <p>close 152:3</p> <p>closely 212:8 213:25</p> <p>closing 140:6</p> <p>clubs 62:17</p> <p>coach 84:4</p> <p>codes 94:4</p> <p>Coles 83:6 115:13 116:2</p> <p>Coles' 115:18</p> <p>Colin 6:11 27:22 76:18 101:4,7 112:7 115:22 120:21 122:12 132:8,9,13 152:4</p> <p>collaborating 191:15</p> <p>collate 89:18 90:7</p> <p>collated 50:17 93:11</p> <p>collation 90:3</p> <p>colleague 6:10</p> <p>colleagues 137:21 162:14 163:5 203:20 206:13</p> <p>college 17:4 18:8</p> <p>column 4:6</p> <p>combination 139:6</p> <p>come 6:3 8:17 9:11 10:25 19:23 25:11 26:6 27:25 31:15 37:9,11 42:15 44:7 47:23 50:13 50:16,18,25 51:19 53:18 54:2,21 58:23 59:24 66:13 70:8 71:23 72:10 73:24 78:6 81:15 93:24 94:4,10,10 94:23 104:6 109:24 150:20 184:5,8 193:8 195:25 196:23</p>	<p>198:8 200:9</p> <p>comes 4:9 71:7 81:5 81:10 174:19 183:17</p> <p>coming 5:6 10:23 13:1 33:3 41:15 43:7 46:16 47:13 68:13 71:19 76:11 77:23 81:11 86:17 89:15 93:11 97:12 97:13 152:14 174:11,17 202:2 203:7 205:19</p> <p>command 168:9</p> <p>commands 13:17</p> <p>commas 14:10</p> <p>commence 211:10</p> <p>commenced 211:15</p> <p>comment 4:7 18:19 25:7 33:17 44:10 130:17 152:24 208:1</p> <p>commented 10:20</p> <p>comments 3:9,17 3:21 4:2 126:9 128:10 132:18 149:15,19,23,24 151:3,6 156:18 185:15</p> <p>commerce 192:25</p> <p>commercial 193:16</p> <p>commissaries 10:19 173:23</p> <p>Commission 51:8,9</p> <p>commissioning 155:5</p> <p>commitment 211:25</p> <p>committed 84:25</p> <p>committee 36:8 45:20</p> <p>common 19:20</p> <p>communicant 82:22</p> <p>communication</p>	<p>88:25 179:2,6 180:14,24 195:20</p> <p>communications 80:1 212:10</p> <p>communion 3:3 4:22</p> <p>community 73:16 73:19 82:20 114:8 195:8</p> <p>complacency 46:18</p> <p>complainant 122:24 132:4</p> <p>complaint 11:3,9 11:10 30:17 31:19</p> <p>complaints 11:5</p> <p>complete 154:24 176:24</p> <p>completed 145:9 211:11</p> <p>completely 14:12 17:13 96:6 136:16</p> <p>completeness' 31:18 208:10</p> <p>completion 122:11</p> <p>complex 210:12 212:25 213:22 214:1,23 216:5,8</p> <p>complexities 95:6</p> <p>complexity 212:18</p> <p>computer 214:15</p> <p>concentrated 215:14</p> <p>concern 46:11 52:2 52:3,25 55:1 67:25 69:7,12,15 111:20 117:7 142:10 151:12 154:21</p> <p>concerned 2:24 15:4 16:4 18:1 21:22 26:14 47:10 47:12 63:7 109:21 125:12 126:24 134:5 138:12 141:24,25 142:1</p>	<p>146:13 170:25 173:5,10,18 175:17 178:2 182:6 195:10 200:16 205:5</p> <p>concerning 50:19</p> <p>concerns 5:8,11,16 7:25 8:6 9:8 20:24 21:2 24:5 24:20 25:14 26:1 26:11,16 44:12 111:24 114:12 117:17,23 118:2 141:10,14 142:23 143:2 144:12 145:4 147:5 150:9 157:4 212:17 215:22,25 216:17</p> <p>conclude 132:23 189:4 208:20 209:6</p> <p>concluded 129:15 132:8 153:18 163:5</p> <p>concludes 150:22 197:12</p> <p>concluding 28:7</p> <p>conclusion 73:24 111:13 114:17 131:12 156:22 157:7 181:18 186:20</p> <p>conclusions 104:7 104:10 109:13 113:23 115:1,3 131:9 136:1 143:22 181:15</p> <p>condition 10:10</p> <p>conditions 7:2,3,9 7:14,21</p> <p>conduct 1:13 29:1 94:5</p> <p>conducted 113:20 215:4</p> <p>conducting 206:23</p>
--	--	---	---	--

<p>214:21 confessing 84:15 confession 15:23 82:19,23,23 83:9 83:23 84:1,8,22 84:23 confessional 82:16 82:25 83:3,9,14 83:22 84:1,13 confessionals 84:7 confidence 144:24 205:8 confident 126:21 confidential 105:24 118:6,11 119:10 119:19,23 121:3 204:5 205:9 confines 66:11 confirm 6:13 99:5 99:10 130:12 163:10,19,23 confirmation 190:21 205:12 confirmations 165:19 confirmed 3:9 6:14 6:17 34:22 conflict 36:19 64:22 143:1,13 154:17 conflicted 65:1 conflicts 25:4 confrontational 29:21 confused 7:4,5 39:18,18 124:19 confusing 201:14 207:8 confusion 36:20 150:17 166:3 congregation 67:11 72:18,19 connected 48:19 212:11 connection 118:24</p>	<p>216:20 Conquest 6:18 conscious 66:14 consciousness 72:14 consensual 63:3 consent 62:13 63:9 consequence 58:18 consequently 180:9 180:23 conservative 13:4,9 14:5,23 15:10 16:12 consider 12:3 39:13 41:4 61:4 102:8 137:17 151:2 153:25 considerable 27:9 considerably 81:13 158:5 consideration 1:25 11:12 27:3 158:13 194:23 199:6 considered 11:25 32:13 34:11 55:21 63:3 111:23 116:4 120:18 147:10 194:19 196:13 206:10 208:20 211:7 considering 10:12 53:2 considers 80:8 consisted 166:6 175:24 212:15 consistency 91:19 110:11 consistent 26:3 constable 210:8 constant 56:22 constrained 121:4 constraints 60:17 consultant 101:22 164:20 210:2 211:23 216:7</p>	<p>217:1 consulting 180:20 consuming 102:24 212:25 contact 3:1 5:19 6:4 89:14 103:1 135:12 148:5 155:21 167:22 213:6,9 contacted 6:16 38:19 49:8 149:12 211:11,12 contain 205:4 contemporaneous 123:7 158:23 186:4 content 163:14 contention 132:16 contents 46:8 176:2 176:3 context 49:17 51:12 54:4 65:18 67:2 68:5 72:15 76:1 90:21 196:24,25 continual 195:11 continuation 202:1 continue 34:11 47:8 59:21 70:21 85:16 144:22 145:18 continued 1:3,5 2:25 38:20 142:2 155:16 213:20 217:16,18 continues 79:3 continuing 22:4 156:1 193:21 205:5 continuity 77:5,6 contract 211:24 contracted' 211:23 contracts 212:1 contradictory 52:12 contrast 15:22</p>	<p>control 8:15 78:1 149:1 194:11 convenient 66:16 121:7 146:15 217:5 conversation 25:24 42:4 51:24 56:25 57:20,21 84:12 90:14 91:2 92:18 111:2 159:23 160:2,10,20 161:7 161:17 185:19,22 187:3,5,22 188:13 188:22,24 200:19 201:25 202:12 conversations 56:15 57:24 58:18 58:21 60:14 93:10 convey 141:3 convicted 15:12,19 85:15 117:10 150:7 conviction 2:4,9 4:12 15:2,5 118:20,22 119:5 119:24 120:11 124:3,7 127:1,4 127:16 128:1 129:2,17,25 130:23 131:10,15 131:24 150:2 156:23 157:8,11 158:20 160:15 161:12 162:1 convictions 154:17 cooperative 108:25 109:2 coordinating 215:21 COPCA 90:6 cope 77:12 copies 100:8 170:25 copy 123:24 124:1 129:21 133:14,17 133:21 134:2</p>	<p>136:21 137:13,14 139:1 147:4,6 155:12 156:8 209:9,15 core 97:17,19 99:21 99:23 106:12 121:9 214:10 215:1 corner 160:17 corporate 133:3 correct 36:5,6,10 36:11,15 37:3,7 99:9 100:20,21,22 102:3 105:10 108:5 110:20 111:24,25 119:12 120:5,9,13,16 122:18 123:2 131:1 132:1,12 139:4 148:13 151:12 155:15 164:19,21 184:21 184:23 188:5 corrected 23:2 87:19 143:5 correction 121:19 corrections 149:19 correspondence 112:12,21 Cotton 2:1,3,11,25 4:9 5:4,12,20 6:2 6:4,17 7:5,6,11 34:19 51:25 101:4 101:7 115:22 120:14,25 122:12 122:16,25 124:4 126:14,17 128:1 129:16 137:13 150:5 152:4 156:19 157:6,7,10 157:18 160:11 161:23,25 162:2 202:23 Cotton's 4:20 7:2 118:19 120:2,7</p>
--	---	--	--	---

127:16 131:10,20 131:23 157:4 Cotton/Colin 106:7 Cotton/Pritchard 139:8 council 19:16 101:17 137:6 148:3 197:7 204:11 counselling 37:16 count 112:24 countries 68:8,8 country 37:18 46:11 74:7 96:13 179:10 County 101:17 148:3 couple 20:22 41:1 48:9 106:11 107:19 113:3 140:21 146:11 214:14 courage 70:8,15 courageously 71:1 course 1:7 3:8 12:12 16:21,23 17:4 22:24 34:21 35:7 52:16 57:5 61:22 76:8,16 82:1 90:11 91:6 95:18 96:1 102:20 116:25 136:23 144:21 153:11 157:21 166:15 172:24 179:4 189:1 194:13 200:7 203:19 209:22 courses 210:21 court 71:16 73:17 74:2 79:24 80:16 99:21 112:7 116:22 124:8 129:17 140:1 183:4	courts 79:11 cover 105:2 138:16 167:10 covered 21:16 24:22 172:13 174:9,10 197:17 206:5 215:19 216:11 covers 25:19 144:7 CP 136:13 CRB 19:1,3,6 110:14,17,18 111:3,5,7,15 166:25 171:21 172:4 174:2,7,11 174:12 184:11 185:15 186:22 187:15 198:25 200:7,18,21 201:2 201:4,9 206:8 216:1 CRB/DBS 184:7 CRBs 206:10 create 93:9 141:19 creature 58:13 85:9 92:4 credible 65:8 71:21 85:4 crime 210:15 crimes 210:11 criminal 30:9 33:25 63:1,11 78:13,14 78:21 79:10 183:21 185:1 210:5,21 crises 154:2 crisis 86:12 criteria 47:2,3 199:16 critical 27:18 131:3 criticised 47:6 143:8 criticising 30:24 criticism 47:5 131:6	Crockfords 170:11 170:14 crops 117:11 cross-diocesan 214:2 crucially 53:6 Cry 44:11 48:22 49:2 52:12 53:9 53:22 54:21 61:14 81:20 90:10 crystal 31:6 CSSA 40:9 cultural 31:25 48:14 56:5 181:15 182:15 189:2 culture 20:25 21:4 21:5 33:13 34:12 34:13,14,16 41:24 58:1 151:22 152:7 152:19 154:11 Cumberlege 51:8 92:13 curacy 17:5 current 20:14 34:12 61:16 93:17 93:23 152:8 171:21 173:16 174:2,4,5,6 207:10 214:22 215:22 216:13 currently 38:6,24 44:3 60:20 62:3,9 62:12 85:11 103:11 152:22 curriculum 194:18 curve 31:8 cuts 73:13 cutting 3:11 cuttings 176:3	110:18 database 154:21 date 20:6 173:15 186:2,3,6,13 204:23 dated 3:22 99:8 146:9 209:24 dates 6:14 David 55:15,18 56:10,16 day 9:9 28:1,16 29:9 33:9 54:12 57:17 95:5 105:7 119:2 132:14 133:20 161:1 185:11 208:20 day-to-day 147:24 DBS 19:6,21,24,25 20:5 85:11 174:12 184:12 198:25 DBS/CRB 183:17 deacon 17:5 dead 54:3 95:21 deal 7:3 23:15 44:6 57:6 58:4,5 79:21 94:3,5,11,12,24 96:23 99:21 100:14 103:16 105:16,17 119:2 190:5 204:12 212:11 dealing 1:10 27:13 29:20 41:10 63:5 90:20 dealings 25:20 deals 1:19 27:6 95:15 dealt 17:22 26:18 26:20,21,22 46:18 82:12,13 97:5 132:21 214:4 dean 10:3 125:1 166:7 deans 194:10 death 74:20 76:12	debate 147:9 decades 49:14 70:6 deceased 170:14 December 133:25 134:4,12 185:25 decide 156:10 213:1 decided 9:4 162:13 deciphering 128:5 decision 32:20 108:6 141:24 163:3 195:23 198:20 decisions 119:17 168:18 199:18 decline 149:8 declined 149:7 deeply 61:11 73:1,2 73:8 defensive 141:5 deficiencies 139:14 define 68:20 defining 84:20 definite 31:6 definitely 72:8 definition 62:20 degree 9:20 153:14 165:3,4 degrees 165:2 Del 25:23,25 26:8 delayed 71:7 delegated 142:6 delegation 141:14 deliberate 111:1 delivering 196:17 delve 101:9 demonstrated 106:9 denominations 50:9 department 68:2 69:15 210:19 departure 216:17 depend 22:24 depending 214:21
D				
D 217:13 danger 79:1 dark 49:9 data 35:20 109:24				

depends 70:22 83:18 174:4	151:22 152:7	diminish 158:5	155:19 157:24	discarded 208:5
describe 40:24 69:20 158:10,11 180:14 189:11	developing 39:7 45:8 60:21	dinner 51:6	158:2 164:14	disciplinary 14:14 22:21 30:19 69:21 71:5,13,24 78:22 103:18
described 14:2 27:18 151:13 157:8,12 158:12 192:14	development 154:18 193:21 195:11 205:6	dinted 74:6	169:18,23 170:10	discipline 30:20 154:24 168:14,18 191:23 216:20
describing 196:18	developments 75:23	diocesan 11:7 12:7 23:15,24 25:20 26:9 29:4,7 64:1,4 64:12 65:6 78:11 91:1,17 102:1 107:3,8 108:22 132:2 134:1,18 162:12 166:8 167:20 168:2,5 171:18 179:11,24 180:21,21 181:9 184:24 187:15 188:6,16 190:13 193:13 212:8,23 215:23 216:5	171:21 172:11,18 172:19,22 173:24 174:11 175:15,22 177:18 179:3,10 179:14,15,18 180:11,13,23 181:4,14,16 183:2 186:25 187:7,11 187:14 188:5 189:3,9,10,15,17 189:18,21,22,23 190:16,23 193:23 196:3 205:3,22,24 207:14 212:13 215:20 216:8,12 216:22 217:1	disciplined 92:25
desperately 114:19	died 74:24 95:21 169:18	Diocesan/religious 82:7	diocese's 139:2	disclose 82:7 186:24 200:7,18 201:2,4,8 202:4
destroy 87:1	difference 27:8,19 27:23 62:21 158:18 166:4 189:20 202:13	diocese 1:12 8:23 8:24 9:2,3 12:14 12:23 14:21 16:11 16:13 20:25 21:4 21:11,23 22:2,11 25:5 29:2,17 32:19 34:12,14 46:12 66:2,4 76:1 76:2 78:1 91:4 95:13,16 100:19 101:24 102:6,6 103:23 104:19 105:16 106:2,14 107:1 109:14 111:18 113:23 117:19 118:12 122:3,6 131:1,4 135:12 138:16 140:3 143:9 144:19 145:11,19 145:22 146:17,20 147:7,15,24 148:4 148:14 150:25 151:2,6,22 152:14 152:19 153:1	dioceses 45:11,15 45:24 50:22,23 75:23 77:21 90:15 119:17,17 170:1 189:20 212:7,13 212:18 213:3 214:19 215:16,18	disclosed 136:25 184:14
destroyed 87:2	differences 23:10		directed 126:6	disclosure 20:9 131:23 150:12 183:13,16,17 184:4,17,17,22 185:3 186:22 188:11 198:1,4,16 198:21 199:3,8
destructive 73:9 76:10 77:11	different 5:20 16:9 16:14,14 19:22 23:12 24:23 30:18 30:22 41:16 43:19 44:24 47:25 52:17 52:17 58:24 59:11 79:12 93:25 109:22 124:16 130:9 138:13 158:2 165:23 181:22 182:7 189:14		directing 142:5	disclosures 188:1 197:24 216:1
detached 96:7	differentiates 30:20		directions 102:12	discourtesy 34:14
detail 11:5 101:10 116:5 129:20 135:1 136:18 149:21 169:1 177:15	difficult 23:21 29:3 30:7 31:12 33:7 80:19 106:16 123:25 141:1 142:2,2 143:15 149:25 151:15 181:19 189:8,10 189:16 190:2 194:7 197:11 199:10		directly 28:13 38:2 76:12 90:21 108:1 108:7 120:7 133:22 157:17 212:12	discover 6:6
detailed 122:16	difficulties 67:24 78:19 92:23 154:3 158:8,11 180:14		directory 170:12 172:3	discovered 7:18
details 119:24 165:24 201:23	difficulty 27:20,24 96:20 150:10		disadvantage 91:25	discretionarily 78:8
detective 210:3,8 210:10,14,18	Dilloway 24:21		disagree 61:20	discretionary 69:13 78:2,7 80:13 81:25
detectives 69:10			disagreement 138:15 155:24	discriminate 154:15
determination 79:3 95:25 97:9			disappear 22:10 23:3	discuss 50:15 108:14,16 187:2 188:13 202:7
determine 63:17 78:17 84:11 97:6 98:7			disarray 169:8,8	discussed 1:9,9 125:6 188:15,18 189:13
determined 71:16 98:7			discard 204:24	discussing 127:1
determines 96:19				discussion 7:8 25:17 69:24 119:14 125:17 139:18 144:1,3 159:4 161:22,24
determining 68:19 93:15				
detriment 63:14				
develop 44:3,4 95:7				
developed 110:17				

198:13	doing 10:6 21:19	due 4:20 28:22	126:15 131:21	171:16,18
discussions 5:1 7:1	42:21 45:5 55:6	31:25 34:21 60:16	171:10 180:11,13	emailed 51:19
7:13 51:17 53:10	65:16 74:15 96:24	69:21,25 174:15	182:19	emails 47:11 215:5
56:4,5 134:23	102:11 142:25	209:21 213:18	effective 42:9 65:8	embers 86:16
135:24 137:8	148:23,24 155:18	Duncan 5:25	65:10 66:7 70:7,7	emerge 23:19
146:25 147:9	164:25 173:4	Durham 53:15	71:14 77:2 78:23	emerged 27:21
disgusted 187:25	194:14 196:21	duties 199:12	88:6,6 93:8	121:6
dispute 2:8 138:14	197:8 198:15	duty 53:25 67:20	effectively 54:22	emerges 141:2
145:7	199:12 208:20	67:21,21 68:23,24	67:14,22 71:4	emerging 156:18
disputes 135:3	domain 179:18	72:12 79:11	95:20 145:23	emphasis 27:19
151:5	domestic 210:8,17	dynamic 74:3	179:25 194:14	34:4 210:6
disrespect 124:8	210:24	dynamics 70:16	effectiveness	emphasise 27:7
dissented 33:4	dominance 157:24	91:5 92:22 94:24	141:23	113:7
distance 189:25	dominant 28:25	dysfunctionality	effort 76:4,6	employed 170:6
distant 213:15	152:19	181:3,4	either 7:7 16:5	employer 194:12
distinction 122:7	dominated 158:9		17:20 62:25 67:15	employing 29:4
132:25	door 176:10	E	97:5 105:16 108:9	enable 89:24 95:20
distinguish 86:1	doubt 10:11 27:12	E 217:13	108:17 113:9,11	96:11
distort 80:2 81:4	30:10 84:2	earlier 38:15 71:25	135:18 148:4	enabling 23:12
distorting 92:22	dozens 46:22	121:11,20 134:10	163:14 169:18	encompass 95:10
distress 47:10	DPA 86:13,22 87:4	148:22 149:20	170:10 173:19	endeavour 206:14
distributed 136:13	87:5,7	150:4 152:11,24	178:4 183:18	endorsed 209:24
155:9	Dr 23:15 37:6	162:17 215:13	186:8 190:6	enforce 67:12
diverse 31:3	draft 9:5 130:25	early 42:1 98:23,24	193:19 194:21	enforced 67:6
division 31:7	139:1,10 149:14	170:7	212:21	enforcement 88:22
divulged 157:17	149:15	ears 94:17	either/or 25:15	enforcing 88:19
doctrines 13:17	drafting 10:21	ease 209:18	eject 88:16	engage 13:7 14:23
document 3:13,17	138:5	easier 2:19	elaborate 211:16	43:10,21 74:4
3:21 4:1 34:6	dragged 79:23	easiest 124:10	elaborating 34:4	90:14
40:3,18 42:10,22	draw 107:19	east 101:16 114:4	element 41:9	engaged 42:4 63:11
43:1,5,9,21 44:1,6	146:11 156:25	153:22 179:9,10	Elizabeth 24:14	75:17 81:7
44:7 51:3 99:16	189:16	190:12	42:14,19,25 51:5	engagement 59:19
110:4 113:7,9,10	drawn 114:9	ecclesial 41:12	53:18 54:5,8,13	73:1 97:21 148:16
113:13 114:13	150:21	educate 72:17,19	54:23 55:2,13	190:16
115:8 116:19	drew 104:7,10	75:4	56:10 60:2 62:6	engaging 38:2
121:10 123:16,24	drug 199:4	education 68:2	63:21 91:6 149:12	England 38:8,10
124:12 137:7,9	drugs 183:22	69:16 73:3 74:5	177:23 186:11	39:6,14,21,22
204:19 207:12	DSA 44:19 66:3	74:14 75:3	213:12,16,17	44:15 46:23 50:5
documentation	71:15 184:2	educative 72:3,11	Elliott 98:9	50:6,24 54:10
121:21	185:16 198:7	effect 23:23,25,25	Ellis 34:8	57:13,21 58:10
documents 37:24	202:25 203:3	28:1 29:1 39:14	else's 92:3	64:11 78:5,15
40:5 44:24 45:15	208:1,1 212:23	46:14 68:4 70:2	email 37:21 38:19	82:22 90:13 92:6
171:5,6 175:9	215:19 216:11,17	80:5,8 85:16	48:12 138:23,25	92:20 97:2 102:7
203:23 204:16	DSAs 52:19 212:8	91:12 92:25 93:2	142:22 144:11	154:3 165:5
dogma 12:16	214:12	96:5 109:19	145:2,3 146:9	192:21 194:4,13

196:7 210:25 211:3,16 213:17 England's 64:17 211:5 enlarge 23:18 enquired 110:16 enquiries 5:16,18 6:22 131:21 157:3 enquiring 105:13 enquiry 141:3 ensure 16:14 37:15 43:25 53:25 77:2 77:5 141:23 ensuring 19:1 26:10 78:25 entered 35:24 entire 17:5 164:3 entirely 26:17 89:22 98:21,24 136:15 212:3 entirety 112:25 entitled 61:20 entry 129:15 environment 13:21 67:9 153:10 193:17,17 envisaging 95:12 ephemera 206:20 ephemeral 205:11 206:7 episcopal 164:8 190:7 195:16 episode 7:24 Equality 154:11 equally 15:25 22:16 equip 193:2 equivalent 110:14 175:19 189:19 era 31:5 Eric 107:22 113:17 126:6 128:4,18,20 128:21 137:12 175:24 179:9,16 180:3 181:21 190:5	especially 193:22 194:12 196:15 essentially 33:11 106:4 112:3 129:6 129:15 147:11 149:19 184:16 establish 24:11 42:16 144:4 established 213:14 estimate 41:22 209:3 et 26:19,20 72:2,2 ethos 29:16 evangelical 13:4,9 14:5 181:25,25 182:3 evangelicals 13:20 14:23 16:13 Evans 119:1 156:6 156:10,13,15 157:15,20 202:21 203:2,10,12,15 event 18:8 34:20 50:5 192:9,9,10 192:10 207:4 events 15:11 104:3 148:6 eventually 57:11 174:8,12 183:10 everybody 86:10 100:7 113:19 124:19 172:13 174:9 202:5 208:9 everybody's 12:4 173:14 209:18 evidence 4:16 7:21 10:24 17:15 20:8 20:11 21:24 24:16 33:21 35:24 45:1 58:15 59:4,6 61:7 62:7 63:22 69:11 71:25 73:22 75:24 76:6 77:16 78:20 83:20,20 87:1 88:11 90:4,7	95:24,24 99:14 100:2 103:3 105:5 127:20 133:19 157:23 158:25 162:16 163:3,6,6 168:21 174:18 175:11 176:19 180:10 182:22 209:13 evidential 143:21 evolution 61:8 evolved 38:5 211:19 213:24 exact 185:18 exactly 6:13 36:19 52:22 58:17 62:18 69:15 70:12 79:9 135:10 178:9 examination 1:5 35:13 99:3 163:9 203:16 217:18,24 218:3,11,15 examined 10:19 184:1 examining 121:5 example 11:16 22:13 29:5,6 72:5 88:8 109:25 167:23 179:12,15 182:22 183:12,22 190:11 191:22 199:4 205:19 208:6 214:23 examples 83:10 86:22 88:9 excellence 45:5 48:18 Excellent 20:10 excluded 47:19 146:24,25 excuse 169:10 executive 36:7 46:9 142:4 exemption 154:10 exercise 8:22	104:15 105:14 122:17 127:5 149:11 exercised 81:23 exhibiting 17:10 exist 10:11 85:8 existence 175:4,5 existing 195:2 199:9 exists 38:11 expand 41:6,7 212:4 expect 8:5 25:21 165:14 expected 14:15 33:16 118:3 173:6 experience 13:20 15:18 20:19 22:3 30:2,2 37:10 48:20 56:12,13 58:9 60:19 101:11 164:15 193:6,16 194:6,6,22,23 195:19 196:4,21 experienced 19:2,4 28:22 33:23 46:1 154:4 196:16 expertise 136:2 explain 19:4 20:9 25:7 58:22 141:7 143:2 165:13 166:3 167:19 183:15 193:5,5 207:20 explained 12:23 13:3 14:4 99:20 181:20 184:4 explanation 168:24 211:9 explicitly 151:2 exploited 74:11 explore 61:15 66:25 167:7 169:2 explored 90:16 108:21	exposure 118:20 express 37:2 42:12 42:13 83:25 expressed 31:1 47:10 187:5 expression 208:3 expressly 120:17 extend 62:20 extent 5:22 13:19 15:5 16:1 78:17 112:5 174:21 213:14 external 32:14,20 66:5 102:16 externally 25:16 26:16 extracts 113:3 extreme 189:22 extremely 23:21 29:3 47:9
F				
				face 22:15 73:15,21 81:7 faced 14:13 153:13 fact 5:11,20 6:11 8:10 9:19 14:17 17:22 18:3,21 41:14 47:6 48:4 49:12 62:5,6 64:22 75:23 88:12 88:14 122:4 138:2 147:4 150:4 151:14 157:1 164:17 169:8,22 174:9 178:15 179:1 185:10 186:10 189:22 190:4 200:17 201:8 factor 17:1 153:2 181:1 factors 16:24 17:8 18:4 195:2 facts 36:23

factual 135:2,25 149:19 150:23 151:4 fail 69:21 70:11 failed 92:16 156:16 169:10 192:21 201:7 failings 177:24,25 failure 44:12 71:6 133:6,7 failures 133:5 fair 37:12 41:25 42:15 48:10 80:2 112:24 131:3 135:3 140:18 143:22 147:12 148:10 170:4 fairly 13:21 15:16 57:14 105:11 114:6 149:9,9 154:5 fairness 100:6 113:4 144:9 faith 42:17 89:12 fall 21:18 67:19 false 74:3 157:9,12 familiar 141:18 families 19:13 family 73:16 far 5:3 7:1 10:15 15:4 16:3 21:21 28:16 45:10 46:22 63:6 64:16 74:5 78:20 93:16 113:24 115:25 120:10 126:24 127:20 134:5 138:12 145:14 165:9 168:21 173:5,18 175:16 176:13 177:22 178:1 181:10 182:6 188:4 195:9 200:16 214:3 215:14	fast 136:6 Father 6:11 205:19 fault 25:22,24 76:23 124:18 130:6 136:15 178:16,17 favour 180:1 favourable 211:8 February 99:8 132:9 feed 93:15 feel 42:4 72:18 103:4 106:13 135:16,17 195:15 felt 4:18 42:2 93:16 105:25 109:7 121:4 126:3 136:9 140:4 142:1,3,9 146:1,4 149:9 155:12,25 158:14 158:16 169:13 174:13 177:17 179:20,23 180:3 180:19,20,21 213:8 female 22:16 34:14 153:13 fewer 88:1 field 64:6 164:17 210:6 figure 78:5 figures 214:3 file 108:19 110:1,12 110:18 111:8 112:12,13,14,16 112:21,23,25 113:9 114:1,7 116:15 117:2,4 118:1,19,21 119:4 119:9,24 120:4,8 120:15 121:21 125:6,7 128:3 137:14 152:16 170:2,24 171:7 175:14,21,22,23	175:25 176:10,13 176:16,20,21,23 176:24 177:4 183:12 188:12 198:4,5 205:2,14 205:15,23,24,25 206:11,25 207:3,6 207:7,11,17,17,18 207:22,24,25 208:2,4,8,8,9,12 files 86:15,16,19 104:17,20,22 108:19 109:15,16 109:17,24 110:14 110:24 111:5,10 111:11,15 168:22 169:2,15,16,16,19 169:22 170:8,9,12 170:13,18,19,21 171:10,14 173:23 174:2,23 175:2,5 175:7,17,18,20 176:11 203:24 204:5,23 205:4 206:6,18 207:2 211:15 214:18 filing 169:7,10,12 169:17 170:5 fill 8:15 fillet 86:15 filleted 111:5,10 filleting 111:4 filleting' 110:24 filtering 77:25 79:20 88:5 final 20:22 34:5,6 155:6 192:18 203:7,9 210:17 finalised 129:21 134:4,8,9 finalising 130:8 finally 71:10,17 120:20 205:10 financial 166:12 find 6:9 12:25	23:21 48:13 65:20 71:14 75:11 108:25 151:8 finding 71:22 143:17 173:10,12 findings 1:14,16 49:7 50:16 52:12 114:9 119:22 140:18 144:25 147:1 174:1 fine 27:17 66:2,3 70:21 92:15 163:16 finish 24:7 119:20 208:24 finished 203:1 firmly 31:1 first 3:6,19 11:11 13:5 16:16 20:22 24:17,18 26:1 32:17 37:9 42:25 49:8,10 50:11 51:18 54:5,8,9 56:9,25 71:25 90:12 105:18 112:20,20 113:21 121:20 124:19,22 124:25 129:22 133:13 134:20 150:18,25 162:14 167:21 169:22 173:9 175:14 183:7,11 185:22 187:10,17 194:1,1 214:23 first-class 193:15 firstly 30:1 42:14 93:3 fit 43:23 47:5 fit/well 126:18 five 39:3 72:5 172:4 173:5,5 174:6 215:19 five-year 184:6,16 fix 57:7,9	flag 150:20 flashing 115:5 flowed 157:16 focus 14:20 51:25 focused 6:25 44:1 56:24,25 212:3 focusing 41:9,11 folder 175:18 folders 166:22 followed 6:2 137:11 205:16 following 4:15 31:22 32:10 33:18 111:24 113:20 122:13 160:16 216:16 follows 210:1 foot' 141:5 forerunner 40:9 foreseen 76:14 forever 73:5,7 forget 66:19 86:12 forgiven 15:7 forgiveness 14:8,11 15:1,13 16:1 forgot 136:17 forgotten 159:16 160:13 form 83:1 84:17 137:10 147:23 150:6 168:6 181:23 194:5 195:14 197:9 202:7 207:23 formal 37:23 141:22 192:6,10 formalised 118:17 214:7 formality 198:19 formally 11:20 34:22 35:24 147:7 147:8 192:7 formed 157:3,13 161:22 213:13 former 6:10 55:20
--	---	---	--	---

formerly 38:8	freedom 179:19	future 17:17 28:25	girls 77:14	174:12 183:15
forms 110:17	frequency 214:20		give 8:5 11:4 63:21	184:3 187:2
forward 10:23	frequent 102:25	G	72:24 76:23	189:25 190:19,19
44:19 54:2 67:10	frequently 102:19	Gamble 55:15,18	108:25 121:10	190:20 193:18
67:18 68:13 71:19	Friday 217:11	56:10	125:23 133:17	194:1,5 195:13
72:14 76:11 77:15	friend 6:10 27:19	gap 46:2 91:8 173:6	136:19 147:3	198:24 200:14
77:23 93:24 94:4	27:19 64:24 80:15	gaps 8:16	155:12 156:11	205:23 208:1
94:23 97:13,13	80:17 185:17	garden 199:14	174:17 190:11	God 15:7 76:17
113:13 134:24	186:25 200:5,25	gardener 166:17	given 4:10 9:18,22	God's 84:25
145:24 177:11	front 35:16	gate 174:22	18:7 26:4 32:18	goes 8:13 16:16
205:2	fronting 142:15,16	gather 10:23	45:1 47:19 54:9	61:11 66:2 115:21
forwards 135:1	142:18	Gemma 76:7,16,25	56:1 61:13,13	128:15 144:20
138:4	fronts 139:14	gender 154:16	80:12 92:17	205:7
found 30:6 33:6	frustrating 61:12	general 8:11 37:19	103:23 106:13	going 3:12 24:15
46:10 79:24 80:16	fulfil 191:14	43:6 44:5 51:24	109:7 111:17	26:5 35:10,20
89:16 128:17	fulfilled 56:8	56:13 67:13,19	115:4 132:14	42:9,22 45:24
145:20 149:25	fulfilling 191:21	143:11 149:23,24	136:25 143:1,22	46:1 50:2,3 51:6
150:18 157:1	full 8:5 23:5 40:6	172:14 197:24	144:1 145:21	51:10,20,22 54:16
169:16 172:1	46:8 68:6 86:17	212:13	147:6 152:13	55:6 56:15 58:1,3
175:25 176:7,8,9	106:13 140:8,10	generalisation	155:20 157:2	58:4,23,24 59:4
200:8 204:11	165:14 208:23	193:14	169:1 175:1	60:7 61:17 65:19
207:3 208:2	209:4,14,20	generalise 189:17	191:13 193:24	68:21 69:7 71:14
209:15	full-time 166:11,17	generally 12:17	197:13 212:7	71:16 73:24 74:24
four 6:20 159:8	172:20	68:3 161:5 168:24	213:5	75:3 76:23 77:9
216:11	fuller 101:6	generated 107:3	giving 18:14 152:7	77:11,12 79:1
fourth 124:5	fully 17:24 31:10	121:3	196:20	80:21 81:8 84:4,9
140:22 146:12	144:24	generation 22:5	gleaned 208:1	94:14,24 97:8,9
Frances 76:14	function 32:19	generationally	glib 15:17	99:17 100:6
Francesca 25:23,25	functioned 5:21	22:20	Gloucester 112:5	102:13 107:21,22
26:4	fund 78:2,3,7	generic 40:22 41:17	176:5,6	110:9 112:3 113:3
Frank 29:25 30:1	fundamental	41:18	glowing 18:8	113:17 115:11
30:15 31:13,21	146:18	George 97:22	go 3:19 4:4 8:17,17	120:24 124:2
32:3,9,23,25 33:2	further 2:23 11:1	George's 194:2	13:18 17:2 19:23	127:5,11,12
33:4,17 34:5,10	13:18 26:24 28:4	getting 87:3 96:14	38:13 48:5 63:1	129:20 131:7
34:20,25 35:3	67:1 79:1 85:12	96:15 98:10	69:2,12,13 97:9	132:5 134:24,25
158:17 159:3,7,14	108:16,21 114:21	128:20 179:16	100:13 105:19	136:12 139:17
159:21 160:1,5,8	115:6 116:13	Gibbs 98:8	107:24 110:16	140:24 142:6
160:16,19,25	117:12 119:11,15	Gibson 123:1	113:17 114:10	143:8 145:24
161:4,6,11,19	120:25 121:6	162:11,14 163:8	115:10,11 122:10	148:7 149:11,18
162:4 201:16,17	127:11 132:4	163:11,15 164:4	123:11 124:2	150:3 158:17
201:22 202:11,19	145:3 159:14,21	197:22 200:23	125:2 127:22,23	165:19 166:20
203:22 206:17,20	162:10 183:15	203:21 208:17	129:20 131:7	169:21 190:22
206:22 207:9,16	203:16 208:15	218:9	133:4 136:18	198:7 208:22
207:20 208:10,14	218:15	Gibson's 162:16	137:1,3 140:18	209:8
free 138:6 155:12	Furthermore 4:15	163:5	148:22 149:18	gold 47:25

good 1:4 35:14,15 41:19 46:2 53:5 55:2 60:24,25,25 73:14 76:3 78:9 86:11 96:21 99:4 161:1 163:10 213:12	27:10 32:13,17,18 32:23 33:14,15,15 34:10,11,23 35:1 36:25 37:5 38:14 39:24 40:11 41:3 42:1 55:11 95:25 97:17,19 147:16 151:10 214:10 215:1 216:14	handed 100:5 176:17	72:21 210:12	106:14 110:2 111:11,14 112:12 154:17 168:3 173:23 175:17,19 187:3
Gordon 15:2 16:4 116:21 182:23 183:1,8 184:5 185:14 200:12 201:7	groups 23:19 24:3 38:2 215:2	handled 167:8 182:9 184:8 212:21	Harper 6:1	help 3:12 14:24 24:8 34:13 58:24 59:23 61:3 84:19 86:15 102:10,11 106:12 107:1 114:20 115:7 118:18 124:12,14 124:15 128:5 145:25 146:5 154:11 158:21 159:17,24 160:6 160:11 161:15 165:17 169:11 170:7 179:5 182:19 197:9 203:21
gotten 1:11 83:16	growing 39:20 55:9	handling 119:12 155:24	Hastings 6:5,18 123:6 143:4,5	helped 10:5 65:22
government 72:23	guaranteed 80:14	hands 98:21,24	hat 191:11	helpful 36:22
governmental 87:10	guess 105:23 145:20 152:11	hands-on 128:21	hats 191:8,8	helpfully 204:10
grabbed 60:12	guidance 39:13 45:9 64:15 69:18 70:10 73:11 86:4 86:4,6 87:10 204:1,5 205:16 206:1,4 211:9	handwriting 124:9	haystack 68:4	helping 84:22
Graham 45:13 56:14 79:19	guide 13:5	handwritten 100:4 123:7,22 127:8 158:22 159:8	hazy 128:23	helpline 37:20 38:15,16,18,23 47:11,18,21 59:9 59:12,16,17
grant 1:25 6:20 126:6	guilty 15:3 73:18 79:24 80:16 125:13,14 200:8	handy 196:23	head 52:8 55:18 64:17 71:9 101:16 195:8	helps 136:17
granted 10:10 120:14 122:5 126:5,14 132:11 171:11	guise 71:3	happen 58:8 77:20 78:24 80:20,22 94:18 96:11 188:22,23	headings 166:21	hesitation 21:21
granting 2:24	guy 161:1	happened 15:12 27:11 51:13 56:24 58:17,17 62:19 65:25 73:21,23 76:16,17 80:22 81:2 83:8 84:11 94:13,20 97:18 108:10 136:19 149:2 167:22 170:3,16 182:12 185:6 187:22 191:20 198:2	heads 55:15	hidden 175:7
grateful 165:1		happening 21:22 43:20 80:3 87:22 87:24 90:5 93:12 97:10,15 176:4 199:24	headship 13:13	high 212:19
great 7:3 23:15 60:6 148:21 169:8 190:5	H	happens 29:23 75:11 78:1 79:23 83:8	health 4:21	high-profile 213:22
greater 9:20 18:13 33:15 72:14 145:13 147:20 152:13	habit 110:24 162:25	hard 96:14 97:2 124:1 150:18 151:8	hear 10:24 24:15 30:16 77:16 97:24 112:11 134:25 158:15 163:6 200:17	higher 33:24 58:12
greatest 86:12	half 71:25 171:17 209:3,5	harder 67:11	heard 15:24 16:8 42:25 48:6 49:7 49:10 50:25 51:4 55:17 58:15 72:3 72:3 76:5 77:18 79:14 82:18 96:3 98:4 100:2,17 103:2,22 104:14 105:5 106:9,10 107:20 109:14 112:10 116:20 133:19 150:5 153:4 157:21 166:22 168:21 175:11 177:14 186:10 187:19 191:6	highlight 2:17 114:16
greatly 215:8	halfway 31:23	harm 54:2 57:8	hearing 21:24 48:3 48:4 90:21 217:10	highlighted 8:8 105:25 127:15 179:1 184:2
Greenwood 24:8 56:16	Hall 24:14 42:14,19 42:25 53:18 54:5 54:8,13,23 55:2 55:13 56:10 60:2 62:6 63:21 91:6 213:12		hearsays 65:1	Hind 13:10 15:25 16:8 64:19 116:3 119:11 120:3 122:25 131:14 143:20 148:10
grew 13:21	Hampshire 103:13		heart 57:24	
grooming 72:5	hand 21:15,16 35:10 133:2 168:4 204:3		heated 58:22 59:25	
ground 79:21 81:6 100:7 140:9			heavily 143:8	
grounds 125:23 178:21,23			heightened 115:4	
group 11:7 26:6,10			held 104:19,22	

153:11 164:5 165:17 Hind's 144:11 hindsight 153:8 hint 207:23 historic 139:7 167:6 178:19 207:1 211:6 historical 197:5 Historically 102:3 history 27:6 34:18 154:16 hold 14:6 15:19 54:6 86:23 100:9 126:1 154:25 175:17,22 holder 67:14 75:7 holders 67:4 171:21 holding 93:13 170:21 Holmes 97:2 holy 13:4 home 3:4 4:20,22 5:12 6:4,7,12,14 7:7,7,11,15 126:15,18 214:17 homophobia 154:12 homosexual 115:20 honest 156:1 hope 24:6 29:11,14 119:1 127:7 151:25 hoped 29:14 136:9 hoping 123:14 horrified 162:2 horror 77:19 horses 84:5 Horsham 22:14 182:2 192:3 Hosgood 25:12,21 25:25 26:14 27:11 28:9 31:5 32:3 103:22,25 107:4	123:1 133:20 134:7 147:3,25 155:12,17 156:4,7 158:11 Hosgood's 32:1 102:1 103:5 hospital 6:18 7:7 hospitalised 4:24 hour 209:3 house 8:14 54:17 55:23 91:16 92:9 92:10 93:15 105:11 107:7 111:9 117:8,8 118:2 167:5 174:8 189:21 198:9 215:1 housekeeping 162:7,8 163:1 218:7 Hove 167:5 190:7,9 Howarth 11:18 HR-related 165:2 huge 72:18 97:8,22 human 165:4,6 hump 160:23 hundreds 77:4,4 hurt 149:9 husband's 64:24 hybrid 14:3 <hr/> I <hr/> Ian 98:9 123:1 162:11,14,16 163:5,8,11,14 181:13 218:9 idea 58:25 59:24 60:7,24,25 61:1,4 78:25 88:2 90:10 ideal 9:14 ideally 102:22 205:14 identical 192:23 identified 46:7 62:6 68:1 80:11 91:12	106:25 107:7 108:14,20 111:21 118:24 121:2 216:13 identifies 62:7 69:19 86:6 identify 13:25 23:9 36:1 39:4 50:4 61:24 65:11 107:10 108:15 identifying 17:16 105:15 identity 154:16 IG 185:25 ignore 55:1 ill 60:2 126:18 ill-health 2:25 imagination 83:3 imagine 192:18 immediately 46:14 51:21 61:2 81:17 150:20 immense 215:9 impact 94:14 98:5 138:7 impartiality 64:13 impede 16:15 imperative 79:2 196:1 implement 10:16 implementation 1:10 148:17 177:13 178:18 216:5 implemented 178:6 178:6 implication 134:15 169:21 implications 143:23 important 52:20 57:2 89:8 126:2 134:18 137:4,16 139:24 142:3,17 148:24 155:13	160:25 180:25 193:7 205:2 206:9 206:10 imposition 72:12 impossible 215:12 impreciseness 128:14 impressed 54:24 impression 14:17 32:18 137:17 161:20 improve 146:1 improved 61:16 213:11 improvement 152:17 in-depth 121:6,8 inability 60:18 128:14 inappropriate 22:9 28:18 incapable 56:21 incarnation 44:10 incident 8:8 include 62:15,16,21 85:22 118:3 172:15 included 38:6 113:25 116:8,9 137:6 168:25 194:23 206:7 208:4 210:7 including 52:18 143:16 205:6 210:16,21 216:2 inconsistent 111:13 111:15 incorporate 127:14 incorporated 130:18 incorrect 40:24 incorrectly 131:8 increase 68:14 213:21 increased 39:1,2,2	213:19 increasingly 146:13 incriminating 86:24 incumbency 195:19,24 196:5 incumbent 5:23 6:2 173:2 197:2 indecent 118:20 independence 52:19 96:9 103:4 103:6 independent 50:11 64:7 71:18 75:25 79:2 85:5 90:10 96:4,6,16 100:18 101:21 103:12 107:11 154:19 210:2 211:6,23 independently 95:16 103:10,19 indicate 85:18 indicated 34:15 indicators 18:4 individual 9:25 88:13 95:9 98:10 117:21 122:23 180:16 198:14 individuals 10:24 11:21 15:20 17:17 17:18 19:1,3 21:25 24:2,4 26:11 28:23 47:16 47:16 62:13 70:8 70:14 89:11 107:17 108:18 122:20 123:3,7 169:23 individuals' 18:17 industrial 193:17 industry 192:25 ineffective 81:10 inelegantly 18:11 187:13
--	---	---	--	--

inevitably 29:23	70:14,14 98:8,9,9	56:2,3	116:2,12 117:13	96:2
infallible 16:23	99:7 106:3 112:21	interests 12:4 36:20	120:12,22 124:24	irreconcilable
influence 141:20	116:20,21 150:4	143:13 144:18	130:2 132:10,15	201:20 202:9,13
152:21 216:16	163:17	interim 168:1	151:9 177:2	irrelevant 20:11
influenced 45:4	insist 154:14	203:8	210:21,22 213:20	204:24 205:18
informal 192:6	Insofar 119:3	intermediary 3:25	216:21	206:6
214:6	inspection 206:23	5:2 135:17	investigations	irritated 19:21
informally 118:16	inspector 210:3,14	internal 49:25	78:21 113:21	irritation 20:17
192:5	210:18	78:21 91:10	114:11 116:23	isolated 213:9
information 49:13	inspectors 69:10	internally 91:15	127:25 140:3	issue 4:19 8:1 16:2
50:18 54:7,22	instance 17:25	international	176:1 183:5 210:5	18:2,3 20:6 22:21
72:24 82:8 87:11	32:17	191:11	210:16,16 216:9	23:11 26:5,19
87:16 88:25 89:1	instances 158:13	internet 74:12	investigative 96:22	29:8,12 31:3
90:11 91:7 93:14	Institute 45:5	interpretation	97:20	45:14 47:8 50:23
106:14,17 109:1,4	instituted 83:4	83:18	investigators 97:1	57:10 62:7 65:1,3
109:7 110:2 111:3	199:23	interprets 25:5	invite 33:17 217:7	67:1 68:2,10,10
111:8 112:11,17	institution 20:1	interrupt 39:16	invited 38:13 39:25	68:12 69:4,6,7
113:25 116:10	29:24 49:20 60:12	interrupting 17:14	44:6 55:14 102:7	72:3 75:9 82:18
117:4 118:21	66:12 81:1 87:15	intervene 84:16	173:1	109:15 127:15
119:3,8 127:13	91:5 92:5,19 96:8	93:3 103:16	involve 18:13 38:9	140:15 142:19
132:21 133:8	96:22 137:17	interview 115:18	105:12	153:9 185:4
139:17,24 141:1	154:13	127:11 157:1,19	involved 28:23	197:23
141:23 145:25	institutional 43:9	159:18	30:19 39:4 40:13	issued 4:8 39:15
147:25 148:1	45:24 60:17 70:16	interviewed 198:23	44:25 48:11 75:20	86:4 112:4 132:9
157:2,5,15 158:18	90:23 91:21,22	interviewing 29:11	76:8 77:14 102:23	173:21 204:6
158:20 159:11,12	institutionally	105:13 171:1	103:8 112:9	issues 14:18 23:2
160:14 161:12,21	44:18 81:8	interviews 122:17	114:18 120:7	26:18 34:18 38:14
167:24 171:2,4	institutions 37:18	introduce 64:13	134:23 145:18	39:17 41:10 43:12
186:24 205:4,7,25	37:18,25 57:25	80:7	146:5 147:8,23	99:21 103:16
206:7 207:10,25	70:13 86:7 91:14	introduced 214:6	149:6 152:23	105:15,25 108:20
information-pass...	instruction 182:9	introduction	158:5 168:17	112:6 121:5
191:18	instrument 44:18	151:23 191:22	169:12 180:16	134:23 140:3
informed 75:17,18	instrumental 40:10	invention 207:22	183:22 190:2	141:19 142:16
87:19 110:17	intend 126:20	inverted 14:10	191:8 204:16	167:8 189:3,5,13
198:6,10	142:22 149:1	investigate 95:20	210:10 212:10,18	189:15 191:20
informing 42:6	intention 62:16	96:18	212:23 213:3,25	192:15 212:17
inherent 180:16	180:6 198:12	investigated 2:11	214:8 215:20	issuing 4:16 109:25
initial 130:25	intentionally 81:3	94:8 199:13	216:13	133:11
initially 184:19	interactions 150:24	investigating	involvement 21:18	italics 4:6
initiative 118:13	interest 64:22	178:24 210:7,10	59:20,21 149:5	
innocent 79:16	143:1 144:22	investigation 4:11	190:5 210:25	J
inquiries 98:10	151:12 205:5	4:16 11:18,22	involving 214:2,5	James 5:25
inquiry 50:11	interested 16:7	15:11,20 33:25	215:25 216:15	Janet 64:19 116:3
55:10 56:19 57:2	59:14,15	75:21 76:13,20	Ireland 38:4 40:4	122:25
57:12 65:20,20	interesting 42:6	77:9 112:5 113:22	68:10,12 95:17	January 163:18

209:24 Jill 60:2 213:24 214:4 job 75:10 88:13 166:20 169:7 194:7 195:18 197:11 198:23 199:1,1 jobs 164:25 John 13:10 24:19 78:19 82:18,24 83:21 88:11 100:1 133:16 142:4 144:1 165:17 179:21,22 180:2 181:8 182:4 184:12,13 185:8 185:13,14 186:9 186:21,23 187:1,4 187:18,23 188:16 188:25 190:17 191:6 192:2 201:19 202:6 203:4,22 204:1 John's 166:16 178:3 179:5 190:15 Johnson 2:12 5:7 51:1 56:10 58:15 59:4 76:5,7 105:6 105:21 112:8 122:23 126:16 148:5,20 join 20:2 joined-up 77:1 joint 38:9 39:12 55:15,16,24,25 58:11 211:2 213:7 jointly 213:23 215:17 Jones 1:3 24:21 25:2 100:1,2 103:3 107:24 135:14,15,23 141:15 142:24	217:16 Jones' 143:14 journalist 5:7 judge 64:24 Judith 209:11,23 218:19 July 3:22 5:6 112:7 jumped 134:3 142:9 jumping 12:24 June 204:7,20 206:1 junior 142:21 jurisdiction 31:10 justice 71:7 78:13 Justin 79:7,18 juxtaposed 110:25 <hr/> K Kate 114:23 121:23 163:7 177:1 208:22 209:11,13 209:23 218:19 keen 125:19 keep 9:22 42:8 50:2 63:19 69:7 86:2 86:10 87:5,15 98:9 107:21,22,23 116:19 121:4 165:10 170:25 keeper 174:22 keeping 86:5 87:8 87:10 109:12,13 109:19 111:4 keeps 69:7 Kemp 107:22 113:17 175:24 179:9 ken 68:22 96:10 Kennedy 37:6 40:10 51:14 kept 20:3 42:6 64:23 75:18 76:15 86:16 87:3 109:22 111:8 123:7	204:23 205:14 206:22 key 23:11 90:22 109:23 110:10 119:22 124:3 134:20 137:3 156:18 166:20 killed 74:19 kind 14:22 21:5,19 29:12 31:3 34:15 37:23 54:24 55:8 57:25 59:8 60:12 67:14 72:12 75:9 87:25 88:2 91:12 95:18 116:7 128:15 145:23 150:20 153:9 205:1 kinds 23:9 77:20 84:21 kitchen 83:8,11,17 83:22 knew 2:7 7:6 18:9 26:11 46:20 47:7 51:8 88:1 124:22 124:25,25 128:16 128:23 129:16,25 130:10 131:9 150:7 161:17 170:13,20 172:21 183:11 know 5:4 12:17 16:7 17:22 20:23 22:11,13,15 27:1 35:17 42:18,23 43:13 46:17 48:8 48:9,10,21 49:11 49:17 51:4 52:2,3 54:15,15,25 57:3 57:4,4,5 59:7 61:19 62:11 65:24 66:8,15 70:5,6 71:13 77:2,12,16 79:7 81:4 82:17 86:17 87:2,25	88:1,7 89:2,3,4,7 89:14 94:14 96:10 97:11 98:14,22 100:11,14 106:25 108:6 111:1 113:18,19 114:21 114:22 116:21 117:11 118:19 122:3 124:24 127:25 128:2 131:19 147:2 149:3 154:6 156:9 158:4,25 159:22 160:9 161:18 162:10 163:1,13 165:8 173:20,22 174:9 175:11 178:7 183:1,13 184:24,24 185:14 187:18,22 196:7 202:4,18 knowing 57:8 knowingly 83:11 knowledge 4:11 35:21 99:11 104:3 104:7,9 134:11 156:19,20,22 159:20 161:18 163:20 215:9 known 8:10 106:25 107:2 114:4 122:8 148:11,18 188:4 knows 8:16 65:19 89:9,9 97:12 <hr/> L la 74:7 lack 2:25 18:21 146:13 150:2 178:13 179:2,6 180:24 216:18 lacuna 9:12 LADO 26:19 66:8 66:8 laid 31:18	Lambeth 170:15 175:19 176:1 177:2 211:15,17 211:19,24 212:2 212:14,22 213:2 214:8,15,18,20,25 215:4,9,15 Lantern 56:14 large 112:23 113:7 157:24 193:3 largely 72:10 104:15 147:11 189:6 late 38:5 132:13 law 30:2 41:8,12 62:25 63:1 64:23 71:16 74:2 79:24 153:15 Lawrence 35:9,12 35:14 36:1 66:19 66:25 92:1 98:13 98:16 217:22 lawyer 33:23 35:18 41:3,8 42:5 lawyers 41:14 69:24 lay 4:10 19:8 21:9 21:19 204:3 laying 133:1 layperson 21:13 lead 17:9 53:11 194:14 leadership 19:9 21:15,16 194:3,6 194:17 197:10 leads 56:17 learned 25:6 72:4 learning 31:8 141:4 learnt 119:18 leave 69:25 121:10 128:7 199:14 led 1:17 10:22 31:19 76:12 194:15 left 1:8 42:1 54:12
--	---	--	---	---

77:4,14 86:16 123:22 124:12 127:10 128:7 145:11 155:23 169:18 170:9 178:5,5 190:13,17 211:21 left-hand 4:6 legal 30:1 31:11 55:22,24 legislation 62:8 63:10,11,18,20 65:3 86:14 88:23 legislative 92:24 93:7 legislature 191:22 Leicester 179:14 length 23:18 111:17 lessens 81:13 lessons 196:22 let's 24:10 57:7 62:24 69:25 82:15 136:21 182:25 184:3 186:18 letter 24:23 107:20 107:22 113:14 137:13 146:8 172:14 173:16 199:22 letters 22:14 107:6 107:17,25 108:2,7 108:17 118:23 170:23 level 10:1 19:3 21:19 47:10 54:19 72:14 73:10 77:24 79:21 88:3 90:4 91:1 97:20 110:3 116:5 175:20 196:16 levels 91:23 182:14 Lewes 123:5 143:2 143:4 192:3 liaise 212:12	liaised 167:20 liaison 167:18 168:6 liar 188:21,23 libel 137:18,19,20 138:7 181:11 202:5 libellous 137:22 licence 71:10 85:24 licensing 167:8 190:21 licensings 165:19 lies 57:9 life 4:24 13:5 14:9 14:12 29:18,23 56:1 79:17 light 9:9 54:21 62:17 115:5 128:11 liked 143:25 limited 174:21 212:14 Linda 108:3 line 99:20,20 102:14 124:21 128:9 141:21 142:9 145:17 164:2,2 166:18 167:21 168:5 215:7,23 lines 14:18 73:20 140:21 159:8,15 link 23:5 37:15 linked 18:23 115:21 linking 151:8 list 50:12 73:6 106:25 107:2,16 115:9 117:18,19 122:20 123:11,19 172:2,9 173:16 listed 162:10 166:15 197:4 Listened 160:22 listening 94:19	literally 57:23 little 29:13 36:1 53:19 100:2 101:9 119:8 128:5 167:19 175:12 204:7 liturgical 165:18 166:1 live 8:13 80:23 152:3 lived 9:2 77:23 living 3:4 5:5 7:7 7:11 54:1,3 Lloyd 5:25 load 53:7 loath 190:22 lobbied 63:19 local 103:9 110:2 142:8 143:12 171:2 173:2 190:3 located 204:9 location 109:15 115:23 170:18,19 locations 109:22 Lodge 6:5,16 log-jammed 138:7 logistical 162:13 lonely 49:9 long 125:6 153:20 197:13 209:1 longer 36:16 169:23 look 2:15,18,19 3:15,21 4:14 24:10,17 32:10 37:15 58:19,25 59:24 60:15 73:3 77:9 78:7 94:22 104:5 107:12,16 109:9,10 110:5 113:18 114:13 118:7 119:7 120:24 121:6,8 124:4 125:3 138:19 140:22	141:12 144:13 151:16 171:16,17 173:9,23 177:3 186:18 190:18 191:19,19 204:19 looked 24:23 46:25 47:1,2 50:19 54:18 95:18 98:22 112:14 113:10,24 114:24 117:12 118:1 121:22 135:11 136:8 145:2 166:14,19 170:11 172:2 176:25 looking 4:4 6:15 8:3 15:21 38:14 38:23 40:13 56:1 61:17 93:12 95:3 106:3 114:6 124:5 129:13,14 140:21 152:13 159:4 163:2 165:5 182:5 189:18 196:3 looks 124:21 125:11 138:3 142:11 160:9 195:7 loose 84:9 lose 149:1 204:25 loss 35:1 lost 42:17 159:25 lot 21:23 42:21 72:4 111:15 128:13 145:21,22 150:3,16 155:20 168:21 169:1,10 169:15 176:2 177:14,21 178:7 179:10 181:12 190:17 191:8,21 191:21 193:11 lots 56:15 58:21 72:1,6 97:13 lovely 51:18	lunch 98:24 100:9 121:8 Luxon 39:23 41:3 42:16 64:18 211:1 213:7 <hr/> M <hr/> m 196:13,13 ma'am 35:5 machines 86:17 MACSAS 35:10 36:8,21,24 37:8 37:24 38:11,20 39:17,25 40:9,13 42:8,11,20 44:5,9 45:13,20 46:4 47:17 48:10 52:6 56:12 59:16,17,21 60:14,20,23 61:13 70:12 76:3,6 78:24 82:3,4,5 83:10 89:14 MACSAS's 46:12 57:13 58:9 61:15 61:19 65:11 91:9 91:16 mailing 172:9 main 8:6 41:3 131:8 142:16,19 major 140:2 majority 165:16 193:22 making 52:19 80:25 138:2 144:2 151:11 162:25 168:17 170:8,12 Malcolm 119:1 156:6,10,13,15 157:15,20 202:20 202:21 203:2,10 203:12,15 male 153:16 male-oriented 153:10 malicious 208:7
---	---	---	--	---

man 56:3 70:18 79:16,23 168:11 185:17	160:8	meaning 93:25	126:11,13,25	42:5 43:8 56:16
manage 96:23 103:14 192:15 194:14 213:2	marital 154:16	means 15:14 17:3 28:11 97:5 174:5	127:4,6 128:22	132:5 148:2
managed 152:2 168:25	Mark 178:5 180:5	meant 34:2 52:4 53:2 86:14 131:19 138:1 212:20	136:5,8,10,19,20	151:10 202:17
management 89:23 92:2 142:9 147:16 164:15,20 165:2,4 165:6,25 166:22 166:25 167:17,18 168:1,7,14,19,20 182:16 190:3 193:6,9,15,18,19 193:20,20 194:5,8 194:8,17,19,21,22 195:2,19,21,25 196:4,12 197:6,8 214:24 215:11	marked 205:8	measure 71:13 154:24 168:15 216:20	137:23 138:9 171:20 185:10,11 185:12 186:20 188:15 191:14,18 192:11,13 198:19 199:20 201:5,13 201:24 202:11,17	Methodist 38:10 39:6,22,24 55:19 55:21,23 84:7 211:3
management-rel... 189:5	Marks-Good 75:24	measurement 137:6	171:20 185:10,11 185:12 186:20 188:15 191:14,18 192:11,13 198:19 199:20 201:5,13 201:24 202:11,17	methodology 122:15
manager 102:14 164:17 166:13,18 168:6 197:1 215:7	martial 116:23 183:4	measures 71:5 74:13 78:23 93:2 168:18	192:14 195:21 202:16 214:10,11 214:18 215:2	microphone 165:10
managers 192:24 193:2,2 196:10	Martin 6:1 180:9	measuring 48:18 48:21	214:18 215:2	middle 32:11 36:21 62:4 140:9 168:11
managing 9:5,12 94:6 188:1 210:9 210:15 216:13	Martini 164:18	mechanism 62:23 97:3	member 11:6 19:13 36:7,16 38:6 58:15 64:8,9 67:15,16 84:14	miles 189:24
Mandate 65:23 67:12	Mary 6:5,16	media 211:5	members 33:8 34:15 38:21 44:8 45:2,7 47:17 55:9 55:12 67:11 72:17 72:19 82:22 85:25 89:13 90:23 197:7	million 78:3 197:4
mandatory 55:11 56:20 65:12,14,21 67:1,12 68:3,9,11 68:20 69:14,17 70:2 72:12 80:5,9 82:2,3,6	material 114:22 176:20 177:6 204:25	Medway 108:3	meme 74:8	mind 57:6 63:5 79:13 114:23
march 1:1 123:18 124:20 183:24 217:11	materialised 61:5	Meekings 1:9 3:18 4:1 98:20,23 99:2 99:4,5 100:3,13 100:17 121:18,25 155:1,2,5 162:5 171:24 174:25 176:14,17 177:14 188:9 202:3,23 203:5,13 208:11 218:1	memory 118:14 128:17	mind-set 27:6 30:23 33:13
Margaret 37:6 40:10 51:14	matter 86:21 99:23 105:14 115:19 157:4 162:9 163:1 187:2 189:24 212:12	Meekings' 4:7 99:25 170:17 176:19 177:22	men 13:12,13 36:25 114:19	mindful 13:7 27:1 33:11
marginal 159:21	McCaffrey 209:8 209:12 217:7	meet 50:15 51:15 57:14 68:13 105:7 105:21 149:13 192:3 215:2	mentality 137:25	mine 109:11 158:3 158:3 196:2
	McNEILL 1:5,6 28:3 35:6,9 98:19 98:21 99:3,4 100:13 121:7,17 155:1 162:8,20,24 163:9,10 197:12 197:19 203:16,17 206:12 208:15,19 209:3,7 217:18 218:3,11,15	meeting 23:20 31:16,21 34:22 41:16 51:17,18 54:6 55:14 56:9 58:5 59:25,25 60:5 99:24 100:3 100:4 123:17 124:19 126:5,7,8	mention 114:5 191:6	mineral 196:14 196:24
	mean 12:16 13:8 15:17 25:5,8,18 43:4 51:5 65:14 65:19 66:12 76:13 77:12 78:23 80:5 86:18 94:25 97:23 100:13 102:21 124:8 142:14 169:25 181:24 185:2		mentioned 6:10 27:5 149:20 185:8 185:13 186:11 189:6	minimisation 46:15 47:9
			mentions 183:18	minimise 93:25
			Mese 25:23,25 26:8	minimising 166:19
			messiness 81:6	minister 36:8,21 43:19 64:19 126:19
			messy 81:7	minister's 205:6
			met 16:20 22:16	ministerial 196:14 196:24
				ministering 8:24 47:8 170:1
				ministers 37:1
				ministries 16:21
				ministry 4:21,23,25 36:18 81:17 85:16 85:19,21,22 125:21 164:8,24 172:24 195:16
				minority 83:1
				minute 141:8
				minuted 198:20

minutes 31:16 191:4 208:23	102:5 205:22 210:13	216:23	209:6 211:6 212:5	159:19 160:12,14 161:14,16
misconduct 30:5,12	movement 97:19	nature 56:5 57:5,10	needed 14:10 91:14	Nigel 71:8
misfiled 150:14,16	148:19	73:13 75:4 78:17	106:9 108:21	nitty-gritty 53:17
mislaid 150:16	movements 6:13	81:1,2,24 87:8	115:3 139:18	81:6
misquote 106:4	7:5 8:11	94:21,25 95:3	167:22 169:11,13	no-one 8:16 28:18
Mmm 21:1 119:25	7:5 8:11	105:12 205:11	169:19 171:3	46:23 65:25 78:25
mode 12:22 128:15	moves 10:13	206:9,10	180:20 182:8,12	97:12 98:3
182:15	moving 23:16 31:2	natures 75:4	184:2 192:24	noises 151:12
model 48:1,18	136:6 177:11	near 113:11	193:1 212:20	nominal 78:5
70:13 95:19 211:9	multi-agency	neatly 87:16	needing 28:9 197:9	non-recent 52:22
modes 16:11,14	210:23	necessarily 20:1	needle 68:4	93:20 94:3,11
189:14	murmuring 204:7	27:14,14 30:24	needs 20:2 22:21	95:14 96:18
Moira 98:8	muscular 153:12	88:23 111:10	69:13 80:17 89:3	non-stipendiary
moment 18:25	mustn't 80:1	124:9 137:2	94:5 98:6 114:20	164:24
27:23 39:21 60:9	mystery 103:2	140:16 145:6	negotiate 216:3	normal 178:1
60:10 62:8,14		148:18 169:15	negotiated 213:3	normally 67:7,8
63:2 66:16 71:2	N	172:7,8,10,20	Neil 76:12	north 71:8 190:12
81:14 84:18 91:23	N 217:13	173:9 183:20	neither 64:8 78:12	Northern 68:11
92:24 96:24	name 84:25 88:13	185:1 188:24	neutral 12:13,15	notably 165:6
115:12 121:7	114:3,3 116:24	190:5 194:22	43:16 135:17	note 100:4 117:6
141:8 167:7	117:8,11,13,16,18	196:2 198:9	neutrality 64:14	119:19 122:1
Monday 24:16 68:2	117:20,22 118:3	199:14 205:21	never 18:1 21:21	126:11 136:8,10
money 77:10	207:11	206:6 207:4	27:24 34:1 44:21	138:7 158:22
monitor 91:14	named 54:20	necessary 27:12	46:8 54:21 58:1,3	159:14,21 160:2,8
monthly 102:22	names 53:21 54:8,9	29:19 178:21,23	58:4 67:13 71:22	165:11 166:8
191:1	108:2 112:1 115:9	179:20 207:8	73:11 94:24 98:4	185:19,25 186:2,3
months 57:19	116:18	214:9	140:10 172:3	186:5,12,16 191:2
76:24 170:7	narrative 27:5	neck 84:21	174:16 175:17	191:3 207:6 208:1
214:14 215:19	51:10 56:23	need 1:17 14:25	176:23,25,25	217:4
216:11	100:24 150:1,11	16:9 17:11 18:22	183:11 199:11	noted 32:12 120:1
moral 70:8,15 75:5	150:23	20:5 22:2 23:2	208:5	120:1,6,10,14
morning 1:4 35:14	narrow 119:7	25:6 26:14 33:20	new 44:10 58:12,14	176:10
35:15 100:5 113:5	national 10:25	49:1 64:13,14	60:18 100:7 102:5	notes 1:8 34:21
113:25 122:15	24:14 38:7 39:23	67:10,17,21 68:6	171:7 191:22	123:8,22 126:22
135:11 136:11	42:14 44:8 45:13	68:20 69:1 70:19	206:4 213:11,23	128:6 138:16
163:4 175:11	54:10 58:13 59:9	72:9 85:12 87:14	215:21 216:3,14	154:22 187:8
176:19 180:10	59:12,16 79:19	87:25 88:1 89:2,7	news 50:22	204:5
mother 74:19,21	89:18,23 90:4,17	93:7 94:2,7,12	newspaper 176:3	noticeable 202:15
mouthpiece 135:21	90:25 91:12,17,21	113:14 114:10	Nicholas 3:3 4:18	noticed 119:22
move 7:23 11:3	92:25 93:5 94:3	129:11 137:2	6:23 7:4 115:15	143:14
14:11 75:14 82:15	95:14 100:19	140:4,12 144:24	115:17 116:3	notices 167:8
111:20 152:2	154:21 164:17	146:10 164:2	123:4 124:25	notified 173:17
174:20	191:9 211:2,4,9	171:2 173:2,20	128:12,12,17	184:12 203:4
moved 7:12 31:5	212:21,25 213:7	179:23 192:23	129:5,16 157:3,5	204:10
	213:18,23,25	196:19 204:23	157:16 159:9,10	

notwithstanding 57:22 85:20,21 November 24:15 99:25 136:6 145:23 171:23 NR 3:2 125:3 126:2 128:24 159:9,16 160:9 NSP 44:7 NSPCC 74:8 nudged 203:17 number 12:25 19:13 38:25 49:22 52:18 56:9 59:13 59:14 60:13 61:12 65:5 68:13,15 74:10 92:12 96:1 97:8 105:25 115:10 116:18 118:23 123:3 130:9 135:4,6 139:14 140:1 141:13 143:15 148:2 152:25 154:2 160:21 174:5,13 179:12 189:25 191:13 205:10 212:17 numbers 82:21 113:12 204:22 Nunn 211:12 212:9 212:15 213:10 215:8 nursing 3:4 5:12 6:4,7,14 7:7,15 126:15	obligation 84:10 obligations 145:18 observation 8:14 31:23 obstruction 28:8,12 obtains 9:15 obvious 73:19 117:25 182:22 obviously 62:20 63:9 73:23 76:12 85:8 97:17 106:22 110:25 124:3 134:22 137:21 156:17 167:20 171:1 174:17 180:21 181:12 184:2 185:3 190:2 190:3 195:9 204:13,20 occasion 29:14 133:3 180:7 188:13 200:11 201:5 208:9,25 214:12 occasionally 29:21 57:15 122:6 212:11 occasions 33:6 192:8 210:24 occur 198:12 occurred 32:5 171:24 185:23 October 31:16 32:6 odd 4:22 72:6,7 offence 2:4 62:12 63:2 69:21 84:25 118:25 129:18 130:11 185:1 199:4,5 offences 62:8 85:15 117:10 210:22 offend 17:18 offender 52:24 offenders 53:21 216:4	offending 54:20 62:12 offer 43:16 59:18 109:3 199:1,2 offered 60:18 61:2 77:22 140:14 211:14 offering 42:8 212:23 office 54:12 67:4,14 75:7 114:18 150:13 165:22 169:6,9 170:24 184:8,9,19,21,23 186:22 187:23 214:17 officer 67:17 89:9 153:13 167:17,18 186:24 210:4 officers 45:16,16 87:18 107:4 119:17 137:4 171:5 205:13 215:23 216:1,15 offices 174:7 official 85:14 officials 43:8 47:25 107:9 officiate 8:1,7 9:6 9:13 10:7 85:22 122:2,4 167:10 171:11 173:3 officiating 8:20 Oh 58:20 65:20 76:21 77:9 79:25 130:21 148:13 155:23 160:7 196:12,19,25 OHY000186 2:17 okay 2:21 24:25 42:8 43:24 51:9 68:7 76:19 84:9 100:15 105:4 136:7,20 156:15 163:4	old 126:17 127:1,1 128:20 ombudsman-type 96:5 omitted 63:23 once 8:12 27:22 71:5 73:7 173:1 184:21 192:8 206:14 211:10 one-off 97:22 one-to-one 182:10 ones 50:4 52:18 102:13 110:10 151:13 ongoing 11:11,13 11:19 12:5 17:7 18:16 38:21 53:2 132:10,15 140:3 144:16 192:15 193:20 195:10 213:5 online 172:2 onus 75:5 onwards 1:20 49:24 61:24 206:2 212:4 open 27:8 47:5 148:23 157:11 opened 57:20 58:12 openness 18:14 25:6 140:4,7 141:3 operate 9:3 operated 27:9 38:15 operating 9:22 103:19 operation 70:4 103:20,20 operational 210:15 Operationally 154:19 opinion 147:23 166:10 opportunity 106:1	163:19 193:24 opposed 22:12 127:1 142:12 167:2 opposing 23:12,12 23:20 opposite 48:17 opposition 12:9 13:14 option 95:18 ordained 16:22 18:1 order 32:4 51:3 61:3 64:1,4,7,9,10 65:6 78:11 91:16 93:8 100:14 138:9 170:9 192:14 204:24 ordinary 11:14 ordinary-sized 189:20 ordination 13:14 17:1,4 18:5 21:9 22:8 153:1 164:23 194:4 195:17 organisation 36:13 36:17 37:8 45:6,7 193:3 organisations 37:16 50:9 59:13 59:15 60:8,14 61:12 organise 170:4 organising 56:17 original 4:8 107:13 139:6 170:23 171:4,6 originally 63:20,21 140:11 174:8 ostensibly 9:16 ought 107:10 out-of-date 204:25 outcome 87:20 111:2 155:25 outcomes 78:13
O				
oath 1:7 66:19 121:12 object 102:21 objection 162:15 objections 135:4,6 objective 138:9 objectives 37:8				

136:9 144:23 outline 24:12 outlooks 152:3 outside 9:2 99:21 105:19 106:2 124:8 137:18 142:14 163:13 176:9 outsider 142:10 outsider's 142:7 outstanding 22:1 61:18 63:15 174:14,15 overall 132:18 150:25 194:11 overarching 91:21 92:20 132:19 overbearing 74:21 overhaul 154:25 overlapped 55:5 oversight 9:20 10:1 10:2 overtaken 10:18 owed 67:20 132:19 132:23 ownership 92:2,15 92:17	138:22 141:12 146:21,22 151:17 158:24 159:3,5,25 160:1,4,16 171:17 204:4,19 209:25 pages 99:8 112:23 113:8 118:9 127:7 163:18 pagination 49:25 palace 111:12 112:23 150:15 165:22 166:4,11 166:14 170:20,23 173:21 174:9 175:18,19 176:9 184:23 185:7,9 188:6,10 189:21 198:2,9,11 204:2 211:15,17,19,24 212:2,6,14,22 213:2 214:15,18 214:20,25 215:4 215:15 panel 13:7 16:7 20:4 26:24 27:2 28:3,5 38:7,9 39:10,12 44:8 48:24 49:24 55:25 58:13,16 62:11 64:24 80:24 90:22 94:17 96:1,2,9,17 98:14 100:17 103:2,12 133:19 136:15,21 153:19 153:24 155:2,3 177:12 181:13 197:15,21 206:16 209:12 216:2 217:20 218:5,13 218:17 panels 96:1 paper 54:11 104:15 122:16 209:15 Papers 205:11 paragraph 1:20,23	2:18 6:15 8:3 12:23,25 18:24 24:12,18,25 30:4 32:11 33:18 34:7 39:9 40:15 61:24 108:12 109:11 110:6,8,9 114:14 122:14,20 125:3 140:22 144:13 146:12 151:16 160:19 178:9 192:19 200:2 202:21 209:25 paragraphs 36:24 paramouncy 53:4 parish 5:19 8:13 9:16,17,17,19,25 11:10,14 19:3,12 19:19 20:14,15 71:15 87:18 89:8 90:3 125:19,21 173:17,19 190:11 197:2 205:12,13 205:15,23,24 206:18,25 207:4,7 207:11,17 216:9 parishes 5:20,21 8:15 90:2 151:24 165:19 179:12,14 190:20 191:21 197:2 215:24 216:3 parliament 63:17 parochial 19:16 197:7 part 11:20 12:9 16:16 18:25 29:7 29:23 30:23 31:9 32:25 33:12 39:5 40:10 49:16,17 51:1,2 91:2 105:7 105:9 111:3 113:15 129:12 130:22 140:14 143:9 157:22	166:9 172:9 179:17 191:25 194:3,18 195:15 196:3,7 200:18 213:16 214:9 part-time 166:12 211:25 216:12 partial 90:9 partially 9:4 participants 99:24 106:12 participants' 121:9 particular 1:16 13:11 15:21 17:21 17:25 19:9 45:8 80:10 86:6 105:14 108:10 127:4 149:2 151:9 158:24 207:5 210:6 216:13 particularly 5:23 104:4 141:25 151:13 205:2 215:12 parts 72:16 129:4 146:19 partway 132:14 party 44:6 pass 62:3 87:15 98:18 100:8 136:14 167:25 188:5 191:4 209:7 passage 22:10 passed 10:3 93:2 114:19 136:16 167:24 170:13 187:15 188:6 passing 105:15 205:22 pastoral 43:5 195:8 196:15 205:6 patriarchy 58:3 patterns 54:20 Paul 2:15 3:12,16 25:1 48:25 49:23	53:14 55:14,17,25 56:10 57:11 107:12,16,25 110:4 111:21 112:19 113:15 114:12 115:8 116:17 118:6 123:14 124:20 128:7 129:7,13 138:20 141:13 146:23 209:17 pause 126:4 136:12 136:21 150:3 195:23 PCC 19:14,15 67:15 68:24 PCCs 89:13 Pearl 39:23 41:3 42:16,18 64:18 211:1 penultimate 160:19 people 9:2 12:17 14:2 15:21 16:21 19:9,20 20:5 21:16 22:11,17 23:7,12 24:3,19 27:8,15,17 31:1 37:20 38:16,19,20 40:6,16 41:17,20 47:7 48:4,6,10 49:7,11 54:1,18 54:20 58:4,6,22 59:13 66:10 67:17 69:6,11 70:24 72:1,6,7,13,22,23 73:14,20 74:22 75:12 76:10 77:23 79:13,15 81:3,23 83:10,18,21 84:10 84:17 85:21 86:11 86:17 88:1,6 89:6 89:10,13 92:1 94:21 95:10,21,22 95:25 96:2,4,8,23 97:13 98:2 109:23
P				
PA 150:19 184:9 page 1:21,23 2:17 3:16,19,21 4:4 8:4 12:25 13:2 24:10 24:17 31:22,23 32:10 34:6,6 39:10 49:24 62:24 64:2 65:5,5 75:15 78:12 107:24 109:11,11 110:7 112:20 113:14,18 114:10,13 115:10 115:12 122:14 123:15,16 124:16 126:20 127:8,9,22 129:13 138:3,21				

111:18 117:19 118:24 127:19 142:14 148:2 151:24 152:2,25 154:25 155:9 157:13 160:21,22 169:17 171:1 172:6,7,8,19,20 172:21,22,25 173:6 174:14 181:5,7 182:8 192:22 193:2,12 194:5 195:8,9,18 196:5,14,19 197:8 210:11 people's 126:17 perceive 142:15 perceived 29:20 132:20 perceptible 74:13 perception 20:24 127:19 143:6 perfectly 61:20 perform 122:5 performance 210:19 performing 198:14 period 29:15 83:24 118:23 135:16 151:21 152:6 211:22 periods 215:6 peripheral 158:3 Perkins 27:22 76:18 permanently 85:17 permission 8:1,7 9:6,12 10:7 85:22 122:2,4 154:14 167:10 171:11 173:3 permit 3:3 permitted 58:9 93:3 122:5 perpetrators 133:2	133:7 persistence 32:1,7 persistent 32:4 persists 72:21,22 72:25 79:18 person 4:10 9:15 18:1 29:15 44:20 62:5 66:6 71:6,20 72:20,21 73:18 75:7,19,25 77:2 79:3,15 88:4 102:16 134:20 142:5,7,15,24 166:14 170:11,13 170:24 182:11 194:18 195:12 198:22 199:9,14 205:22 212:20 person' 187:1 person's 110:1 personal 144:21 205:4,14 personalities 27:25 28:1,23,25 157:25 180:11,16,24 personality 29:8,22 182:16 personally 27:13 51:5,14 82:5 personnel 215:10 perspective 31:2 61:19 179:4 persuaded 11:21 persuading 56:25 57:1 pertinent 209:13 Peter 70:18 76:11 107:20 112:1,8,9 112:10,13,14,22 113:22 114:3,25 115:2 117:9 121:21 122:1,2 175:12,15,16,21 175:22 176:1 212:24 213:20	phenomenal 49:13 Phil 51:1,13 56:10 76:5,7 Philip 1:3,7,24 2:12 2:19 3:5,11 5:7 24:9,21 25:2 100:1,2 103:3 105:6 107:24 112:8 122:23 126:16 135:14,15 135:23 137:9 138:19 141:15 142:24 145:5 147:20 148:5,20 157:22 180:10 181:10 217:16 phone 123:4 phrase 158:1 physical 73:6 physically 168:17 pick 28:6 30:25 51:10 102:12 156:16 169:21 picked 29:17 48:15 181:3 184:11 picking 146:15 156:6 piece 45:4 54:11 86:14 116:9 184:15,15 pieces 103:9 pilot 59:5 PJ 126:16 place 11:1 12:6,7 23:17 27:22 44:16 48:2 49:9,9 51:17 63:19 71:4,13 73:2 76:4,7,18,19 76:24 77:8,19 78:22 88:10 89:24 90:1,15 94:20 98:1,7 141:5 148:17 169:17 178:19 179:1,8 198:18 201:25	217:5 placed 109:5 170:24 171:7 188:11 209:17 places 61:3 77:21 plan 165:18 planet 52:17 74:5 planned 139:21 Platt 71:8 play 29:23 played 75:25 pleaded 73:18 please 25:1 30:1 31:13 32:10 48:7 48:8 107:12,16,22 107:25 109:10,11 110:6 111:22 112:19 113:13 114:14 115:8 116:17 118:7 121:12 125:22 127:8 136:7 138:19 141:13 146:22 171:18 186:7 193:5 204:3 plus 74:7,7 pm 98:22,25 121:14,16 162:9 162:21,23 208:19 208:21,24 217:9 point 5:6 6:8 7:10 20:7 21:17 22:4 23:5 24:6 25:12 26:20,23 28:7 29:9 46:10 51:21 58:25 60:16 77:7 90:13 95:4 102:7 102:25 119:16 121:25 124:5 127:14 128:13 130:12,20 137:11 139:5,16 140:12 143:6 144:6 145:16 146:3,23 147:14,15 148:22	150:13 156:18 161:25 201:17,18 213:9 pointed 42:24 54:5 pointing 160:9 points 53:5 137:3,6 139:1,6,8,10 144:2 147:11 156:7 poles 31:3 police 4:10,15 11:19 44:19 56:22 66:5 69:8 77:9 83:12 84:16 96:18 112:5 113:21 115:19 116:2,23 120:10,22 124:24 125:12,23 129:25 131:19 183:4 200:6,12,13,14,15 201:1,10,13 210:4 210:18 214:11 216:3 policies 216:6 policy 110:17 111:4 111:7 210:13 215:23 poor 4:21 37:11 40:8 109:14,19 110:4 Pope's 42:20 55:7,7 portable 20:4 pose 79:3 posing 138:1 position 3:7 18:19 33:7 65:11 141:6 158:2 168:3,4 193:18 213:9 positions 19:9 21:10,10,11,15 23:13 95:11 141:19 143:15 151:24 192:22 193:13 positive 141:20
---	---	--	--	---

216:1 possibilities 194:21 possible 8:11 14:22 38:12 47:12 81:15 119:22 144:24 146:13 possibly 7:9 53:9 72:21 74:14 87:9 93:18 103:1 115:19 153:8 172:21 post 27:22 29:5 32:7 55:7 101:19 169:3 188:8 195:16 204:14,20 205:17 213:12 postdate 113:8 posts 29:16 potential 16:24 23:25 62:7 109:19 potentially 21:3 26:15 169:25 pours 94:17 power 11:11,19 12:1 73:1 81:21 81:22,25 88:15 90:15 92:24 95:11 142:13 practicable 78:23 practical 9:11 11:6 79:21 88:22 89:6 practically 62:22 67:6,25 88:6 89:10 practice 11:14 12:21,22 28:17 36:4 56:6 87:3,25 88:19,24 93:24 196:22 214:6 practices 14:24 45:16 61:16 93:23 practised 82:19 preach 173:1 preached 205:20 preconceptions	103:23 104:1 predecessor 25:23 37:5 prefer 123:24 192:25 preference 91:16 preferment 194:19 preferred 195:6 preferring 30:9 prejudgment 12:15 premises 166:13 211:13 preparation 113:1 prepare 3:8 136:18 prepared 24:13 123:10,20 153:15 presence 187:21 present 19:19 22:13 31:3 107:8 143:17 187:5 188:15 presentation 142:11 presently 193:11 president 55:20 press 46:13 79:23 89:15 pressure 76:24 157:13 presupposed 43:14 pretending 95:4 pretty 114:2 126:23 135:8 prevailing 152:19 prevalence 74:6 94:12 prevalent 15:16,17 prevent 4:16 prevented 28:24 previous 4:12 104:3 110:23 115:13 116:1 117:5 118:25 119:24 120:11 121:2 124:7	174:10 183:7 184:11 previously 38:8 123:5 157:11 200:4 213:6 priest 5:19 8:12 9:16,17,19,21,21 9:25 11:10,14 71:15 72:20 85:14 173:17 190:11 priestly 22:12 priests 6:3 13:15 22:9 133:11 151:25 primarily 48:12 prime 215:20 principal 18:8 principally 13:15 principle 10:22 20:16,17,19 53:4 60:24,25 principles 14:15 prior 17:3 27:10 28:7 102:2 104:7 164:22,23 190:3 priority 109:20 146:13 190:3 192:1 207:2 prison 200:8 Pritchard 34:19 51:25 101:4,7 106:7 112:7 115:22 120:21 121:1 122:12,16 132:8,9,13 152:4 202:24 private 36:4 202:17 privately 187:23 pro 51:2 probabilities 30:8 31:11 78:16 probability 53:3 79:13 95:23 161:23 probably 1:22 24:8	31:9 32:8 40:24 50:12 61:9 64:25 89:8 102:25 108:11 109:7 111:6 122:9 135:14 139:4 141:9 152:25 154:4,18 157:18 158:4,22 159:2,22 160:8 167:2 174:14 180:18 193:10 problem 19:11,19 24:4 29:8 43:18 52:24 69:10 72:8 79:6,6 80:11 83:2 84:5 86:7 92:3 96:25 130:18 153:9 154:7 178:8 problems 64:20 77:20 95:20 139:15 146:6 157:23 procedure 56:6 178:1,24,25 184:23 187:7 188:5,8 198:25,25 199:1,22 procedures 18:12 23:6 37:14 44:15 44:16,16 48:2,18 75:17 78:13 81:9 81:13 97:4 108:9 151:7 178:15,17 178:22 215:10 216:18 proceed 98:25 proceedings 116:23 153:12 process 11:13 16:22 17:5 19:11 44:21 51:2 71:17 71:18,24 72:11 76:13 96:19 97:17 107:5 135:12	140:14 149:6 155:4 168:15,19 168:20 183:21 184:6,16,21 191:18 193:19 194:24 195:10 196:7 197:23 198:1,22 211:10 211:17,21 212:3 214:7 216:24 processes 18:20 45:23 73:3 90:1 94:3 produce 1:17 4:1 39:13 40:5 118:12 produced 3:17 54:17 99:7 100:22 100:23 101:1,6 105:24 118:5 129:8 209:23 product 137:5 PROF 156:6,10,13 156:15 157:15,20 202:21 203:2,10 203:12,15 profess 89:11 professional 27:16 64:15 75:6 102:2 102:4,8,9 103:5 137:15 145:18 146:2 155:16 158:6 193:21 195:11 212:6 213:10 professionally 145:17 professionals 64:5 Professor 119:1 profile 212:19 profound 98:5 project 56:14 59:5 59:21 60:21 195:21 promote 192:25 promptly 19:18
---	---	---	---	--

promulgated 44:1	provision 37:17	76:18,19,24 84:10	203:18,22 204:13	46:2 53:21 103:3
proof 30:8 53:1	psychological 15:9	88:10 90:7,9,12	206:17	106:11 114:7,12
78:14 79:10,12	PTO 2:1,24 3:1 4:8	92:14 95:9,17	questioning 149:22	118:2 119:2
125:14	4:17 6:20 7:2	99:17 106:7 111:6	questions 10:4	130:20 133:10
proper 16:15 29:10	8:19,21,23 9:3,15	111:21 112:19	20:22 26:24 28:3	135:4 141:13
29:10 68:6 154:22	9:17,20 10:10	119:8 129:14	28:4,5 66:13 67:2	142:23 145:4
properly 17:24	109:25 120:14,21	143:15 144:10	98:14 99:22 100:9	147:5 149:20
136:25 192:15	125:18,24 126:5	146:10,21 148:17	105:18 106:11	182:25
proportionate	126:14 132:8	150:10 158:23	121:18 123:11,19	raises 100:11
68:15	133:11 137:12	163:3 164:1 168:8	127:22 128:7	raising 72:15
proposal 10:15	152:16 169:25	170:17 175:23	129:1 135:23	134:24 150:9
proposals 10:23	171:21 172:6,7,10	179:8 181:19	138:2 144:7	range 112:4 121:5
propose 11:1 99:19	172:12,21,23	183:10 187:13	150:22,24 153:18	ratify 186:10
115:6 177:11	173:7,16,19,20,21	198:4,23 199:9	153:20 155:2,3	rational 72:25
proposing 9:19	public 4:23 5:14	putting 50:24 91:15	177:12 189:10	73:12 74:4
10:9	44:5 62:10 67:13	133:6 196:24	197:13,15,19,21	RC 125:4
prosecuted 79:16	74:1 85:25 143:6		203:20 206:12,13	re-enacted 178:2
79:25 80:17 97:5	143:11	Q	206:16 208:15	reach 33:15 38:20
97:14	publication 3:6	qualification 196:4	217:20 218:5,13	111:13 138:10
prosecution 71:12	81:20	qualifications 36:2	218:17	145:23
prosecutions 78:22	publish 49:6	101:10	quickly 52:10	reached 109:13
protection 35:20	published 39:19	qualified 101:12	204:19	131:12 145:16
120:3 210:6,9,13	44:1 46:9,9 48:23	193:12	quite 19:12 37:10	153:5,6 156:22
protection/safeg...	49:2 209:21	qualities 195:1	49:1 52:10 54:13	198:10 199:18
64:6	publishing 49:3	quality 77:7	58:22 60:3 64:16	214:22
protest 183:24	pull 166:20	Queen 6:5,16	65:15 71:19,20	reaching 153:24
protocol 9:5 105:11	purpose 3:1 26:10	queried 142:25	72:4 102:24	read 18:24 43:3,3
107:7 108:11	42:2 43:23 83:25	queries 130:14	124:11 135:4	49:16 110:9 112:3
125:5	108:7 119:14	216:5	137:25 145:21,22	114:25 124:10
prove 81:10	127:10 137:8	query 147:2	151:8,15,15 165:8	125:4,22 129:4
proved 86:24 145:1	191:18	question 11:24 13:6	175:25 187:18	140:25 163:6
208:6,6	purposes 62:10	16:5,16 28:20	189:25 190:17	166:21 200:3
proven 74:2 183:19	89:6 90:8 103:6	34:5 103:4 105:3	197:13	208:22,23 209:2,3
provide 37:23	129:8 149:22	109:3 117:25		209:8,9,11,14,16
62:23 145:13,25	186:18 205:13	119:2,20 120:20	R	209:18 218:20
195:24 212:6	pursue 138:17	126:21 130:22	rac 58:4	Reade 3:3 4:18
216:15	push 81:10 140:16	133:1,10 137:12	racism 58:5	6:23 7:4 115:15
provided 75:19	pushed 125:14,16	143:19 145:7	racking 156:24	115:17 123:4
116:5,25 117:13	145:20 169:19	152:6 154:9	radical 154:5	124:25 128:12,12
117:16,18,20,22	put 9:5 10:15 12:21	156:16 158:17	radically 21:7	128:17 129:5,16
141:2 145:7	24:8 31:13 41:16	162:15 176:7	raise 5:7 24:8 47:8	157:5,16 159:9,10
153:16 163:17	43:4 46:13 47:20	180:12 182:20	99:23 100:7	159:19 160:12,14
173:3 176:2,13	47:21 52:6 53:5,7	185:22 186:15	130:14,22	161:14,16
195:3 214:12,16	60:11 63:18 71:4	192:12,18,18	raised 7:25 20:24	Reade's 157:3
providing 158:6	73:2 75:5 76:4,7	200:1 202:20	21:2 26:15 43:18	reader 67:15

readers 19:8	192:17	81:16 90:19,24	Redress 95:17,19	region 38:22
readily 19:10	reassess 18:22	93:19 94:1 104:5	reduced 7:22 47:3	regional 59:13
reading 128:9	reassurance 145:8	109:21 139:11	Rees 186:9	register 8:18,21
208:20	reassured 20:8	144:18,25 146:16	refer 62:24 109:4	registered 25:3
reads 125:11	recall 5:3 26:3,13	147:8 153:24	136:17 163:14	registrar 186:9
real 7:25 24:3	31:18 32:21	167:6,15 170:17	reference 18:7	188:16
41:24 80:24,25	107:10 116:6	177:13,22 178:7	20:13 26:5 34:7	regularly 57:15
103:21 110:11	126:8 156:21	recommended 40:4	105:10,20 110:1	204:24
140:4 157:4	159:22 160:10	52:21 89:21	120:15 152:16	regulations 64:12
realised 136:12	recalled 201:5	116:13	163:25 209:19	66:3 80:7,10
177:24	receive 61:3 155:6	recommending	references 18:14	rehearse 2:3
reality 79:22,22	received 56:22	96:16	29:10	relate 8:22 128:6
80:23	107:17 112:21	reconciled 14:11	referral 61:1	related 64:9 90:3
really 4:17 7:6 15:1	133:21 139:1	reconciliation 14:8	referrals 216:2	169:17 181:19
16:21 18:9,18	147:25 148:1	reconsider 34:20	referred 7:9 25:16	205:21 207:4
27:7 37:11,13	177:3 183:13	138:5	28:10 85:10 97:4	relates 21:20
41:12,24 42:2	184:22 186:23	record 9:22 10:2,2	99:25 125:7	relating 14:18
44:23 46:3,17	187:10 205:8	10:4 87:10 89:19	206:17 207:12	136:1 197:24
56:11 60:8,13,15	211:8 212:10	109:12,13,19	referring 26:1	205:11,13 216:21
61:5 62:2,10	receiving 40:7	129:24 140:25	161:4 170:14	relation 32:14
65:22 77:17,25	136:3	154:21 159:3	refers 159:24	99:24 100:10
80:19 82:25 87:6	receptive 151:3,6	167:17 186:19	reflect 5:1 12:10	112:10,13,22
93:9,20 96:16	151:15	187:8 188:24	49:4 102:10 206:1	115:1 117:4
97:24,25 98:3	recipient 22:14,24	209:14	reflected 136:9	118:21 120:20
100:7 102:10	reckon 70:25	recordable 208:2	reflecting 140:17	121:20 122:1
103:8 128:15	recognise 32:5	recorded 31:24	150:24	124:13 125:17
130:12 135:21	recognised 106:5	33:4,19 34:8	reflection 80:2	126:21 131:5
137:4 139:15	recognising 94:7	87:20 116:16	reflections 12:20	132:8 135:25
143:13 145:14	recognition 211:5	124:13 137:11	refused 19:14	141:16 144:7
148:1 149:9,11	recollection 25:9	168:14 198:4	90:13	147:22 151:3
151:8 153:9 154:9	108:22 133:18	199:21 201:6,24	regard 14:18 53:4	156:19 160:8
155:25 165:25	156:25 188:20	202:12	69:21,25 145:21	183:14 184:5
168:1 171:3	recommendation	recording 111:7	151:14 152:20,21	200:2 204:2
189:19 191:17	9:15,18 62:4,20	128:10,13	153:1	214:13
reason 2:23 25:18	63:25 65:4 75:14	records 86:2,5,11	regarded 34:25	relational 73:1,2,9
41:15 67:18 81:14	78:10 79:5 81:15	87:5,8 109:22	143:10 179:17	73:10,13,20 74:4
108:10 114:2,8	82:9,14,15 85:3	122:4 151:25	207:13	74:22,23 75:4,4
127:12 134:17	86:2 87:9,17	167:2,8 169:19	regarding 33:21	85:2,2 95:5
148:9 155:23	89:17 93:11	171:7 172:8	158:18 177:1	relationally 73:10
168:8 181:2 186:5	194:16	recruitment 18:12	182:23 183:20	relations 151:14
208:7	recommendations	23:6 194:24	184:25 198:17	relationship 27:16
reasonable 30:10	1:11,15 49:23	recuse 64:25	201:6 202:8 211:5	57:13 95:8 115:20
143:22	50:1 51:22 52:5,7	red 115:5 150:19	216:5	178:14 182:11
reasons 91:19	52:10,15 53:6	207:17,22,25	regardless 70:22	201:19 213:13,16
103:1 162:13	61:17,25 64:3	208:7,8,9,11	regards 181:16	relationships 73:12

181:1 relatively 22:7 Relativity 136:25 release 46:13 51:3 released 35:6 203:12 relevant 44:20 130:16 171:4 212:12 214:11 relied 2:23 religious 62:15,21 64:1,4,8,10 65:6 72:20 78:11 154:13,17 reluctance 19:2,4 20:15,19 22:23 reluctantly 141:2 rely 78:12 relying 70:24 remain 1:7 195:2 remained 38:25 68:17 161:13 164:11 remaining 69:8 remains 60:25,25 79:6 remarks 28:21 remember 23:10 25:17 57:1 83:2 88:13 89:22 100:3 110:19,23 113:10 113:24 116:1 121:12 125:7 130:17 133:22 137:19 185:18 186:13 193:8 207:1 remembering 172:19 173:5 remembrance 187:8 remit 32:16 67:19 105:19 remote 59:18 remotely 214:17	215:5 removal 203:23 204:16 removed 71:11 85:17 111:3 149:9 155:19 175:9 renew 173:6 renewal 184:6 renewed 174:15 repeated 19:21 20:15,17 repetitive 99:19 replied 108:18 reply 211:8 report 1:9,18 2:16 3:6,18 4:8 5:9 9:21 33:20 48:23 49:6 50:16,17,18 52:11,11 54:17 67:7,10,18 68:21 69:1,15 71:7,15 74:21 75:8,10,12 75:18 90:20,22 92:16 93:25 94:13 94:15,21 95:1 100:23,24 101:2,6 101:12 104:10 106:7 107:14 109:9 111:21 114:24 117:11 118:6 120:25 122:11,16 127:14 129:9,11,21,22 130:8,25 133:13 133:21,25 134:2,5 134:19 135:5,13 135:25 137:15,22 138:5,6,10 139:9 140:8,10,18 143:7 143:25 144:15,17 145:21 146:1,16 146:25 147:1,3,4 147:6,12,14 155:5 156:8 171:24 174:1 177:14,22	177:23 181:14 185:16 188:9 202:23 203:1,7,8 203:9 211:4 reported 26:18 56:23 66:1,4,5,10 69:19 85:5 162:2 184:10 reporting 55:11 56:20,21 65:12,14 65:16,21 67:1,12 68:3,9,11,20,25 69:18 70:2 72:2 182:12,13 198:2 reports 21:23 61:2 67:7 69:9 90:7 100:22 103:17 139:3 202:3,3,9 representations 136:3 representatives 121:9 136:14 represented 40:17 representing 143:20 204:10 reputation 137:16 reputations 160:21 request 63:23 171:8 177:1,3 182:23 187:11 requested 118:11 171:20 187:1,14 require 117:12 154:24 required 32:15 34:2 53:1 68:12 105:25 108:9 150:6 174:10 192:23 214:19 requirement 10:14 34:1 requirements 60:17 requires 70:14 79:11,12 141:22	173:20 residential 195:13 resignation 34:7,22 resigned 19:18 115:13 resigning 34:12 resistance 72:18 196:9,16 resisted 15:3 resolve 146:6 resolved 76:22 resource 165:4,6 166:13 resources 68:12 166:13 214:13 215:6 respect 16:10 23:21 33:20 78:16 93:23 93:24 95:7 152:11 respected 21:12 186:25 respective 213:14 respond 17:18 21:2 39:8 41:10,14,23 44:13,18 48:7 51:20 58:19 60:8 70:25 92:17 149:13 174:3 212:9 responded 46:3,23 50:20,21 51:20 98:6 responding 39:24 39:25 40:5 41:19 42:10,16,22 43:1 44:3,4,17,24 45:2 46:6 53:19 58:23 70:23 139:2 142:5 216:4 response 4:13 40:2 46:12 48:8 49:18 49:19 54:25 58:7 65:8 68:1 135:9 144:11,12 145:2,3	145:7 170:16 211:4 215:21,24 responses 37:12,23 39:7,21 40:8 43:9 48:11 responsibilities 134:21 141:16 166:21 responsibility 33:11 57:8 67:3 75:11,12 132:19 132:23 133:1,4 144:16,17 179:11 180:22 197:3 215:21 responsible 30:6 168:4 responsive 151:11 rest 125:4,22 187:3 restitution 16:2,6 restoration 16:1 restored 14:11 result 4:3 5:16 6:22 9:4 21:24 47:15 48:23 49:22 50:14 53:9 55:12 72:11 108:17 112:7 119:10 147:7 171:24 173:15 results 144:22 resume 1:6 resurrect 42:22 retaining 110:18 retired 2:1 7:12 8:12 85:24 164:11 172:16,21 196:6 210:3 retirement 4:9,20 125:15 172:23 retires 8:12 retribution 16:2,5 retrospect 153:7 return 66:18 164:13 returning 210:15
--	---	---	---	---

revelations 62:19	Rideout 15:15 16:4	robust 127:13	126:14,17 127:16	69:4 78:11 79:19
Reverend 11:17	76:9 77:14 116:21	Roger 3:18 4:1,7	128:1 131:10,20	85:5 86:5 87:8,18
98:2 107:21,23	116:22 182:23,25	98:20 99:2,5	131:23 150:5	88:9 89:7,9,18
113:15,20 211:1	183:1,8,14 184:5	174:25 176:14,17	152:4 157:6,7,18	90:17,18,25 91:10
213:7	200:5,8,12,17	177:22 203:5,13	160:11 161:23	91:13 92:3,20
review 1:13,14	201:1,7	218:1	RSCB 66:8	93:1,6 95:14
18:16,22 20:3	Rideout's 15:2	role 1:10 3:24 5:2	run 26:15 37:6,19	102:1 104:20
24:20 32:13,14,20	185:3,14	13:12 18:25 19:24	37:20 68:4 90:25	105:16,17 109:16
38:4 39:12,19	right 1:24 2:13	20:2 22:18 26:9	165:22	132:2 134:1,2,18
45:22 46:5,8	3:23 9:4 13:19	37:3 39:4 55:24	running 23:24 47:1	134:21 136:2
47:22 50:25 51:3	28:17 32:3,8	75:25 102:9 103:5	84:5 112:23	141:16,21 142:18
85:18 99:14	37:21 49:6 64:21	147:20 148:4,5	147:24 179:23	146:18,24 147:16
100:20,23 102:24	71:10 87:23 88:5	158:4 164:7,11,22	195:20 197:2,6	147:18 151:4,5,7
103:7 104:14,19	96:2,24 97:15	165:14,15,16	runs 99:8 163:18	153:13,21 154:19
105:8,9,14 106:3	101:12,25 102:13	166:1,1,2 179:21	rural 10:3 125:1	156:12 167:17,18
106:22 109:18	107:21,23 115:15	188:1 195:12,16	194:10	167:20 168:2,2
111:22,24 113:8	120:4 122:19	196:15,15 207:13		178:11,15,16,22
114:1,23 115:2,16	123:6,19 124:5,20	210:10,14,15,17	S	178:24,25 181:9
115:25 116:22,25	124:23 126:1	210:18 211:8,14	sabbatical 178:4	181:17,20 182:7,8
117:5,14 118:3	128:6 129:9 133:1	211:21 212:2,4,13	sacked 71:10	182:20 183:21
119:11,15 122:2	134:1 142:24	212:15 213:18,24	sacrament 82:19	184:1,24,25 185:2
139:7,18 149:2,3	144:6 145:5,10	214:10 215:19	82:23 83:23	185:4 186:24
149:4 155:25	163:7 164:4,6,12	216:11	sacraments 126:1	187:16 188:7,17
163:19 167:6	164:13,24 165:3	roles 19:22 62:15	sacred 84:20	191:24,25 192:15
174:21 175:1	169:4 174:23	62:21 153:21	safe 59:1,5,20 60:8	198:5,17 199:3,22
178:19 202:23	175:14 185:19	164:14 191:13	60:21 61:4	202:8 206:8,11
206:23 207:1,7	190:25 205:1	192:23 193:1	safeguard 54:14	207:5 210:2 211:2
208:11 210:18,19	207:9,17	195:19,24 213:14	88:3	211:19,23 212:5,6
211:6,10,17,21	right-hand 160:17	Roman 102:5	safeguarding 10:8	212:8,11,17,21,25
212:3 215:10,17	rightly 71:20,20	room 74:18,18,20	10:8,9 11:7 14:7	213:7,10,24 214:1
216:19,24 217:3	rigorous 13:16 17:7	83:18 163:13	14:19,24 16:15	214:12 215:16,22
reviewed 104:17,24	18:12 29:11	187:2,4	17:19 18:2,3	215:25 216:6,7,14
114:1 117:2,6	rigour 27:12	Rossi 164:18	21:10,20 24:1,12	216:16,18,23
118:1,19 119:4	rise 208:25	rota 4:22	24:14 25:14 26:6	217:1,2
121:22 157:2	rises 61:10	rotas 8:16	26:9,18 27:10	safer 93:16
176:21 177:7	risk 16:24 17:1,8	Roughly 38:15	29:1,4 30:21	safety 53:2,2
204:24	18:4 47:7 52:19	routine 86:7	32:13,16 33:14	saintly 70:18
reviewer 100:18	68:5 79:4 80:5,5,9	row 88:10,16,16	34:10,23 38:7,9	sake 31:18 207:20
107:11	80:18 82:12 87:20	Roy 2:1,3,11,25	38:14 39:23 42:15	208:10
reviewing 119:16	89:12 162:25	4:20 5:4,12,20 6:2	44:8,15 45:14,16	sales 164:17
205:1 210:12	210:12 216:2,9	6:4 7:2,5,6,11	53:11 54:11 55:15	sanction 65:16,19
211:14	RM 138:3	101:4,7 106:7	55:16,18,25 56:2	sand 60:16
reviews 216:10	robed 83:24	115:22 118:19	58:2,11,13 60:1	Sandbrook 181:13
revise 138:6	Robert 83:6 115:13	120:2,7,14 122:12	61:16 64:4,12,18	Sandham 60:2
rid 83:16	115:18 116:2	122:25 124:4	65:7 67:16,17,19	213:24 214:4

Sandra 108:3	111:22 112:19	42:21 43:3 51:11	171:6 191:4	183:14 185:23
sat 41:3 42:6 90:18	116:19 123:14	51:12 60:18 61:17	sending 108:7	186:21 201:24
98:22	124:20 129:14	69:4 70:9 73:7	130:11 170:10	202:12
satisfaction 148:21	138:19 146:10	80:15 81:13 83:15	senior 55:22 107:9	sergeant 210:10
Savage 108:3	149:18 160:5	85:1 91:6 93:12	108:15 128:22	series 47:24
saw 9:9 29:18	171:16 209:18	96:3 97:11 107:22	141:18 151:10	serious 210:11,15
49:17 56:20 63:12	screening 216:24	107:25 108:2	165:23 166:5,6,10	210:22
64:20,25 113:4	script 143:17	112:1 113:14	178:14 179:2,7	seriously 12:18
176:25 190:13	scriptural 13:16	119:18 121:10	180:15 185:10,11	54:24 94:12,13,19
saying 12:4 15:5	14:15	122:20 123:18,22	185:12 186:20	seriousness 94:7
22:19 25:9 26:8	scripture 13:4,11	124:5,21 125:11	190:24,25 191:14	143:23
28:18 33:8,9	13:16	126:13,17 127:18	192:13,22,24	sermon 205:20
47:25 50:21,22	scroll 107:21	128:3 134:18	193:1,13,18 194:8	served 200:8 210:4
65:15,21 69:11,16	scrolling 107:24	138:3,23 141:17	194:19 195:12	service 4:22 20:9
70:10 71:24 72:23	scrutiny 143:21	145:15 153:19	196:10 199:20	45:22 85:11 96:5
75:2 76:15 77:8	152:1,14	155:20 160:20	202:24 214:3	165:7 210:20
79:15 86:18 106:5	seal 82:16,25 83:13	176:22 185:2,13	seniority 142:21	services 5:14 8:16
129:4 158:15	84:1,23	185:25 206:24,25	sense 14:13 21:13	36:3 66:7 97:6
159:21 160:12	search 108:19	seeing 86:16 91:4	21:14 39:20 46:16	101:16 122:6
173:8 182:14	110:4	seek 14:10 32:20	47:13 80:3 95:3	165:18
196:19 201:12	second 2:22 4:14	42:12 168:8	127:9 148:21	servicing 22:6
202:4	11:12 24:17 25:1	172:23	senses 160:13	set 30:3,7 39:8,12
says 2:22 12:16	49:11 62:4 109:3	seeking 43:15	sensible 202:7	39:24 43:19 44:11
69:14 78:3 125:11	121:25 125:3	seen 17:21 18:7,20	sensitive 140:15	44:16,21 61:24
135:9 137:14	127:6 147:14	59:17 63:12 68:7	sensitivity 212:19	65:2 71:5 95:15
140:23 144:14	157:1,18 161:23	70:11 73:14,14,17	sent 47:15 52:15	97:3 129:1 135:7
scandal 97:25	second-to-last	77:21 83:9 85:1	53:20 107:5,20,23	154:20 156:24
scandals 104:4,9	138:22	88:8 112:25	108:1,1 112:22	177:15 188:8
scenario 27:20,21	secondly 93:3	134:13 142:4	113:23 138:25	sets 43:17 44:21
scheme 152:15	154:18	146:15 148:6	143:25 145:4	139:11
179:8,22,23 180:1	secretarial 21:10	150:18 160:21	150:14 170:10,14	setter 191:3
180:7,17 189:14	169:12	selection 16:17,25	170:23 173:16	setting 4:2 89:10
194:2,3	secretaries 108:2,3	17:3,3,15 24:5	205:2	150:6
schools 66:9 74:14	108:8 204:6	209:12	sentence 2:20,22	settlement 51:1,2
SCIE 45:4,8,10	secretary 25:20	self-confidence	4:14 25:1 110:21	setup 65:22
93:13	29:7 150:19	46:16	114:15,25 200:8	seven 17:6
Scolding 35:11,13	162:12 166:8,11	self-disclosure	sentences 24:18	sex 129:18 154:15
35:14 39:16 66:17	168:5 169:9 170:6	150:1	separate 106:3	sexism 154:12
66:19,21,25 98:13	181:9 211:13	self-employed	151:4 169:17	sexual 2:4 36:9
98:15,18 217:24	section 2:16 125:22	211:22	196:25 205:15	39:8 62:8,12,12
scope 16:23	135:11	self-harming 77:20	separated 41:2	73:5 75:16 85:4
Scout 137:25	Seddlescombe 7:12	Selwood 131:25	separately 117:20	85:15 116:4,24
screen 2:20 3:13	see 5:20 9:12 18:7	132:3,6	192:3,4	117:10 210:22
24:9 31:13,15	26:14 31:23 32:1	seminary 80:16	September 6:18	sexuality 154:16
107:12 110:5	36:21 37:13 42:19	send 52:9,9 107:8	138:24 139:1	sexually 37:1 42:11

45:3 46:7	shook 97:23	156:13,15 157:15	101:15,21 102:10	space 83:19
shape 59:23	short 66:23 101:1	157:20 202:20,21	192:8,10	Spaces 59:1,5,20
shaping 60:15	121:15 162:22	203:2,10,12,15	society 49:15 72:4	60:8,21
share 30:17 33:2	192:19 200:3	sit 44:9 53:16 64:24	softly 165:8	speak 6:22 14:22
133:8,14 134:10	shortly 4:9 185:9	88:10,14,15,16	solely 65:17	37:17 72:1 92:2
144:23	shove 81:11	148:9	solicitor 33:23	106:22 108:22
shared 131:24	show 85:20 144:10	sits 92:21	solid 30:25	126:24 148:20
133:4,24 134:7,12	showed 7:1 54:19	sitting 62:3 66:14	somebody 15:22	speaking 12:17
134:16 137:10	shown 71:6 74:9	situation 17:19	29:4 37:6 72:9	56:11,12 83:7
139:19,19,25	shredding 86:17	24:13 28:9 44:23	88:12 92:3 117:9	123:6 194:11
140:11,13 157:5	Sibson 25:13,19	63:6 71:1 84:19	117:16 153:20	special 154:13
161:14	162:11 163:2	93:17 95:7 96:23	169:11,13,20	specialised 210:5
sharing 87:11	Sibson's 25:23	97:18 140:23	183:19,22 197:1	specific 32:19 39:7
88:25 89:1 133:22	side 69:25 92:14	141:1 152:8,9	somebody's 16:25	62:12 94:2 158:3
139:17,20,22,22	123:15,15 124:1,1	156:2 178:11	Somerset 71:8	165:1 182:22
140:8 141:23	204:7	197:5 213:11	son's 205:21	190:20 196:21
147:12,14,15	sides 100:4	situations 87:7	soon 4:19 43:18	197:25
Sharpling 28:19,20	sidetracked 23:24	89:15	sorry 1:12 3:14	specifically 26:25
157:21 158:10	sight 146:25 170:1	six 17:6 57:18	12:24 18:11 19:7	30:24 40:17 44:11
180:12 200:1,16	171:14	76:23	23:1 25:24 39:16	44:13 47:19 57:1
200:22,25 201:10	signature 35:19	six-monthly 57:17	84:18 92:2 110:8	57:22 63:19,22
201:15	signed 99:10	size 189:18	117:25 118:10	84:4 114:15
shattered 73:20	137:12 209:23	sizeable 113:9,10	124:16 137:8	120:25 122:12
shatters 73:16	significance 33:14	skills 192:23,24	144:9 156:16	127:15,23 128:25
she'd 32:6 158:14	197:5	195:15 196:20	187:12,13 192:16	130:7 133:6
Sherlock 97:1	significant 22:1	197:10	196:6 201:14	140:21 141:14
shift 48:14 57:20	82:21 109:18	skip 113:13	202:20,21 207:8	142:13,24 153:23
75:5	112:12 128:12	slack 118:9	sort 25:10 37:24	165:5,17,18
shifted 74:13	144:2 152:21	slate 15:7	40:20 43:25 89:20	170:21 171:5
Shirley 25:2,4,21	164:15 170:4	slightly 27:5 41:6	95:13 109:20	179:4 181:16,20
25:25 27:11 31:5	177:18 181:15	97:16 100:13	132:18 135:17	186:14 191:19
32:1,3 103:25	214:24	122:15 162:17	143:17 150:22	speculate 16:18
107:4,4 108:3	significantly 39:2	167:15 193:8	165:20 195:24	25:11
123:1 133:20	211:20 213:19	slip 25:22 121:24	196:19,22	speculative 17:9
147:3,25 148:6	signs 73:4 148:19	slowly 184:15	sorts 78:24 95:10	spent 150:3 152:9
156:7 158:6,10	similar 70:3 144:12	slur 137:15	97:21	164:20
Shirley's 24:20	152:3 212:7	small 70:20 103:19	sought 43:24 212:9	spiritual 95:8
153:8 158:7	simply 8:15 10:3	124:11 190:6	sound 207:8 208:3	spoke 6:3,9 11:21
shock 46:13,13	19:8 22:10 34:4	196:13	soundboard 102:11	115:15 122:21
97:25 187:18	40:20 65:10 67:3	smaller 182:4	soundingboard	123:3 186:21
shocked 162:1	sin 84:24	215:2	102:17	187:24
187:19	single 46:12	smoking 86:16	source 158:17	spoken 22:17 23:14
shocking 46:14	single-agency	snapshot 20:6	161:20	23:15 83:6 127:18
77:17 89:16 91:8	210:23	social 25:3 45:5	Southwark 215:18	158:20 159:19
Shoes 98:2	Sir 119:1 156:6,10	66:7 97:6 101:12	215:20 216:8	163:13 165:8

sponsoring 9:21	50:2 119:21	25:16 26:2,12	study 68:6	summarised 112:1
sports 62:17	136:20 158:4	28:10 214:10	stuff 52:5 76:18	112:16
spread 190:23	190:4 211:20	stay 66:4	86:23 191:21	summarises 114:11
squaring 48:3	starts 122:14	stayed 74:8	stunning 150:2	140:24
St 194:2 215:18	124:15	steady 38:25	stupid 72:22,23	summary 8:5 46:9
staff 34:15 74:18	starved 74:20	steading 216:16	style 182:16	111:22 114:24
74:18,20 103:14	state 66:6 81:12	steeped 13:22	subject 11:5 70:13	116:8 140:19
128:22 141:18	156:20 180:5	Steers 108:3	116:22 147:19	201:17
151:10 165:21,23	stated 30:13,15	stenographers	198:25	summer 24:19
165:24,25 166:4,5	150:14	165:11	submissions 135:24	192:8
166:6,10,11	statement 1:19,22	step 11:22 12:5,10	submitted 130:25	Sunday 9:23
171:19,20 175:24	6:11,15 7:24 8:3,4	12:12 195:7	131:24 140:11	superior 13:12
178:14 179:3,7	11:17 12:21,24	stepping 106:2	149:14,15 150:5	supervise 91:13
180:15 185:10,11	18:25 19:22 25:19	steps 43:24 75:19	subsequent 24:20	supervision 155:17
185:12 186:20	27:15 30:4 35:16	93:4 148:11 170:4	81:19 116:12	158:6 173:1
190:24,25 191:14	35:21 36:24 39:9	Stones 44:11 48:22	120:22 149:3	supervisor 102:2,4
191:17 192:13	54:13 61:25 65:11	49:2 52:12 53:9	177:23	102:8,9,14 103:5
199:20 202:15,25	91:11 99:7,10,25	53:22 54:21 61:14	subsequently 6:16	support 9:17 36:25
stage 1:11 5:3 7:6	105:1,2 108:12	81:20 90:10	7:18 104:11	37:3,9,14,16
8:10 17:11 26:17	109:5 110:6,7,25	stop 40:6 55:5,12	112:22 117:10	38:21 43:5,15,16
27:7 106:8 119:14	113:1 114:5	56:16 57:22 87:7	129:8 200:7	52:18,21 57:4
133:15,17 140:1	122:13 143:14	89:2 217:5	substance 61:6	59:13 65:22 75:19
140:13 152:11,24	151:17,17 154:23	stopped 91:6 92:18	substantiated	75:25 76:15 77:5
162:9 202:6,13	163:17,19,25	stored 176:11	71:21	77:6,7,8 154:18
203:6 214:22	164:3 169:1	stories 47:20	sudden 216:17	156:1
stages 162:12	177:16 178:10	story 49:4	sufficient 190:16	supported 3:2
193:19 214:23	181:13,21 191:7	strangely 43:13	sufficiently 127:13	59:12
stamp 154:11	192:20 200:2,20	strategic 165:3	139:11	supporter 57:11
stand 11:15 70:15	201:17 202:22	210:14	suffragan 194:9	supporting 78:4
84:15 144:5	209:1,11,14,15,17	strength 70:15	suffragans 179:24	95:24 153:2
standard 30:9	209:20,23,25	strengthen 81:25	suffraganship	215:24
33:24,25 48:1	211:18 218:19	strengthening	180:8	supportive 53:20
53:1 78:14 79:10	statements 47:24	91:15	suggest 12:8 29:6	suppose 8:9 12:6
79:10,12	138:2	stress 17:9	100:6 119:21	41:7 86:24 144:9
standards 48:2	states 25:2 210:1	strict 13:21	suggested 25:14	149:10 158:2
standpoint 15:23	stating 74:1	stringent 7:2,3,8,21	118:16 138:1	165:21 192:1
Stapleton 100:1	station 200:6,12,14	stripped 154:10	140:10	supra 90:16
stark 27:23	200:15 201:1,10	strong 12:9	suggestion 7:13	sure 10:6 17:13
start 1:22 41:21	201:13	strongly 48:16	15:3 59:7	20:4 44:4 45:20
78:25 80:25 98:23	statistic 68:16	154:17	suggestions 9:11	52:19 76:5 85:12
99:22 127:8	statistically 70:25	structure 90:17	suggestive 141:4	87:18,24 100:16
136:22 138:22	statistics 74:9	92:6 93:5	suitability 16:25	122:7 126:23
148:25 162:16,18	status 20:6 169:2	structures 24:3	18:17 198:14	137:25 153:10
196:10 208:23	180:4	struggle 153:8	summarise 18:11	165:16,24 167:16
started 37:6 38:1	statutory 10:14	studies 54:18	131:7,8 135:3	170:8,12,22 171:3

172:12 173:14,17 178:2,5,16,18 180:8 181:23 186:15,17 188:9 188:10 195:18 203:10 207:22,24 surmise 129:4 surprise 4:10 surprised 154:20 173:12 174:5,13 survey 46:21 47:15 48:5 49:5,7 55:7 SurveyMonkey 48:13 survivor 43:25 58:11 61:12 survivors 36:9,20 37:3,9 39:8 40:5,8 40:14 41:14,24 43:7,12 44:13,17 45:17,21 46:3 47:10,14 48:20 49:5 52:20,21,22 53:22 54:2 56:13 56:23 57:23 58:1 58:20 59:9,24 60:9,13 63:14 77:11 92:18 106:6 138:11 139:23,25 survivors' 45:25 suspect 16:3 17:10 65:24 72:8 118:15 suspected 48:16 suspend 11:20 12:1 81:21,22 suspended 12:13 12:18 81:17 120:21 132:14 199:11 suspending 11:12 suspension 12:14 132:13 199:10,10 199:15 suspicion 67:8,23 75:8,9	suspicious 114:7 suspicious 72:7 Sussex 101:16 114:4 131:19 148:3 153:22 190:12 210:4,18 swamp 61:10 swear 128:11 sworn 35:12 162:24 163:8 217:22 218:9 synod 79:8 92:8 system 78:14 89:23 91:17,17 92:4 171:10 204:9 systems 215:9	144:22 145:24 151:16 153:7 157:12 160:23 162:13,16,18 164:2 169:6 171:16 177:3 179:1,10 189:1 193:17 194:7 208:22 209:1 taken 5:14 8:15 10:16 17:23,23 35:19 36:23 48:20 115:4 134:24 139:4 146:14 148:12 154:5 158:14,15 173:14 187:9 198:18 207:2,7 208:8 taker 166:8 191:2,3 takes 24:4 95:1 talk 1:15 11:3 12:20 14:21 41:13 43:22 45:17 51:11 53:19 72:9 74:17 74:18 91:23 101:9 104:13 111:20 121:8 125:17 138:14 174:20 177:17 182:25 185:13 189:9 talked 3:24 4:19 7:3 28:21 48:7 74:20 130:6 137:18,19,21 147:19 175:12 184:13 192:2 208:21 talking 12:19 17:14 17:16 18:18 21:14 24:2 32:6 38:3 40:16 41:17 45:19 57:25 58:2,3 65:17 67:10 73:12 83:11 98:2 123:17 130:16 137:20	138:18 146:9 150:4 152:22 161:5 177:9 182:11 202:22 talks 27:15 51:1 tampered 176:23 tapped 10:4 tarnished 79:17 task 105:12 tasks 103:15 169:12,13 196:21 tassel 84:20 teacher 71:9,11 teachers 74:17 teaching 70:5 team 79:19 166:9 194:8 195:21 197:6 210:9 216:23 217:2 technical 142:7 technically 194:11 teleconferences 215:5 telephone 37:21 38:16 59:9 215:5 telephoned 47:18 tell 8:4 37:10 52:1 53:22 79:7 83:13 84:18 88:14 119:3 120:11 122:4 128:4 131:8,14 151:5 156:9 161:19 169:5 176:13 185:6 186:5 201:7 telling 83:7 84:24 159:10 tells 82:24 temporary 170:6 213:23 ten 191:1 tend 29:13 153:7 tends 141:5 tension 181:12 202:10	tensions 155:20 156:3 tenure 25:13 170:7 174:23 178:4 179:17 190:15 term 13:9 95:10 terms 8:11 10:21 13:6 15:2,8 17:15 19:8 22:6 26:5 40:18 68:15 71:23 89:10 91:15 97:20 98:5 105:10,19 122:15 138:18 142:13 158:12 161:19 165:6,14 170:16 174:13 181:1 189:9 193:21 195:11 197:24 199:6 200:21 terribly 118:14 tests 95:23 tethered 9:25 thank 3:20 19:17 26:23 28:6,19,20 32:9 34:5 35:3,4,5 76:17 98:13,15,15 99:1 100:12 115:7 121:17 129:7 155:1 156:15 157:20 160:7 162:4,5,20 165:13 189:1 197:12,18 197:22 199:25 202:19 203:15 205:19 208:14,17 209:7,19 217:6 Thanks 116:17 theological 17:4 23:10,13 196:24 theology 13:8 23:24 41:11 thereabouts 113:22 thesis 8:6 they'd 136:10
T				
tab 1:20 24:10 31:14 48:24 118:8 123:24 124:14,17 124:18,19 127:6 129:11 138:20,21 146:7 149:17 158:24 161:8 185:21 209:16 table 83:8,11,17,22 107:16 135:8 tables 50:19 tackle 14:22 tail 60:13 take 4:22 11:1 12:10 17:6 18:13 22:4 24:11,16 43:24 50:4 64:2 65:7,19 66:17 71:13 72:16 75:13 78:22 89:24 90:15 92:15 93:3 94:18 98:24 99:19 105:1 109:9,10 110:5 114:21 115:6 116:17 126:20 129:7,22 132:3 136:5 137:5,22				

<p>183:23 thick 111:16 175:25 thicker 111:19 thin 111:17 thing 15:1 27:4 32:9 39:18 42:7 47:3 49:8,10,11 58:24 61:10 67:9 73:9,15,15 76:3 83:3 91:3,21 92:14 95:5 110:9 110:21 116:7 144:6 146:3 160:23 165:20 170:22 things 26:20,21 27:14 29:13 38:3 38:5 41:11 43:20 48:4 51:15 55:5 57:19,24 58:10 65:25 69:5 72:1,6 73:12 74:15 84:21 86:23 87:4 96:12 133:4 148:7 154:1 161:24 176:4 179:19 181:6 189:25 190:4 195:20 think 7:4,6,10 9:9 9:14 10:21 12:8 12:16 14:2,6 15:16,19,21 16:13 16:18 17:11,20,20 18:6,18 19:5,10 19:11,22 21:5,7,9 22:1,4,9,21,23 23:4,16 24:2,3 26:3 27:2,4,12,17 29:3,22 30:19,21 31:1,7,7,9,17 32:7 33:6,9,10 34:4,8 34:25 39:17 41:25 42:17,20,24 46:25 48:1,9 49:25</p>	<p>50:12 53:16 54:22 55:2 58:10 60:7 60:16 61:7 62:2 62:16,22 63:14 64:11,20,21 65:2 65:14 66:9 68:18 68:18,19,25 71:21 72:6,8 75:9 78:9 78:15,24 79:5,8 81:24 82:2,5,6,9 82:13 86:3,4 87:9 87:17 89:23 90:1 90:2,5 91:13 95:6 95:15 96:20 98:25 102:11 103:18 104:6,8 105:18 106:2,2,5 109:7,9 109:18,20 111:7 111:10 112:24 114:2,5,5,10,25 115:4,6,23 116:15 121:23 122:10 124:4,15 125:9 126:8 127:9 128:13,16 129:20 130:17 132:16,25 133:13 134:17 135:6 136:10 137:24 138:13,14 138:15 139:4,10 139:15,19,24 140:1,7,8,16 143:10 144:6 145:6,17 148:19 149:1 150:10,11 150:13 151:1,6 152:12,12,14,24 153:12 154:2,4,7 154:23,23 156:24 158:13 159:2,3,7 159:18 160:6 161:7 172:25 173:13,19 174:5 174:14 175:23 177:14,24 178:10</p>	<p>178:24 179:19 180:13,18,25 181:1,20 182:5,21 185:10 186:8,18 187:17,20 189:6 190:12,15,17 191:13 192:12 193:6 195:5,5,10 196:5,9,12,23 197:1,15,17,17,25 201:3 202:1,5,9 203:4 204:11 209:3,8 Think/couldn't 128:11 thinking 16:3 40:16 51:22 64:23 77:1 88:2 96:12 142:12 154:6 192:16,16 thinks 60:23 76:3 82:3 thinning 205:1 third 19:24 114:14 124:21 147:15 159:7 161:11 thought 3:10,14 7:17 8:6,9 14:17 16:22 18:4 36:19 45:23 48:2 50:2 51:4,8,9,19 53:4 53:25 54:12 58:20 59:11 60:6 61:14 91:7 96:13 111:19 130:9 131:6,20 132:10 137:9 139:14 140:12,17 142:17 155:13 170:10 178:13 203:8 thousands 41:22 98:11 threatened 74:22 threatening 202:5 three 4:24 53:5</p>	<p>57:18,19 100:22 166:7 192:4 194:10 196:6 199:23,24 213:21 215:1 three-monthly 57:16 threshold 67:24 thrown 157:4 thrust 103:21 193:12 Thursday 1:1 tic 69:3 tick 50:12 tightening 140:5 Tilby 45:13 79:19 time 3:5 10:11,22 22:10,10 23:3,3 31:1 34:16 38:3 39:11 40:2 42:17 42:25 45:17 51:13 55:6 56:11 57:19 70:11 74:9 76:10 77:4 83:10 86:11 86:12 94:16,23 98:22 102:20,24 103:15,15 106:15 109:8 113:17 116:1,21 117:5 118:23 119:20 120:2 122:8 125:5 125:6 126:16 127:6,9 130:15 131:15 132:3 138:25 142:2,3 145:22 146:22 148:1 150:3,17 152:10 153:21 154:4,7 155:21 156:23 163:2 166:16 169:9 174:1 175:4 176:21 177:6,19 178:3,15 180:4 183:2,11 184:7</p>	<p>187:9,10,17,19 188:17,18 199:15 202:11 204:3,17 205:16 211:4 212:1,25 213:5,17 213:25 214:7,14 214:16,24 215:8 217:4 timeline 145:6 times 38:5 57:19 77:22 151:10,13 191:1 215:1,3 Timing 55:8 today 18:22 72:4 74:15 157:21 162:10 163:6 204:8 217:5 Todd 76:12 told 1:14 11:16,23 40:17 43:22 49:5 70:12 87:3 91:7 94:16,16 110:19 110:23 116:11 121:11 124:8 126:4,13 128:23 129:5,16 137:14 157:8 159:9,11 161:24,25 167:22 181:17 190:24 197:25 200:10 204:1 Tolworthy 6:11 Tommy 98:2 tomorrow 163:4 217:8 tongue 25:22 121:24 Tony 131:25 top 2:18 8:4 52:8 65:4 77:24 89:2 128:9 144:13 159:4 160:4 topic 18:23 124:13 144:8 topics 123:19</p>
---	--	---	--	---

total 100:23 172:18	196:20 200:6,17	72:16 84:17 98:2	88:11 93:10 97:10	68:14
touch 5:24 51:13	201:2,4	100:4 105:18	113:20 144:21	unusual 49:18
53:17 102:16	trivia 41:4,8	110:25 116:23	149:25 156:13	unwell 126:14
110:10 138:15	trivial 160:23	119:12 122:7	158:21 165:1	updated 45:1,2
167:14 191:24	trotting 118:10	124:1 136:2	174:4 178:20	uphill 153:8
touched 13:9 83:5	trouble 85:12	138:13 154:1	179:5 208:10	upload 154:22
118:5 122:14	true 35:21 45:21	156:7 162:9 166:6	understandable	uploaded 136:24
151:1 189:4,7	48:14 64:16 73:23	179:24 180:25	16:8	upwards 68:21,24
track 8:11	73:24 74:25,25,25	183:4 187:3	understanding	urgency 47:13
tracked 138:5	75:2 80:1 84:6	189:19 190:6	12:11 13:11,12,23	URN 99:16 137:1
tradition 181:22,24	99:11 163:20	194:9,21 215:1	13:24 15:25 22:5	use 9:13 43:6 54:16
182:6	213:8	two-thirds 92:10	22:8 57:10 129:24	54:22,23 58:23
traditions 13:22	truly 84:23	Tyler 113:16,20	153:3 207:9	67:21 70:10 92:2
16:9	truncating 157:25	117:11 118:1	understands 30:21	95:9 102:17
trail 89:21 154:22	trust 62:9,14	121:21 176:20	79:19 81:1	199:11 208:4
trained 22:7 195:19	128:19	177:6	understatement	useful 42:2 106:6,9
training 10:8,9	trusted 185:17	type 14:5 214:21	46:15	145:1
16:17,17 17:1,2	truth 48:17 209:25	typed-up 123:10	understood 12:14	users 45:22
17:16 18:17 23:3	try 3:12 9:8 37:15	types 74:10	29:16 33:3,7,10	usual 124:20
23:7 24:5 36:17	39:13 60:11 76:7		45:18 207:16	145:14 164:1
94:6 148:6 193:1	119:1,7 124:15	<hr/> U <hr/>	undertake 80:9	184:6
193:16,20,20	138:6 145:24	Udimore 5:23	104:1 214:1	usually 35:17 82:20
194:17 195:3,14	156:25	ultimate 78:1	undertaken 90:2	86:12 183:18
195:14,17,20,24	trying 6:9 41:20	unable 126:18	215:16	192:10 193:18
195:25 196:17	57:16 59:23 60:22	213:3	undertaking 19:3	197:9 213:5
210:20,23	86:13 87:4 94:2	uncertain 40:17	36:17 216:8	utterly 73:9,15
transferred 6:17	95:7 110:5 135:13	Unclear 115:19	undertook 103:24	76:10 77:10
206:20 207:11	141:7 151:4	undecided 73:25	114:23 210:20,23	
transformed 14:9	170:17 202:6	underage 115:20	215:17	<hr/> V <hr/>
14:12	turn 18:23 31:22	undergo 19:11,14	undetermined	vagueness 128:14
transparency 90:8	35:18 39:10 46:5	19:21	98:11	valid 17:15 20:5
140:5,7 141:4	61:14 93:19	undermined 32:20	undoubtedly 81:10	value 205:1
transparent 148:23	104:13 108:13	underneath 179:25	unease 39:20	values 25:3
transpired 56:14	115:8 149:17	underreporting	uneasy 126:3	variation 82:9
trashed 53:19	153:18 161:6	46:15	unfortunate 27:13	181:16 182:15
trauma 77:23	214:8	understand 3:5	unfortunately	varied 38:1 102:20
94:22	turned 18:2	10:13 12:1 13:25	36:12 114:15,17	variety 103:8,16
trawl 121:3	Turning 78:10	14:24 20:5,23	unfounded 79:17	various 36:3 61:25
Treasurer 164:8	101:24	34:2 36:2,8 37:5	unique 15:15	90:23 108:4
treated 21:12 22:15	twice 173:1 192:8	37:20 39:5,11	universal 111:11	127:18 141:19
22:17 52:22	two 17:21 24:19	41:1,20 42:1	university 183:23	171:18
trial 176:4 183:10	31:3 32:7 44:8,24	44:13,25 45:10	unnecessarily	vary 214:20
triated 89:24	47:4 49:4,21	46:10,20 47:15	160:22	varying 182:14
tribunal 80:24	51:15 53:5 55:15	50:14 53:12 59:5	unravelling 143:18	vehemently 22:12
tried 58:22 190:22	56:19 58:10 69:24	75:22 76:2 81:12	unsubstantiated	verbal 211:25

verifiable 144:3	virtually 213:6	179:9,19 180:2,19	137:22	191:15 194:15
version 41:19 134:7	215:11	181:8,25 182:10	wants 9:15	212:7
134:8,9 155:6	visible 148:19	182:24 184:12	wardens 197:7	ways 23:11 29:19
204:6,8,12 206:14	visit 42:20 55:7,7	185:12 186:21	Warner 23:15	59:11 105:23
versions 134:10,14	190:19 214:19	187:1,6,20 188:14	180:9	153:17 192:24
vetting 23:6 28:8	visitation 10:19	188:18,19 200:11	warrant 178:11	213:15
85:10	173:22 177:19	200:16,19,25	warranted 178:13	WB 2:23
vibes 29:17	178:12,13,21,23	201:3,7,8,12,19	wasn't 12:6 18:2	we're 76:21
vicar 164:8 195:16	179:1 181:2,3	202:2,7 216:19,21	27:14 29:22 40:1	we've 98:9 197:17
Vickery 117:8,8	visited 6:11	Wallace's 4:11,13	41:7,15 42:7 43:1	wear 191:8
118:2	visiting 214:17	125:9 135:20	47:22 48:19 50:21	website 35:25
victim 43:25 52:24	visits 205:12	156:19 160:14	57:17 65:1 77:13	47:21,22 69:16
71:17 75:16,20	214:20 215:3	161:21 179:13,18	77:15 79:16 86:19	99:17 137:1 164:1
victims 40:19 41:21	voice 49:10 165:10	180:4 184:8,9	87:6,22 105:9	209:21
43:2 59:9 63:14	voices 106:5	191:7 200:5	106:23 107:5	wedding 205:21
71:9 77:4 78:4	voluntarily 11:22	want 2:20 4:17	109:25 112:4	weed 24:6
97:9 98:5 106:6	12:5	7:24 8:18 9:24	113:11 114:2	weeding 152:1
112:6 132:20,24	voluntary 36:3	11:5 14:4,20,21	117:1,20,20,22	week 57:17 215:1
137:7,10 138:11	volunteer 197:8	17:13 20:13 21:8	127:12 139:20	weeks 215:3
139:23,25 144:18	vouch 187:9	21:8 22:25 23:23	145:2 147:6 158:5	weight 33:22
148:16,20	vulnerabilities	25:11 27:7 29:5	158:8 167:5,23	Welby 79:7,18
victims/survivors	74:10	32:9 33:17 34:2	168:1,8 175:21	welcoming 58:8
105:6	W	52:2 54:7 57:3,4,5	176:10,11 180:1	well-intentioned
view 7:10 15:6,16		62:2 66:13 94:11	184:11 190:4,22	43:5 81:9
15:17,19 17:2	wait 22:20	97:1 106:4 107:19	196:2 199:14	well-meaning
24:1 26:21 27:18	waiting 163:2	118:18 125:2,17	201:6 203:7 208:6	43:21 81:9
28:24 30:11,16,17	walks 29:23	127:19 135:24	208:8	went 26:1,12 40:14
30:18 33:2,5	Wallace 2:7,23 3:2	140:22 141:15	way 3:15 10:6	43:2 51:12,18,23
42:12,13 45:25,25	3:18,22,25 4:1,8	144:13 146:11	11:16 12:3,13	52:7,7 54:10
45:25 61:15 66:11	4:17,19 5:4 7:14	147:22 149:11,21	27:13 33:4 37:23	60:13,16 76:20,21
80:4,9 91:9,9	11:4 12:10,19	149:22 172:24	40:24 43:6 44:22	79:9 80:15 86:21
132:16 135:20	13:3 14:20 27:21	174:22 177:17	46:4 48:19 52:23	91:4,5 170:8
136:5 139:5	30:5,11 31:19	182:16 189:7,8	60:9 63:23 69:20	177:25 178:17
140:24 142:6,7	83:7 107:23	195:1 196:10	70:10 71:4,23	184:19 187:7
143:6 145:23	122:25 123:18	wanted 9:24 24:25	72:13 82:10 86:1	188:9 196:5
152:7,25 153:5,6	126:3,6,17 127:11	26:25 32:12 48:13	92:19 93:4 95:9	weren't 42:2,24
153:7 157:3,10,13	127:24 128:23	49:15 53:6,23	100:11 106:20	45:21,23 49:12
157:17 161:22	129:24 130:7,10	58:19 64:16 66:25	113:9 132:21	52:12 109:23
viewpoint 15:10	131:4 135:19	105:7 108:16	138:4 141:3	204:14,16
views 14:5,25 21:12	137:14,21 138:8	123:11 125:15	142:11 143:12	West 148:3 153:22
23:20 26:4 30:13	143:16 150:7,11	127:23 137:5,9	146:18 148:23	Westminster
30:15,25 52:14	157:2,6,6,18	138:14,17 149:6	153:12 155:22	214:25
vigilant 114:6	158:14,19 159:18	158:15 170:22,25	159:7 161:11	whatsoever 25:9
vindicated 71:17	160:12,13 161:3,7	173:2 201:8	167:14 178:1,18	whilst 12:19 39:6
virtual 59:18 166:8	161:13 162:1	wanting 13:7 81:4	179:22 182:8	123:6 125:12

138:18 146:16 164:24 182:25 199:12 209:18 whistleblowers 71:2,3 Who-de-doody 98:3 wholly 186:4 wider 51:11 144:19 wife 64:19 wilfully 81:4 willing 48:16 Wilmer 56:14 Windsor 194:2 wiped 15:7 wisdom 88:2 120:17 wise 55:21 wish 39:10 95:9 99:18 153:24 wished 108:14 206:23,25 wishing 216:4 withdrawing 76:21 withdrew 35:8 98:17 162:6 208:18 withheld 106:18 witness 1:6 28:4 35:6,8,9,16,21 36:24 39:9 61:25 65:11 91:11 98:17 98:19 99:7 110:6 113:1 122:13 151:17 154:23 162:6,24 163:17 164:2 180:12 181:13,21 187:21 197:20 204:13 206:15 208:16,18 208:21 209:13,21 210:1 witness's 1:21 witnesses 99:18 105:13 112:11	162:10 woman 74:22 women 13:12,14 21:9,9,19 22:8,12 36:25 58:2 77:14 152:20 153:2 wonder 18:9 31:22 140:24 147:3 158:21 217:4 wonderful 40:21 70:18 86:14 205:20 wondering 28:23 Wood 114:23 121:23 163:7 177:1 208:22 209:11,13,23 218:19 Wood's 209:1 word 7:25 8:18 9:13,24 32:8 48:1 125:3 127:3 135:25 137:2,2 141:15 174:22 182:17 195:2 196:11,12 199:10 words 60:11 89:20 151:11 182:9 185:18 work 21:19 23:11 23:13 29:13 37:24 42:21 44:3 45:4,8 46:1 57:16 68:22 69:5 71:24 73:11 96:14,15 101:21 102:10 103:9,24 104:1 123:15 144:23 146:4 152:2 172:20 179:25,25 191:9 191:11,16 198:15 211:16,19 214:21 215:4,10,14,16 216:19 worked 51:14	101:15 102:3 103:10 114:4 148:2 153:20 184:16 212:8 213:16,22 214:16 216:25 worker 25:3 101:13 101:15 102:10 working 27:16 38:2 38:13 39:5,24 40:11 44:6 60:20 67:24 87:13 91:22 102:4 103:10 148:2 153:13 156:1 182:1,3 195:22 213:13,15 213:25 214:6,15 216:2 workload 213:19 works 93:5 world 68:8 143:9 worried 69:6 worry 17:20 20:12 109:12 115:11 worse 74:11 79:25 worship 12:22 16:11,15 83:1 182:15 189:15 worth 197:4 Worthing 190:8,8 worthy 208:3 wouldn't 29:21 36:22 41:23 43:10 43:11 53:24 93:6 114:8 121:4 148:11,17 150:19 wrap-up 192:12 writ 95:19 write 40:15 160:25 writing 7:22 9:16 118:24 written 50:17 75:24 80:20 82:17 86:2 86:11 115:18 200:23	wrong 12:18 14:10 14:14 17:23 48:4 69:1 73:14,15 74:15 87:19 121:19 124:17 133:4 134:22 wrote 6:1 96:25 138:23 145:16 167:17 211:1 WWS000060 185:21 WWS000070 163:25 WWS000087 204:4 204:4 WWS000090 171:16 <hr/> X X 205:19 217:13 <hr/> Y yardstick 13:5 yeah 65:20 year 46:6 53:18 57:19 163:18 191:1 192:8 216:25 years 4:24 6:20 17:6,22 19:12 20:14 21:5,6 32:7 38:1,25 39:3 56:1 70:6 71:9 72:5 74:6,14,16,16,17 76:9 95:1 103:12 103:14 128:19 151:21 152:6 164:18,20 172:4 173:5,6 174:6 195:17 196:6 200:4 210:7 213:21 215:13 yesterday 1:8 3:24 13:10 15:24 24:22 27:5 72:3 78:20 82:18 88:12 103:3	133:19,20 143:5 171:20 174:6 203:23 young 114:19 116:4 210:11 younger 194:4 <hr/> Z zoom 3:16 114:14 144:12 204:22 zoomed 113:15 zooming 115:11 <hr/> 0 002 158:24 159:3 160:1 003 160:16 <hr/> 1 1 3:21 24:10 48:24 49:17 123:15 124:16 127:9,25 138:20,21 197:4 204:4 209:25 217:16,18 1.00 98:25 121:14 10 21:6 56:1 70:25 71:9 74:16 82:15 103:12 124:18,19 164:20 10.00 1:2 66:15 217:8,11 100 78:3 87:24 196:8 203:11,14 103 1:23 6:15 105 8:3 11 85:3 122:14 123:24 124:14 127:6 158:24 163:18 11.00 27:1 11.33 66:22 11.45 66:18 11.48 66:24 112 1:20 12 68:17 108:12
---	---	--	--	---

129:13 161:8 12.30 98:22 12/97 124:22,25 13 46:11,25 47:2,4 47:6 85:18,19 86:2 87:9 138 174:2 14 87:17 15 50:23 68:17 89:17 208:23 155 218:5 16 63:7,9 93:19 110:6,9 123:18 124:20 146:7 162 218:7 163 218:9,11 167 49:24 62:3 168 62:3 17 3:22 6:18 93:19 185:25 170 64:2 171 65:5 178 65:5 179 78:12 18 62:24 63:3,7 93:19 139:1 180 113:8 18s 63:6 19 31:16 39:9 40:15 93:19 149:17 1954 2:4,8 118:20 124:4 131:10,14 150:1 197 218:13 1975 101:13 1985 210:4 1992 112:2 1993 113:22 1997 2:12 101:19 115:13 120:2,12 129:15,25 150:4,8 1998 131:10,19 156:20 1999 2:1,3,7,15 5:12 7:16 120:14	124:25 129:15 157:19 <hr/> 2 2 24:17 36:24 49:16 62:20 109:11 128:2,19 141:13 160:4 2.00 121:16 20 12:23,25 20:14 21:5 49:25 50:22 56:1 74:16 93:20 95:1 159:4 160:3 2000 101:19 2001 40:3 131:24 137:13 150:1,5,8 179:21 204:11,14 206:14 2003 6:18 132:6 2004 164:5 169:3 206:2 2005 36:4,9 2006 210:5 2007 27:10 31:9 132:9 211:1 2008 100:17 119:4 204:7,20 206:1 211:12,20 212:2 2009 3:9,22 32:6 36:14 39:4 40:13 47:24 99:25 100:17 121:23 123:18 131:1 133:13 134:4,12 138:24 152:9,22 155:19 159:4 160:3 164:7 171:8 171:23 212:2,4,14 215:15,17 2009/2010 114:22 2010 24:15 42:1 46:10 146:10 154:12 183:14 185:23,25 215:19 216:7	2011 5:6 6:8 10:12 10:15,17 39:15 42:10 152:9,22 212:14,16 213:12 214:7 216:11 2011/early 9:10 2012 9:10 79:8 121:24 177:9 213:19 2012/13 58:14 2013 36:10,14 164:5 213:22 2014 36:11 2014/15 59:6 2015 36:4 86:5 164:11 211:21 2016 38:21 64:12 80:7 216:23,25 2017 38:18 216:25 2018 1:1 99:8 209:24 217:11 203 218:15 206 218:17 209 218:19 21 30:4 194:10 22 161:9 209:24 23 138:24 24 146:10 151:17 25 19:12 74:6,14 99:8 163:18 26 18:24 28 217:20 29 131:1 <hr/> 3 3 63:25 115:10 128:3,19 185:21 3.00 162:9 3.02 162:21 3.20 162:23 30 21:5 71:9,11 74:17 30s 47:1 330 113:14 34 192:19	347 114:13 35 217:22,24 376 31:22 378 32:11 38 1:23 61:24 382 34:6 <hr/> 4 4 65:4 68:17 110:7 123:16 127:7,8,22 128:4 144:13 204:19 209:25 4.15 208:19 4.30 208:21,24 209:6 217:9 40 8:4 400 38:18,23 42 1:21 44 122:14,20 470 112:23 476 113:8 <hr/> 5 5 4:4 39:10 68:17 75:14 99:25 127:7 136:6 195:17 500 38:19 <hr/> 6 6 78:10 82:9 109:11 183:14 185:23 186:21 195:17 201:24 202:12 204:22 600 38:23 64 202:21 650 38:22 <hr/> 7 7 13:2 44:14,14 81:15,16 70 178:9 75 94:9 77 189:24 <hr/> 8	8 1:1 34:7 36:24 81:16 118:8 204:22 205:10 83 68:8 84 200:2 <hr/> 9 9 2:17 24:10 31:14 79:5 82:14 99:8 129:11 217:11 90 172:3,6,7,8,15 172:18 173:8 90s 38:5 95 151:16 97 128:19 98/99 127:25 99 218:1,3
---	--	---	---	--