

<p>1 Tuesday, 5 June 2018 2 (10.30 am) 3 Welcome and opening remarks by THE CHAIR 4 THE CHAIR: Good morning, everyone. My name is 5 Professor Alexis Jay. I am the chair of the Independent 6 Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse. Sitting with me are 7 the other panel members of the inquiry: Professor Sir 8 Malcolm Evans, Ivor Frank and Drusilla Sharpling. On 9 behalf of the inquiry, I welcome you all to this 10 preliminary hearing. 11 In April, the inquiry published its interim report, 12 with which I am sure all the parties are familiar. 13 Among other things, the interim report set out 14 the inquiry's work programme for 2018/19, including that 15 in respect of the Roman Catholic Church investigation. 16 As you know, one of the case studies within this 17 investigation is the English Benedictine Congregation, 18 the other being the Archdiocese of Birmingham. This 19 case study has itself been split into two substantive 20 hearings. The first took place in November and December 21 last year, and examined Ampleforth and Downside Abbeys 22 and their affiliated schools. 23 Next February, 2019, we shall hear the second, 24 examining Ealing Abbey and St Benedict's School. 25 The conduct of this Ealing Abbey and St Benedict's'</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 1</p>	<p>1 Submissions by MS KARMY-JONES 2 MS KARMY-JONES: Thank you chair, members of the panel. As 3 you have already said, this hearing is part of the Roman 4 Catholic Church inquiry and is the first preliminary 5 hearing specifically in relation to Ealing Abbey and 6 St Benedict's School. I appear as lead counsel to the 7 inquiry and will be assisted in this strand by 8 Mr Matthew Donmall who is unable to attend today. 9 This hearing forms part of the English Benedictine 10 Congregation case study along with the abbeys at 11 Ampleforth and Downside and their affiliated schools. 12 Evidence in respect of those two institutions, as you 13 have said, was heard in November and December of last 14 year. However, after last year's preliminary hearing in 15 June, on 6 June, it was held that the inquiry would also 16 hear some evidence in respect of Ealing Abbey and 17 St Benedict's but that that should not take place until 18 the conclusion of the criminal trial in respect of 19 the former Abbot of Ealing, Laurence, born Andrew, 20 Soper. 21 He was convicted on 6 December of last year and 22 sentenced on 21 December to a total of 18 years 23 imprisonment. The public hearing in respect of Ealing 24 Abbey and St Benedict's School has accordingly been 25 listed for five days from 4 February to 8 February 2019,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 3</p>
<p>1 School hearing is the subject matter of this preliminary 2 hearing. 3 Before getting underway, I would also add that, as 4 published on 21 May 2018, I determined that Worth Abbey 5 and School will not be part of the English Benedictine 6 Congregation case study. Having carefully considered 7 the issue of Worth Abbey and School, I decided that the 8 evidence heard in respect of Downside Abbey And School 9 and Ampleforth Abbey And School together with the 10 evidence to be heard in connection with Ealing Abbey and 11 School will be sufficient for the inquiry to properly 12 consider matters in relation to the English Benedictine 13 Congregation. 14 We will take a 15-minute break at around 11.45 am 15 and then a break for lunch, if the hearing has not 16 concluded by then, at 1 o'clock. 17 Any submissions made will be considered and 18 decisions will be published on the inquiry's website 19 shortly after the hearing, as will the hearing 20 transcript. 21 I will now invite leading counsel to the inquiry, 22 Ms Karmy-Jones QC to address us. 23 After Ms Karmy-Jones, other legal representatives 24 present may speak if they wish. Please go ahead, 25 Ms Karmy-Jones.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 2</p>	<p>1 inclusive. 2 A note setting out counsel to the inquiry's 3 submissions in respect of matters to be considered today 4 was circulated to core participants on 18 May. It 5 invited observations and response by 31 May and 6 submissions have been duly received from 7 Slater & Gordon, from Howe & Co, from Hugh James, 8 Imran Khan & Partners, Brabners, Switalskis and Milners 9 on behalf of those they respectively represent. 10 An agenda for the hearing was also circulated on 11 30 May and identified six issues for discussion today, 12 namely core participants, the scope and duration of the 13 hearing, the outline of the shape of the February 14 hearing, disclosure, rule 9 statements and witness 15 selection and any other matters that should arise today, 16 through submissions. 17 If I may, I will deal with each of those briefly in 18 turn. The first, core participants: a number of parties 19 and organisations have been granted core participant 20 status within the wider investigation into the Roman 21 Catholic Church. As was the case with the November and 22 December hearing in respect of Downside and Ampleforth, 23 it is not anticipated that all core participants 24 designated in connection with that wider investigation 25 will need to attend this public hearing or that they</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 4</p>

<p>1 will have sufficient interest in this case study to 2 receive disclosure. 3 Of the core participants, the inquiry considers that 4 the following have a particular interest in this case 5 study, given their individual experiences or 6 involvement. 7 Not all are represented today but I will identify 8 who is. 9 The complainants A43 to A54, A64 to A66, A69, A70, 10 A72 and A75 are the West London Benedictine Order Abuse 11 Survivors, who are represented by Slater & Gordon, and 12 today by Mr Scorer and Mr O'Donnell; F13 who is 13 represented by Howe & Co, and today Mr Enright and 14 Mr Cade; G2 who is represented by Imran Khan, and today 15 Mr Khan QC; G1, G3 to G6 represented by Hugh James 16 Solicitors, and today by Mr Collins; C18 and 19 who are 17 represented by Switalskis, today by Mr Chapman and 18 Mr Greenwood; Adrian Child and Eileen Shearer, who are 19 both represented by Brabners solicitors, today 20 represented by Mr King and Mr Nisbet; Jonathan West, who 21 is also represented by Slater & Gordon, by Mr O'Donnell 22 and Mr Scorer; the English Benedictine Congregation 23 represented, as they were before, by Ms Gallafent, 24 Ms Kemp and Ms Elliot; the Monastic Community of 25 Ealing Abbey who are represented by Haworth and</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 5</p>	<p>1 The list of core participants was circulated to all 2 those involved in the Roman Catholic Church 3 investigation and those not identified on the list were 4 invited to make submissions if they considered their 5 interests relating to this case study and to explain 6 why, in any such written observations or submissions, 7 they felt that they should be represented and to provide 8 those in advance of the hearing. 9 Turning to the next point, scope and the length, the 10 duration, of the hearing. Because the scope and length 11 of the hearing in February are the fundamental matters 12 upon which the preparation for that hearing follow and 13 because two submissions from core participants have 14 raised them, I will deal with that directly at 15 the outset. 16 In terms of scope first, the focus of this 17 investigation is on the institutional responses to 18 allegations or instances of child sexual abuse. 19 The scope for the Roman Catholic Church 20 investigation and the English Benedictine Congregation 21 case study has already been determined and the evidence 22 in the Ealing Abbey/St Benedict's hearing will be 23 added within that context. 24 We remind all parties of our proposals as to topics 25 that the chair and panel should consider as was set out</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 7</p>
<p>1 Gallagher and Mr Nelson today; the Catholic Council for 2 IICSA again represented by Kingsley Napley and 3 Ms Gallafent, Ms Kemp and Ms Elliot; the Independent 4 Schools Inspectorate, which is represented by Mr Lawson, 5 Ms McKimm and Ms Ockwell today. 6 We understand that they are here only to observe 7 today and don't propose to make representations as 8 I understand Ms Gallafent and Mr Nelson are in the same 9 position. 10 The Commissioner of Police for the Metropolis, 11 Mr Dixey and Ms Royan represent; the Secretary of State 12 for education is represented by Mr Everitt, again, 13 unlikely to make representations today. Ofsted is not 14 in attendance nor represented today. 15 In addition, we take the view that the specific 16 English Benedictine Congregation institutions that were 17 considered during the last case study, namely, 18 Ampleforth and Downside, may have an interest in this 19 case study. Disclosure will therefore also be made to 20 them. Downside is in effect represented by 21 Ms Gallafent QC and Ampleforth is not present nor 22 represented but have provided a short submission 23 indicating they may wish to attend the hearing in 24 February next year should evidence affecting Ampleforth 25 be called.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 6</p>	<p>1 in our note of 18 May at paragraph 4. We suggested 2 the nature and extent of child sexual abuse by 3 individuals at Ealing Abbey/St Benedict's, the nature 4 and extent of institutional failures to protect children 5 from abuse by those at Ealing Abbey and St Benedict's. 6 That may, of course, include consideration of the extent 7 to which the culture within those institutions, 8 the English Benedictine Congregation and the Catholic 9 church more widely inhibited the proper investigation, 10 exposure and prevention of child sexual abuse. 11 The extent to which those failings have been 12 addressed, the extent to which the recommendations of 13 previous reviews of safeguarding and child protection at 14 Ealing Abbey and St Benedict's and the Catholic Church 15 more widely have been implemented, in particular through 16 the policies and practices in relation to safeguarding, 17 including questions of governance, training, 18 recruitment, leadership, reporting, investigation, 19 disciplinary procedures, information sharing and finally 20 the roles and responsibilities of other bodies including 21 Ofsted, the ISI and the Department of Education. 22 These topics have been suggested as a guide to 23 the evidence that is likely to be heard during the case 24 study hearing and it has been made clear that the scope 25 of the evidence will be kept under review. The topics</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 8</p>

<p>1 will, by their very nature, include some consideration 2 of Charity Commission inquiries, Independent Schools 3 Inspectorate reports and interactions with 4 the Department for Education, a safeguarding review that 5 was carried out in 2009 by Philip Wright and 6 John Nixon, the review carried out by Lord Carlile in 7 2011, the apostolic visitation conducted by 8 Dom Richard Yeo and Bishop John Arnold in 2011. We 9 consider that these topics will allow a proper 10 consideration of the issues as set out in the inquiry's 11 scope. 12 Slater & Gordon propose extending the scope of 13 the investigation to St Augustine's Priory, a Catholic 14 girl's school in Ealing. 15 At this stage, which is comparatively early on, 16 I would caution against that. The purpose of the case 17 study is to identify themes and potential 18 recommendations more generally in respect of the Roman 19 Catholic Church investigation. By its very nature, such 20 an approach is not exhaustive of all the issues and 21 it is not considered that extending this hearing's focus 22 beyond Ealing Abbey and St Benedict's to a detailed 23 consideration of another school, St Augustine's, would 24 be justified, but that of course would be subject to 25 considering all the evidence and I will come back to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 9</p>	<p>1 warrants a longer hearing. If anything, the fact that 2 there have been criminal convictions assists and enables 3 the hearing to focus upon the institutional responses 4 rather than the individual cases which befits the remit 5 of the inquiry. 6 The second point raised by Slater & Gordon, 7 supported by Howe & Co, is that there already been 8 a number of reviews into Ealing Abbey and St Benedict's 9 and we are very mindful of that, but again consider that 10 that fact of itself does not lead to the conclusion that 11 a longer hearing is required. Rather, in our view, it 12 lends itself to matters being taken a little more 13 shortly. 14 Ealing Abbey is closely associated -- this is 15 the third argument -- with St Augustine's Priory School 16 for Girls and, as I have already outlined, 17 I respectfully submit that the extension of the focus of 18 this case study to another school is not here justified 19 but again, I will return to St Augustine's in a moment. 20 More generally, any argument about duration has to 21 be seen in the context of the inquiry as a whole. It is 22 a general principle, and has been throughout the course 23 of proceedings, that the inquiry takes a proportionate 24 approach to evidence sufficient to cover the thematic 25 issues and that is of particular significance in</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 11</p>
<p>1 St Augustine's in a moment. 2 Howe & Co, in their submissions at paragraphs 84 to 3 87A, suggest that the inquiry should consider the 4 question of whether there are alleged sexual abusers 5 currently resident at Ealing Abbey. In my submission, 6 it is not the inquiry's role to determine individual 7 cases or allegations, but consideration of the topics 8 identified, such as the reviews and steps undertaken to 9 implement them and present safeguarding arrangements and 10 the adequacy of such safeguarding arrangements, will of 11 necessity address the critical question of whether 12 arrangements are now in place to safeguard children 13 effectively and, if not, what recommendations are 14 necessary. So it is likely that that topic will fall 15 within the ambit of what we will consider at the hearing 16 in February. 17 As to duration, Slater & Gordon, supported by 18 Howe & Co, argue that the five days scheduled for 19 the Ealing and St Benedict's hearing is wholly 20 insufficient. Briefly, going from the submissions of 21 Slater & Gordon, the argument seems to be that 22 Ealing Abbey and St Benedict's have had about as many 23 monks and teachers convicted of abuse as Ampleforth and 24 Downside combined. 25 We don't consider that that of itself necessarily</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 10</p>	<p>1 relation to this case study in respect of Ealing Abbey 2 and St Benedict's, which of itself is just one part of 3 a wider case study, the English Benedictine 4 Congregation, which is itself part, just one part, of 5 yet another wider case study, the Roman Catholic Church. 6 The inquiry has many other investigations going on with 7 their own demands and the five days of hearing in 8 respect of Ealing Abbey and St Benedict's in February 9 are, I understand, immediately followed by four days of 10 a public hearing in respect of protection of children 11 outside of the United Kingdom and thereafter closely 12 followed in March by a nine-day hearing in respect of 13 child sexual abuse linked to Westminster. 14 We suggest the five-day hearing is proportionate in 15 the context of the other material and evidence that 16 the inquiry has heard and will be hearing. 17 Turning next to the outline and shape of the hearing 18 in February, as I said earlier, this is an early stage. 19 At this early stage, as those here recognise, it is not 20 possible to give anything but the most broad indication 21 of the shape of the February hearing. 22 Given the focus of the inquiry, it is anticipated 23 that the majority of the hearing will be spent taking 24 evidence from witnesses who will speak to the vital 25 questions relating to the institutional approach to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 12</p>

<p>1 safeguarding and the response to child abuse. However, 2 to give context to that consideration, it is submitted 3 that two or perhaps three accounts from complainants 4 should be adduced through a combination of live and read 5 evidence. With respect to any who give evidence live, 6 the inquiry will ask for their views and consider how 7 best each individual may be supported in giving their 8 evidence and through the process as a whole. In all 9 instances the identities of complainants will be 10 protected unless they waive their right to anonymity. 11 In respect of the extent of child sexual abuse 12 allegation at Ealing Abbey and St Benedict's more 13 generally, I submit it is neither necessary nor 14 proportionate for you, chair, and the panel to examine 15 in detail every individual allegation. We propose 16 a schedule to be prepared setting out matters such as 17 the year of the allegation or the child sexual abuse, 18 the year it was reported, the name of the perpetrator, 19 or alleged perpetrator, subject to the inquiry's 20 redaction policy, the age and sex of the 21 complainant/victim and a brief description of the abuse. 22 For those entries on the schedule that will not be 23 considered in detail during the hearing, core 24 participants will be provided with some disclosure of 25 material that supports the information contained in the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 13</p>	<p>1 applying ciphers and redactions and liaising with the 2 material providers about those redactions is complicated 3 and time consuming. 4 As has been done previously, we therefore intend to 5 provide disclosure in stages and to complete disclosure 6 as far in advance of the hearing as is practicable. 7 Specifically, we plan to provide a first tranche of 8 disclosure in August 2018 and to have substantially 9 completed disclosure by December at the latest, 10 providing that those served with rule 9 requests provide 11 material within the given timeframes. In general terms, 12 the vast majority of disclosure in this case study will 13 be focused on matters pertaining to Ealing Abbey and 14 St Benedict's and, as such, that material will only be 15 disclosed to core participants with a specific interest 16 in this case study. 17 Rule 9 statement requests and witness selection is 18 the next topic. 19 First of all, dealing with the statement requests, 20 the inquiry has already sent out rule 9 statement 21 requests to all core participant complainants inviting 22 them to assist us with their testimony as to their 23 experiences, which of course is foremost in our minds 24 and of crucial importance to placing the institutional 25 focus of this inquiry into its proper context. A rule 9</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 15</p>
<p>1 schedule so that they are aware of the nature of the 2 allegations. 3 This, as you know, has been done in other hearings 4 and has proved an effective way of proceeding and also 5 a helpful way to focus minds on the individual 6 allegations. I know some concerns have been raised by 7 core participants that disclosure will only be made in 8 respect of the two or three cases about which 9 complainant evidence will be called, I think 10 particularly by Mr Khan QC, and I hope what I have said 11 will alleviate, or will have alleviated, those concerns. 12 The material will be ciphered in accordance with 13 the inquiry's redaction protocol and it will be 14 appreciated that the process of ciphering of names and 15 personal details of complainants and, where appropriate, 16 the perpetrator, is no small task. 17 Moving on to disclosure: the inquiry has already 18 obtained a significant amount of documentary material 19 relating to Ealing Abbey and St Benedict's. There is, 20 in addition, likely to be some further material 21 forthcoming following the rule 9 requests. We are 22 conscious of the need to provide the core participants 23 with the appropriate disclosure in a timely matter. As 24 all core participants will be aware, the process, as 25 I have mentioned already, of reviewing material,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 14</p>	<p>1 request has already been made of Abbot Richard Yeo, 2 former Abbot President of the English Benedictine 3 Congregation, specific to his involvement in 4 Ealing Abbey and St Benedict's School. 5 We, counsel to the inquiry, are in the process of 6 identifying and drafting further rule 9 requests. 7 A non-exhaustive list which indicated some likely 8 requests was set out in our note for this hearing and 9 core participants have come back with some further 10 suggestions with which we broadly agree. We anticipate 11 making rule 9 statement requests from a number of people 12 who I will list, but I mention now and make it plain 13 that this is not an exhaustive list. It can never be an 14 exhaustive list until such time as we conclude our 15 review of the evidence. 16 Firstly, Ealing Social Services, then 17 the Independent School Inspectorate, the Department for 18 Education and -- I deal now with a point raised by 19 Mr Enright of Howe & Co -- the question of whether that 20 extends to ministers of education is a matter that will 21 be judged in due course in view of the evidence and in 22 view of our consideration of what information they would 23 be in a position to give. The Charity Commission, 24 the Diocese of Westminster, likely to be for 25 Mr Peter Turner, the safeguarding adviser,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 16</p>

<p>1 Abbot Martin Shipperlee, the former headmaster of 2 the school Christopher Cleugh, Abbot President 3 Christopher Jamison, Bishop John Arnold who was involved 4 in an apostolic visitation on Ealing Abbey, 5 Philip Wright and John Nixon, who conducted the 2009 6 safeguarding review. Inquiry will also be made of 7 the Holy See, the Metropolitan Police and/or the Crown 8 Prosecution Service, again subject to consideration of 9 all the disclosed material.</p> <p>10 Mr Khan QC has made suggestions in his submissions 11 in respect of the Commission for Social Care, a body 12 inspecting and regulating social care services from 2004 13 to 2009, and suggested that they be the subject of 14 a statement request, also the Metropolitan Police and 15 the Crown Prosecution Service. We will keep these 16 requests in mind as we review disclosure.</p> <p>17 I said that I would return to St Augustine's Priory. 18 In reviewing the disclosure, we will also consider 19 whether it will be appropriate to make a rule 9 request 20 of the headmistress of St Augustine's. So that, too, 21 will be kept under review.</p> <p>22 The Charity Commission's submissions suggest seeking 23 the views of a penitent abuser and they suggest 24 the perpetrator Pearce, who was one who admitted his 25 guilt.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 17</p>	<p>1 the hearing time available. It is suggested that 2 the identification of individuals to be called to give 3 oral evidence should be addressed at a further 4 preliminary hearing prior to which we will circulate 5 a proposed witness list as a basis for discussion.</p> <p>6 However, the date of any such further preliminary 7 hearing will need to be identified as a matter of 8 urgency and notified to core participants as soon as 9 possible if, chair and members of the panel, you are in 10 agreement that such a hearing should take place.</p> <p>11 Other matters: some of the representations from core 12 participants in advance of today were lengthy, and I do 13 not consider it appropriate or necessary to deal 14 publicly with each and every point, although they are 15 all noted. You may now wish to hear submissions from 16 the individual core participants and may I suggest that 17 those submissions are made broadly in the order of the 18 introductions that I gave at the outset and that those 19 representing more than one core participant deal with 20 their submissions jointly.</p> <p>21 It might assist if I indicate, as we proceed, 22 the order, bearing in mind the way the room is set out.</p> <p>23 Chair, if you are content with that, the first 24 submissions, should they wish to make any, will be from 25 Mr O'Donnell and Mr Scorer who represent A43 to A52, A64</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 19</p>
<p>1 Again, we will reserve our position on this 2 suggestion until we complete our review of disclosure.</p> <p>3 We consider that a rule 9 request should also be 4 made of Lord Carlile, who carried out the 2011 5 independent review. It will not have escaped your 6 notice, chair and members of the panel, that 7 Lord Carlile is not representing Ealing here today and 8 I understand he will not be representing Ealing for this 9 next hearing. He has stood down to be replaced by 10 Ms Henke QC and he has already indicated that he is 11 willing to provide a statement in respect of that 12 review.</p> <p>13 In respect of timing, counsel to the inquiry and, 14 indeed, the solicitors to the inquiry are very conscious 15 of the need to send out the rule 9 statements as soon as 16 practicable not least in order to ensure that any 17 consequent disclosure can be effected in good time in 18 advance of the hearing and all are working towards that 19 end.</p> <p>20 In terms of witness selection and those who would in 21 fact give evidence live at the hearing, it is not yet 22 possible to identify witnesses. We will identify 23 witnesses to address institutional responses and 24 safeguarding policies with a view to obtaining really 25 the best possible coverage of the points at issue, given</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 18</p>	<p>1 to A66, A69, A70, A72, A75 and also Jonathan West.</p> <p>2 THE CHAIR: Thank you.</p> <p>3 Submissions by MR SCORER</p> <p>4 MR SCORER: Thank you, chair. It is obviously me today, 5 Mr O'Donnell is not able to be here. I can hopefully be 6 fairly brief. I had intended to address you on three 7 issues, but my learned friend Ms Karmy-Jones has dealt 8 with a number of the matters that I wanted to raise in 9 her opening comments, particularly in relation to 10 witnesses and rule 9 requests, so I do not need to take 11 up your time on that.</p> <p>12 What I do want to address you on is the issue of 13 the length of the hearing, which is a serious concern to 14 my clients.</p> <p>15 Our position, as we have set out in our written 16 submissions, is that the five days is simply completely 17 insufficient. I hear what is being said today, but this 18 does seem still to be a case of shoe-horning the hearing 19 into five days when it obviously needs more than that. 20 Contrary to what was said about our submissions, 21 the issue is not principally about the number of 22 convictions of staff and monks at St Benedict's and 23 the abbey, although that may itself be indicative of 24 the wider prevalence of abuse. It is simply a case of, 25 when you look at what needs to be looked at in relation</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 20</p>

<p>1 to Ealing Abbey and St Benedict's and then compare that 2 with what has been dealt with in comparable hearings, at 3 Ealing Abbey and St Benedict's we had two reviews 4 commissioned by the abbey, Philip Wright and 5 Lord Carlile, we had two inquiries by the 6 Charities Commission, we had an emergency inspection by 7 the ISI, we had the apostolic visitation, we had 8 extensive interaction and correspondence with the 9 Department of Education and we also had the campaign 10 over a number of years by my client Jonathan West. He 11 was granted core participant status, as you know, 12 because the inquiry could see the value in considering 13 the work that he did as a campaigner who was trying to 14 get the school and the abbey to take these issues 15 seriously and the school's rather hostile response to 16 that. 17 You need to look at all of those issues. You also 18 need to look, as Ms Karmy-Jones has said, at 19 the possible failings of the ISI and Ofsted which 20 clearly need to be examined generally and there was not 21 the opportunity to do that in the December hearing. 22 So what we have with Ealing Abbey and St Benedict's 23 is a number of external inquiries and a number of issues 24 to consider, which is certainly greater in number than 25 Ampleforth and Downside combined, and we have an abbey</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 21</p>	<p>1 described as a "pick and mix" approach by a number of 2 witnesses whom you heard in December and others have 3 made that same comment, where the Catholic Church deals 4 with bits of child protection that they want to deal 5 with and disregards the bits that they find 6 inconvenient. 7 As you know, after the hearing in December, 8 the Charities Commission decided, in fact, to intervene 9 in Ampleforth and effectively put it into special 10 measures. The situation at Ampleforth was seen as that 11 serious. So there are major, major issues of wider 12 relevance here with the Catholic Church perhaps behaving 13 as if they are not, in reality, happening. 14 We had the annual report a couple of weeks ago from 15 the National Catholic Safeguarding Commission. It did 16 not even make reference to what was happening at 17 Ampleforth. So there is some concern that 18 the Catholic Church is not taking these issues as 19 seriously as it needs to be. 20 I hear what is being said about the practical 21 difficulties, in terms of the timing of the hearing and 22 the fact that a hearing on another subject follows 23 immediately thereafter. If the hearing can't be 24 extended into the weeks immediately following from this, 25 it seems to me that we ought to consider going part</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 23</p>
<p>1 and a school attracting a number of external inquiries 2 not dissimilar, in fact, to the number attracted by 3 the entire Anglican Diocese of Chichester in its 4 entirety, and we had three weeks on that. 5 Chair, we recognise the importance of 6 proportionality and we recognise that timing is tight 7 but we do say that it is important that you look at 8 these issues fully and properly, not only to ensure that 9 the inquiry looks properly at Ealing, but there are also 10 issues around this that go well beyond Ealing. You have 11 chosen the EBC as a case study to inform you about 12 the Catholic Church in England and Wales much more 13 widely. 14 Chair, as Howe & Co set out in their very thorough 15 submissions, in terms of involvement with the education 16 of children, the Catholic Church is one of the largest 17 organisations in the country and so the conclusions you 18 reach about it are going to affect hundreds of 19 thousands, if not millions, of children in the future, 20 so the importance of that is very clear, and that is 21 particularly so, given what we are seeing happening with 22 the Catholic Church safeguarding at the moment. We see, 23 in our submission, a very clear disconnect between what 24 the Catholic Church says publicly it is doing around 25 safeguarding and what is actually going on. It has been</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 22</p>	<p>1 heard and having further time later in the diary rather 2 than rushing through the evidence. 3 So that is our submission on the length of hearing 4 point. 5 Chair, in terms of the question of St Augustine's 6 Priory School, I want to make our position clear on 7 that. We are not suggesting some radical reformulation 8 of the scope of the inquiry. We are simply making this 9 observation: F80 was the subject of allegations. He was 10 a monk at Ealing Abbey. He was the subject of 11 allegations. And in response to those allegations, 12 it is our understanding that he stepped down as 13 a trustee of Ealing Abbey. However, he continued to 14 work as a chaplain and as a governor at the girls' 15 school, so we say that is an issue which should properly 16 fall within the scope of your considerations here. 17 It is not some radical expansion of the scope we are 18 seeking, we are simply saying that issue has to be 19 addressed. 20 Finally, chair, and I think this is accepted by 21 Ms Karmy-Jones, we say we will need a further 22 preliminary hearing later in the year. We are at a very 23 early stage in relation to document disclosure and 24 witness evidence and we clearly are going to need 25 a further preliminary hearing in order that any issues</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 24</p>

<p>1 arising from that can be dealt with so that we avoid 2 a situation where those issues come up at the beginning 3 of the hearing and therefore end up being addressed too 4 late in the day. 5 So those are our submissions, madam, thank you. 6 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Scorer. 7 MS KARMY-JONES: Can I just clarify, when I mentioned 8 the practical issues of timescale, of course that is 9 not, and could not ever be, the driving factor in 10 considering the time that this hearing will take and, 11 chair, I have no doubt that you and the panel will of 12 course consider all matters in the round in deciding 13 this, including the time needed to consider the issues 14 as outlined. 15 The next in line, then, is Mr Enright and Mr Cade 16 representing F13. 17 Submissions by MR ENRIGHT 18 MR ENRIGHT: Good morning chair, Ms Sharpling, Sir Malcolm, 19 Mr Frank. 20 We appear on behalf of F13, as counsel to the 21 inquiry has said, but also, as you know, on behalf of F1 22 to F12, F44, F48, F49 and F53 who together form a very 23 substantial proportion of the victim and survivor core 24 participants in this wider Roman Catholic Church 25 investigation.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 25</p>	<p>1 Catholic Church. Before I develop that main submission, 2 I wish to return to a matter that arose in December of 3 last year. You may recall that we were permitted to 4 question Dom Yeo and we were very grateful for that 5 opportunity. During the course of that questioning, 6 Dom Yeo, who was at that time the recent former 7 president of the English Benedictine Congregation, he 8 was asked: 9 "What actual steps have been taken by the English 10 Benedictine Congregation to institute a fund or redress 11 scheme for survivors of abuse by the English Benedictine 12 Congregation monks. Can you help us please?" 13 Dom Yeo said: 14 "As regards survivors of abuse at Fort Augustus, 15 we recognise a moral responsibility and, because we hold 16 some money which has been gifted to us by the trustees 17 of Fort Augustus Abbey when it closed, we are asking 18 the Charity Commission to allow us to use that money for 19 compensation to victims of abuse at Fort Augustus. 20 "Now that was a decision taken when I was Abbot 21 President. Since then, I understand that 22 the Charity Commission is still looking into that. So 23 that is a partial answer to your question." 24 Now, despite that assurance which was volunteered by 25 the English Benedictines over six months ago that they</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 27</p>
<p>1 I trust you have received and read our what have 2 been referred to as lengthy submissions, and indeed they 3 were, but, as ever, counsel to the investigation has 4 considered them carefully and I therefore do not need to 5 rehearse those at any length. 6 I fully endorse the submissions made by Mr Scorer in 7 writing and today in relation to the length of this 8 hearing. Mr Scorer has referred to our submissions on 9 the scale of the issue. It is not merely the almost 10 1 million children who are in schools operated directly 11 or indirectly by the Catholic Church, but that every 12 church in the country operates Sunday schools and 13 after-school groups and mother and baby groups and every 14 other type of association. We are probably talking 15 about 2 million children and vulnerable people who are 16 directly, or indirectly, under the care of the Catholic 17 Church. It is, therefore, a very big issue. They are 18 probably one of, if not the largest providers, outside 19 of national government, of care and education to 20 children and vulnerable people. This is, therefore, 21 a very serious issue. 22 As you will see from our written submissions which 23 I will focus on today, there are two issues. We say 24 the inquiry has heard enough so far to compel it to 25 issue an urgent interim report in relation to the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 26</p>	<p>1 had asked the Charity Commission to use that money for 2 compensation for victims of abuse at Fort Augustus, and 3 there are others representing other Scottish survivors 4 here today, nothing has happened. No support has been 5 received. 6 Now, we highlighted this point very clearly in our 7 written submissions to give those representing 8 the English Benedictines the opportunity to take 9 instructions on it and to inform this inquiry as to what 10 actions had been taken in relation to the commitment 11 given to this inquiry six months ago. 12 Our clients are not young men, they are not well 13 men. They cannot wait interminably for that promise to 14 be turned into reality. So we ask again, on behalf of 15 F13 and indeed the other Scottish survivors of 16 Fort Augustus, what steps have been taken? When will 17 this promise be made good? Hopefully we can get some 18 information on that today. 19 Now, madam, turning to our main submission which, as 20 you will have seen, is that we say an urgent report 21 needs to be issued now. The interim report did not 22 address the Catholic Church. We say the Catholic Church 23 is structurally, culturally and doctrinally incapable of 24 developing, implementing and enforcing acceptable 25 minimum standards of child protection.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 28</p>

<p>1 Looking first at structure, on 9 May, last month, 2 counsel to the Birmingham investigation stated in 3 response to our submissions the following: 4 "There is a submission made on behalf of the core 5 participants F48, F49 and F53 relating to the role that 6 the Catholic Council for the IICSA play in the 7 investigation into the Roman Catholic Church. I am 8 aware, and have no doubt you remember, that this topic 9 was raised at the second preliminary hearing on 10 6 June 2017, again by us. On behalf of these core 11 participants, it is submitted today that you should 12 compel the Catholic Council to state clearly and 13 unequivocally whether it represents it in the full and 14 true meaning of the word the Catholic Church in England 15 and Wales." 16 And counsel to the inquiry said: 17 "On behalf of the inquiry, it is my submission it is 18 clear that the Catholic Council was not granted core 19 participant status on the basis that it was 20 the mouthpiece for the entirety of the Catholic Church 21 in England and Wales." 22 Counsel went on to say that the Catholic Council 23 assisted the inquiry in relation to disclosure and 24 witness statements. 25 Now, the reason we pressed for an answer to that</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 29</p>	<p>1 Catholic Church of England and Wales, it is not just 2 into Ealing Abbey, which is a case study -- it is 3 supposed to be a demonstration of the Catholic Church, 4 so I will proceed. 5 This structural problem, madam, which is highlighted 6 by the answer to that question, was again, as Mr Scorer 7 has mentioned, further amplified by the expert witnesses 8 the inquiry heard from, Ms Shearer and Mr Child, who 9 gave example after example of instances where 10 the Catholic Church adopted a "pick and mix" approach, 11 where one diocese would adopt child protection norms and 12 others refused. Mr Child said it was based on 13 a goodwill basis and no systems. 14 Again, as child protection experts, you will 15 understand that you cannot have a system of child 16 protection based on goodwill, it must have systems. 17 Mr Child memorably said that the Catholic Church 18 should not be given a third chance. They had had two 19 perfect opportunities in 15 years with Nolan and 20 Cumberlege and they had failed to do it. He said it 21 would be wrong to say, "Oh, go on, have another go". 22 Those were his words. 23 So, madam, we say that structurally it is 24 demonstrated that the Catholic Church, including 25 Ealing Abbey, is not a safe place for children and it is</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 31</p>
<p>1 question for over a year, madam, was because we thought 2 it was vitally important that this inquiry and 3 the public at large understand that the Catholic Church 4 is incapable of putting forward a person or a body who 5 can speak for it and who can give commitments on its 6 behalf. 7 As child protection experts, you will understand 8 that dealing with a very large organisation providing 9 education and care to vulnerable people, if you were 10 dealing with an organisation that was not 11 the Catholic Church, who honestly said to you, "We can 12 produce no one who can speak for us and no one who can 13 give commitments to you in relation to child 14 protection", that would set off very big red lights. 15 MS KARMY-JONES: As my learned friend has just paused, 16 I wanted to rise to remind all that today's hearing is 17 specific to Ealing and perhaps submissions could be 18 focused on that rather than the wider, broader sphere of 19 the investigation. 20 MR ENRIGHT: Before the hearing, we met together, all 21 counsel met, and that issue was discussed. The inquiry 22 chose the case studies. You will have seen our 23 submissions previously when we talked about 24 the suitability of those case studies. 25 The Catholic Church investigation is into the whole</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 30</p>	<p>1 not something that we should wait to act upon. Yes, 2 we should continue forward. Yes, let's take all 3 the evidence we can. Yes, let's give 4 the Catholic Church every opportunity to rebut this, but 5 thus far the Catholic Church has not offered you 6 a scintilla of evidence that it is capable of 7 implementing national minimum standards of child 8 protection and that is a fact. 9 Madam, culturally and doctrinally, 10 the Catholic Church similarly cannot engage in effective 11 child protection. You will remember our submissions in 12 relation to the Archbishop of Melbourne who said he 13 would rather go to jail than reveal matters, including 14 child abuse, that were revealed in the confessional. He 15 made it clear that it was sacrosanct, that it was above 16 the law. Canon law is above domestic law. 17 Just a few weeks ago, and we wrote to the inquiry 18 about this, the Sunday Times reported that the Catholic 19 bishops' child protection body in Ireland, where they do 20 have a mandatory reporting system, had issued guidance 21 to priests to tell them, "Do not report child abuse 22 revealed in the confessional". That is in the context 23 of a country that has implemented a law that we are 24 considering and there will be a seminar on that in 25 September and the Catholic Church has said they will not</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 32</p>

<p>1 do it and telling people, "Do not do it, flout the law". 2 They were asked again why were they doing this. 3 They cited Canon law. They said the sacramental seal is 4 inviolable and therefore it is absolutely forbidden for 5 a confessor to betray, in any way, a penitent, in words 6 or in any manner, for any reason. They consider 7 themselves above the law. 8 Now the issue around reporting child abuse or 9 disclosing child abuse in confession is not sort of some 10 nebulous fear or concern, there has been research on 11 this from the article referred to the work of 12 Marie Keenan of UCD, who is an assistant professor and 13 psychotherapist, who has found that eight out of nine 14 offending priests who participated in her research had 15 disclosed their sexual abuse of children in the 16 confessional. 17 Cardinal Nichols, who gave a statement in 18 the Birmingham investigation, perhaps he can address 19 this pretty central issue in that statement, but what 20 can he say? It is the law of the church that they will 21 not disclose child abuse revealed in the confessional. 22 I have dealt with the scale of the risk. It is 23 immense. And it is a pressing issue. In another 24 context, we have given the example of a coroner's 25 inquiry where a coroner can, under regulation 28, issue</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 33</p>	<p>1 for an organisation of this size. But act now, chair, 2 there is no reason not to act now. Thank you. 3 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Enright. 4 MS KARMY-JONES: Next in line is Mr Khan QC who represents 5 G2. 6 Submissions by MR KHAN 7 MR KHAN: Good morning chair. Can I deal with the issue of 8 timing in terms of numbers of days. In our submission 9 we put it in this way. It is premature at this stage to 10 list the hearing for only five days when we have not 11 dealt with disclosure, with witness lists, proposed 12 schedules or finalised a list of topics. We do think it 13 appears that five days is simply set aside without 14 thinking through all of the issues that are yet to come 15 up and perhaps the best way of doing this is to say that 16 it is not set in stone but it may be that more time may 17 be needed in due course. I understand Mr Scorer saying 18 we may need to go part heard. It seems to us, looking 19 at the issues thus far, that five days does not appear 20 to be sufficient to deal with those topics. I am not 21 asking for more days to be decide today. It may be that 22 the inquiry panel needs to consider whether there will 23 be further days set aside in the event that we don't 24 deal with all of the issues that are likely to come out. 25 I completely accept there needs to be a preliminary</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 35</p>
<p>1 a risk of death report. We say the inquiry should do 2 the same. It should do it now. 3 We gave the example, madam, of the children in 4 custodial institutions investigation, which is fast 5 approaching, and we asked the question: 6 "Imagine if the most senior civil servants in 7 the Home Office issued directions to all civil servants 8 saying, 'Do not disclose, or do not tell the authorities 9 about child abuse revealed in line management meetings'. 10 Imagine if the minister at the Home Office said -- again 11 directed that members of his department should go to 12 jail rather than disclose child abuse to the police" -- 13 I see you looking at me. 14 Imagine if every child in a custodial institution 15 was run by a governor who was entirely independent of 16 everybody else and could opt in or opt out of child 17 protection at whim. That is the case with the 18 Catholic Church as it stands and it cannot change. 19 It is structurally incapable of changing. Change must 20 be forced upon it. 21 So I recognise what you say, that this is a case 22 study about Ealing but Ealing has been chosen as an 23 example of what is occurring within the Catholic Church 24 so we say, yes, investigate Ealing, but do so properly. 25 As Mr Scorer has said, five days is simply not enough</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 34</p>	<p>1 hearing some time before Christmas. It may be that by 2 that time, the inquiry panel has considered the topics 3 and the issues and there has been some discussion, but 4 at this stage, may I invite the panel to set aside or 5 look at possible diary entries in the event we need to 6 go part heard as far as this particular aspect is 7 concerned. 8 Can I then deal with a couple of other issues 9 dealing with the scope of the inquiry and the areas that 10 Ms Karmy-Jones dealt with as far as enquiries to be 11 made. There are two aspects really: one is in relation 12 to the state responsibility and whether ministers might 13 be called and, in relation to the police or CPS, 14 the police more particularly than the CPS in our 15 submission. 16 We have set out in our submission at paragraph 17 1(b)(ii) in relation to the police in particular 18 we submitted, following the last hearing, the inquiry is 19 not in a position to fulfil its obligations to 20 investigate and make a finding about the conduct of the 21 police. 22 It might be worthwhile just reminding ourselves that 23 in December of last year we made a number of submissions 24 in relation to the conduct of the police and what 25 happened in relation to their investigations. We put it</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 36</p>

<p>1 in this way. It may be worth reminding you of that. 2 Paragraph 19 of submissions that we made. They are not 3 in front of you. These are submissions we made in 4 December. Forgive me, I will have to read it out to 5 you: 6 "Similarly, what of the police who were learning of 7 serious allegations involving schools and abbeys and 8 experiencing resistance to their investigations, yet 9 reported this to no statutory body? We say they ought 10 to have intervened and opened an investigation earlier 11 than they did. Incidentally, we submit that the inquiry 12 is not in a position to make a finding on the conduct of 13 the police in relation to the handling of any 14 allegations regarding monks/staff at Ampleforth or 15 Downside prior to the year 2000 as insufficient evidence 16 in that regard has been obtained. We trust the inquiry 17 will confirm that more evidence will be obtained in this 18 regard to be dealt with at the next hearing." 19 Again as a reminder, we listed the manner in which 20 there was a lack of investigation. 21 We said in relation to the abbots and 22 Abbot Presidents who failed to contact the statutory 23 authorities for decades about what they knew to be 24 criminal offences; decided to act as judge and jury and 25 failed, both deliberately and due to the complete lack</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 37</p>	<p>1 sufficient information thus far for those enquiries to 2 be made now rather than for a consideration to be made 3 at a later stage. 4 Then, in relation to the ministerial aspect, 5 Mr Enright has, I think, some cogent arguments in 6 relation to an interim report. I understand completely 7 where he is coming from. The inquiry has two options 8 here. If there is a sufficient risk to children that 9 there is a need for this inquiry panel to provide an 10 interim report, as of course you can under 11 the Inquiries Act, I think section 24.3, you can produce 12 an interim report, if needed, if the risk is so severe. 13 Mr Enright puts it very clearly in his submissions. 14 We don't go that far, but we do say there has been 15 a lack of state accountability, so the options 16 we present to you today is to either go down the path 17 that Mr Enright suggests, which is to produce a report 18 which is then sent to a minister for action to be taken 19 immediately or, alternatively, that a minister is called 20 to this inquiry to give evidence. 21 In December, we put it in this way: given the extent 22 of the failings in relation to safeguarding and 23 reporting to the statutory authorities on the part of 24 the Catholic Church, we submit that rather than 25 delegating the task of implementing an entire</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 39</p>
<p>1 of the necessary skills, to then properly investigate or 2 investigate at all; minimised the extent of the abuse as 3 a comparatively minor offence; transferred abusing monks 4 without any sufficient information to enable 5 the receiving establishment to decide whether to accept 6 the offender in the first place; allowed abusive monks 7 access to children with no or inadequate restrictions; 8 then failed to keep proper records, including 9 a deliberate omission of references, safeguarding and 10 visitation. 11 And then this in relation to the police: resisted 12 police and other investigations through non-cooperation 13 and lack of disclosure; tampered with police 14 investigations; destruction of evidence; falsely 15 claiming that a witness could not assist the police for 16 medical reasons and due to old age; threatening police 17 officers that they would draw upon their connections 18 with those that they knew with a position of influence 19 to interfere with the officer's job and so on. 20 That was evidence given by DCI White at that stage. 21 So it troubles me slightly, and I wonder if 22 Ms Karmy-Jones can respond in this way as to what 23 inquiries will be made. I know it is a matter that she 24 has said will be taken into consideration and an eye 25 kept on it, but our submission is that we have</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 38</p>	<p>1 safeguarding structure to those who had proved so 2 unqualified, if not deliberately evasive, in that 3 regard, without proper oversight, was a derogation of 4 responsibility. In our submission, the state failed in 5 its obligations to protect children from the risk of 6 child sexual abuse. It is unacceptable for this 7 discussion to be taking place 16 years after the issues 8 were so widely and publicly identified. 9 We do think, therefore, that it is necessary for 10 a minister to be contacted to explain away why it is 11 that the state failed over that period of time. 12 It is our submission, we said back then, that 13 the state failed to meet that obligation and this 14 inquiry, and that this inquiry is its means of 15 compliance. 16 Successive accounts to the Commission for 17 Social Care, Ofsted and ISI inspection reports deemed 18 the schools that are the subject of this investigation 19 inadequate. The DfE was never asked to request an 20 action plan. No school was removed from the register 21 for failing to meet applicable standards. Prior to 22 2002, there was little or no systematic inspection of 23 independent schools at all. In a complete derogation of 24 responsibility by the state, statutory standards for 25 the inspection of independent schools were not even</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 40</p>

<p>1 created until 2002/2003." 2 So we say that there is a real need now rather than 3 to await further disclosure because the evidence is 4 there. Certainly, there is a prima facie case that 5 those enquiries should be made now. So we do ask that 6 rather than leave it until later, that the ministers 7 responsible are contacted and whether rule 9 requests 8 are made or not is a matter for the counsel to 9 the inquiry but at the very least contact should be made 10 and enquiries made on what action or inaction and why 11 that inaction took place over that period of time. 12 Madam, those are our submissions. 13 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Khan. 14 MS KARMY-JONES: In relation to that, I will respond in 15 the following way. 16 As I have already indicated, the Metropolitan Police 17 Service and/or the Crown Prosecution Service, 18 the Department for Education, the Independent Schools 19 Inspectorate and Ofsted are all on the list that has 20 been circulated and which I outlined earlier of those 21 from whom we anticipate making rule 9 statement 22 requests. 23 It is the content of those rule 9 statement requests 24 that needs to be carefully considered, needs to be 25 carefully set out and drafted in order to assist them in</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 41</p>	<p>1 written submissions so I will confine myself to four 2 points that I would like to make on the basis of what 3 we have heard so far this morning. 4 First of all, dealing with the idea or concept of an 5 interim report: of course, that may well not only just 6 be pragmatic but also would be a considerable help to 7 you and your colleagues because it may well help to 8 generate minds focusing on the future. It may well help 9 to bring certain issues into focus and may well provide 10 you with an opportunity to get valuable contributions 11 from core participants and others. So I would commend 12 that. Of course the Royal Commission in Australia, 13 I believe they produced interim reports and that that 14 was an invaluable exercise. 15 Getting back to three other points which are all 16 inter-related and that involves very much the role of 17 the core participants. As regards the core participants 18 that my firm represents, there is a concern that their 19 role may well be in the future constrained in some way. 20 That is a concern and if there was that possibility, 21 that would be very sad and a missed opportunity because 22 of the contribution that they have played in the past 23 and the contribution that they intend or would like to 24 make in the future. 25 I raise that because whilst we are dealing with</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 43</p>
<p>1 the statement-making process. That cannot be done 2 without a full review of the material. It will be done 3 in due course but done properly and we don't propose to 4 shortcut the process. I am sure Mr Khan would not wish 5 us to. Just to clarify that, which I hope assists. 6 MR KHAN: I hope we are not having a one-way conversation. 7 I know the DfE is going to be contacted. I wonder 8 how high the position is going to go, whether it is 9 going to get to ministerial level or whether it is going 10 to be -- forgive me for using the pejorative phrase -- 11 some underling at the Department who is going to be 12 providing evidence. That is really what I am trying to 13 get at. 14 MS KARMY-JONES: We have very much Mr Khan's submissions in 15 mind but until a review is conducted, I am not able to 16 identify specific individuals as yet. If it is the case 17 that specific individuals at higher level can provide 18 any information of worth, then of course we will take 19 steps, but it is only when we discover that that those 20 steps will be taken. Of course, I am happy to discuss 21 this with Mr Khan after the hearing. 22 The next then in line is Mr Collins for G1 and G3 23 through to G6, to make submissions. 24 Submissions by MR COLLINS 25 MR COLLINS: Good morning, ma'am. Thank you. You have my</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 42</p>	<p>1 a particular tranche this morning, as far as the core 2 participants that I represent, they are interested in 3 the Roman Catholic Church in its very broadest sense and 4 not just particular tranches of this inquiry. It seems 5 to me that all the various issues that we have been 6 hearing about this morning do affect many, many 7 institutions across the land. It is not just 8 a particular institution. The concern is that we may be 9 missing an opportunity if the core participants are not 10 able to take part in each and every tranche that relates 11 to the Roman Catholic Church. 12 We have very much in the public domain at the moment 13 the Australian case of Archbishop Wilson. That case 14 brings into sharp relief the challenges that many 15 organisations, many institutions -- not just Catholic 16 ones -- are facing when it comes to child protection and 17 when it comes to safeguarding. That particular case, as 18 I say, brings into very sharp focus the various issues 19 and challenges that you are familiar with and you don't 20 need me to repeat ad nauseam. We know what they are. 21 I think it is absolutely vital that the core 22 participants are able to participate fully and without 23 fetter in the discussions, in the submissions and in 24 the questions when it comes to these issues. So all 25 I would ask today is that when you are considering</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 44</p>

<p>1 the road ahead that that is borne in mind. I think 2 it is absolutely necessary for the core participants to 3 participate fully and openly. 4 That fairness, because that is implicit, must not 5 only be procedurally; it must be visible. It must be 6 visible to the core participants to this inquiry and to 7 the wider world. Otherwise, there is a risk that 8 the contribution that they can make is not going to be 9 as full as it ought to be and as we would wish it to be. 10 Finally, we have heard a great deal about the time 11 estimate today. It is quite apparent that the existing 12 time estimate is going to be challenging at best. 13 I would be loath on the basis of my experience in these 14 things to see hearings going part heard. So all I would 15 say is that that time estimate needs to be revisited 16 sooner rather than later, because the risk of going part 17 heard is that momentum is lost. From experience, that 18 is always unwelcome. 19 So, unless I can assist you, ma'am, and your 20 colleagues any further, those are the four points. 21 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Collins. 22 MS KARMY-JONES: Next it is Mr Chapman and Mr Greenwood on 23 behalf of C18 and 19. 24 Submissions by MR CHAPMAN 25 MR CHAPMAN: Madam chair, panel, I make two submissions in</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 45</p>	<p>1 criticised for not acting within the powers it already 2 has. Or it may be that the Charity Commission chose not 3 to act within its powers. Therefore, ma'am, if you did 4 receive an application for the Charity Commission to 5 have core participant status, we would be minded to 6 recommend that that is granted. 7 There is an important public interest in relation to 8 the Charity Commission. The general public will want to 9 know why taxpayers' money is being used to subsidise 10 institutions which on the evidence that we have heard 11 have provided and continue to provide a haven for 12 paedophiles n close proximity to children. 13 Ma'am, in relation to calling a convicted abuser, 14 we accept that you will wish to proceed cautiously. 15 Nonetheless, ma'am, this is an opportunity in 16 the Ealing Abbey case study to call evidence from 17 a convicted abuser who carried out their abuse while 18 professing at the same time apparently sincere beliefs 19 in the tenets of St Benedict and the Catholic Church. 20 The questions or the abuser will be: how did they 21 reconcile their actions with their beliefs; did those 22 beliefs inhibit or promote their behaviour; did 23 the institution in which they worked promote or inhibit 24 their behaviour; and finally, what measures might have 25 stopped their activity.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 47</p>
<p>1 relation to the shape and content of the hearing in 2 February. The first is in relation to the 3 Charities Commission and the second in relation to our 4 proposal to call a convicted abuser to give evidence 5 before you. 6 Madam chair, we welcome counsel to the inquiry's 7 indication that a statement will be sought from 8 the Charity Commission. The purpose of my submissions 9 is to persuade you that that indeed should become 10 a focus in this inquiry into Ealing Abbey because 11 it represents an important opportunity, because 12 the Charity Commission did investigate Downside and 13 Ampleforth but those were not fully explored at 14 the previous hearing. 15 In relation to Ealing Abbey, there were two 16 inquiries. What we discovered at the previous hearing 17 was that unless these Catholic institutions face an 18 existential threat, they are unlikely to reform, no 19 matter what they profess, no matter what reports are 20 published, no matter, I regret, what your inquiry 21 recommends, no matter even if mandatory reporting were 22 enshrined in law. 23 The removal of charitable status would have an 24 direct and immediate financial consequence for these 25 institutions. It may be that the Charity Commission is</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 46</p>	<p>1 Those are the questions which a penitent convicted 2 abuser might be able to provide invaluable answers to. 3 That is a matter perhaps, ma'am, which can be revisited 4 at a forthcoming preliminary hearing. 5 Now, in relation to timing, time is quite clearly 6 too short. Given the topics that have been raised 7 today, certainly if it is going to be five days, 8 we suggest that all those five days should be used for 9 evidence and that submissions should be provided in 10 writing. 11 Unless I can assist you any further, those are our 12 submissions. 13 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Chapman. 14 MS KARMY-JONES: Chair, I note the time. It is coming up to 15 11.45. However, a number of those who remain have 16 previously indicated that they are unlikely to have 17 submissions today. I wonder if we could possibly ask 18 whether submissions from now on are long, so that you 19 can consider whether you wish to take the break or not. 20 A few minutes, I think. There are two who wish to 21 make short submissions. Are you content to carry on? 22 THE CHAIR: Yes. 23 MS KARMY-JONES: Then I think Mr King on behalf of Mr Child 24 and Ms Shearer. 25</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 48</p>

<p>1 Submissions by MR KING 2 MR KING: Good morning, madam chair. 3 You will note that for this particular preliminary 4 hearing, written submissions were submitted in respect 5 of both Eileen Shearer and Adrian Child. I do not seek 6 to repeat those submissions in their written form but 7 simply to identify two further matters please, if I may. 8 Simply this: in relation to disclosure, as has been 9 previously identified, both Adrian Child and 10 Eileen Shearer are not in post of course with CSAS and 11 of course not with COPCA and by that position don't have 12 access to the relevant records. 13 There has been, and we have welcomed this, ongoing 14 liaison with the inquiry in relation to obtaining 15 disclosure in relation to the Birmingham study. It is 16 simply raised now that if a similar process -- and 17 it has not taken place yet in relation to Birmingham but 18 it is understood that that is likely to take place in 19 due course -- it is simply requested now that a similar 20 process in relation to this study is going to assist 21 both of these professionals to carry out their review 22 and answer the relevant questions that are posed to 23 them. So it is flagged up now to hopefully ensure that 24 they can provide the most detailed responses that they 25 are able to do.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 49</p>	<p>1 nothing has happened in relation to compensation 2 payments to victims of abuse at Fort Augustus. That is 3 simply factually incorrect. I appreciate that Howe & Co 4 do not represent 13 in relation to civil claims and 5 therefore he may not be in possession of the full 6 details. It would be wrong for me to go into 7 the details of any particular claim or claimants in an 8 open forum such as this, but can I assure the panel that 9 contact has been made with a number of representatives 10 of victims and survivors of abuse at Fort Augustus and 11 indeed a number of claims have already been resolved and 12 we will continue to go down that path. 13 If the panel would welcome any further assistance or 14 detail on that, we would be happy to provide it but 15 possibly better placed on a confidential basis rather 16 than dealing with individual claims in this public 17 forum. 18 The second point is in relation to the question of 19 an interim report. Now, we are conscious that of course 20 the panel is anticipating that its report in relation to 21 Downside and Ampleforth will be published in the not too 22 distant future and no doubt the panel, whilst writing 23 that report, will have had well in minds its own role 24 partly as an interim report in relation to its 25 investigation into the Roman Catholic Church.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 51</p>
<p>1 Simply another practical point in relation to 2 the hearing for next year, as it is currently listed, 3 for 4 February. The practical point is this: 4 Eileen Shearer at this stage is currently timetabled to 5 be out of the country for the first two weeks of 6 February 2019. It is flagged up now. It is anticipated 7 that she may well be required as she has been previously 8 in relation to providing witness statements and one of 9 course remembers the evidence that she gave in some 10 detail previously to the inquiry. 11 I can perhaps say no more than this. At this stage, 12 noting that there is a potential issue regarding her 13 availability for February of next year, certainly 14 the intention is to stay in touch with the inquiry, to 15 liaise as we move forward and to see how that develops 16 and to try actively to manage that as far as we are able 17 to to ensure that the process is managed appropriately. 18 I do not have any further submissions. Thank you 19 very much. 20 THE CHAIR: Thank you. 21 MS KARMY-JONES: Ms Gallafent is next. 22 Submissions by MS GALLAFENT 23 MS GALLAFENT: Chairman of the panel, good morning. Just 24 two points from me today if I may. 25 Firstly, in relation to Mr Enright's suggestion that</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 50</p>	<p>1 So we make that as a starting point and no doubt 2 it will bear in mind the types of concerns that have 3 been raised throughout by core participants in relation 4 to issues such as the sacrament of the confessional, 5 the structure of the church and the like. But equally 6 we hope that the panel will have borne in mind the 7 position that we set out in our closing submissions at 8 the end of the hearing into Ampleforth and Downside, 9 that is that those are issues upon which we have always 10 suggested that the panel could be assisted with more 11 information, more detail, more evidence before reaching 12 any firm and settled conclusions. 13 We are very happy that there will be 14 a wider-reaching general hearing in due course into 15 the Roman Catholic Church and we welcome and look 16 forward to assisting the panel with issues in relation 17 to those sorts of matters. We simply say it is 18 premature at this stage to anticipate what evidence 19 might be put before the panel, particularly in relation 20 to current safeguarding policies and procedures as 21 opposed to what we have heard predominantly which is in 22 relation to those relating to the past, as well as 23 future developments. 24 You will obviously hear from the Abbot President of 25 the EBC, we hope, Christopher Jamison, at the hearing on</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 52</p>

<p>1 Ealing Abbey and he will be able to update the panel in 2 relation to recent developments but equally obviously 3 there is a need for a wider input from other 4 representatives of the Catholic Church, not restricted 5 to the English Benedictine Congregation and equally not 6 just restricted to the Archdiocese of Birmingham. 7 We will do all that we can to assist you in that 8 regard. The only thing that perhaps we would say is 9 that it might be helpful if we could have some 10 indication of when that might be, not just for ourselves 11 but for all the other core participants, who are clearly 12 very keen to have their say on those wider issues not 13 limited to the particular case study coming up in 14 relation to Ealing Abbey. 15 So we would welcome, if there were an opportunity, 16 to schedule that hearing sooner rather than later, no 17 matter when it is to be scheduled for, the clarity that 18 that might give. Then we can all start working towards 19 that hearing at the same time as Ealing Abbey. 20 Thank you. 21 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Ms Gallafent. 22 MS KARMY-JONES: I think that brings to an end 23 the submissions on behalf of core participants. Yes. 24 If I may just deal with two matters: one by way of 25 correction. I think during the course of my submissions</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 53</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">I N D E X</p> <p>1 2 3 Welcome and opening remarks by THE1 4 CHAIR 5 6 Submissions by MS KARMY-JONES3 7 8 Submissions by MR SCORER20 9 10 Submissions by MR ENRIGHT25 11 12 Submissions by MR KHAN35 13 14 Submissions by MR COLLINS42 15 16 Submissions by MR CHAPMAN45 17 18 Submissions by MR KING49 19 20 Submissions by MS GALLAFENT50 21 22 23 24 25</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 55</p>
<p>1 at the outset, I referred to the Charity Commission's 2 submissions seeking evidence of perpetrators. Forgive 3 me. That was a mistake. It was the Switalskis 4 submissions and I think it is important to make that 5 clear. 6 The second matter: during the course of this hearing 7 inquiries had been made about available dates within 8 the schedule of inquiry work for a further preliminary 9 hearing. I understand that the week commencing 10 29 October may provide a suitable date within that week, 11 within those five days. So I raise it now to give 12 everyone advance notice. No doubt, chair, that will be 13 confirmed in due course. Apart from that, there is 14 nothing further I wish to add over and above what has 15 already been said. 16 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Ms Karmy-Jones. If there are no 17 further submissions, I would like to thank everyone for 18 their participation today. I will consider the issues 19 raised very carefully and we will notify core 20 participants of the decisions in due course. 21 Thank you very much. 22 (11.55 am) 23 (The hearing was adjourned until 10.30 am 24 on Wednesday 6 June 2018) 25</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 54</p>	

A				
A43 5:9 19:25	abusing 38:3	agree 16:10	applicable 40:21	association 26:14
A52 19:25	abusive 38:6	agreement 19:10	application 47:4	assurance 27:24
A54 5:9	accept 35:25 38:5 47:14	ahead 2:24 45:1	applying 15:1	assure 51:8
A64 5:9 19:25	acceptable 28:24	Alexis 1:5	appreciate 51:3	attend 3:8 4:25 6:23
A66 5:9 20:1	accepted 24:20	allegation 13:12,15 13:17	appreciated 14:14	attendance 6:14
A69 5:9 20:1	access 38:7 49:12	allegations 7:18	approach 9:20 11:24 12:25 23:1 31:10	attracted 22:2
A70 5:9 20:1	accountability 39:15	10:7 14:2,6 24:9 24:11,11 37:7,14	approaching 34:5	attracting 22:1
A72 5:10 20:1	accounts 13:3 40:16	alleged 10:4 13:19	appropriate 14:15 14:23 17:19 19:13	August 15:8
A75 5:10 20:1	act 32:1 35:1,2 37:24 39:11 47:3	alleviate 14:11	appropriately 50:17	Augustine's 9:13 9:23 10:1 11:15 11:19 17:17,20 24:5
abbey 1:24,25 2:4,7 2:8,9,10 3:5,16,24 5:25 8:5,14 9:22 10:5,22 11:8,14 12:1,8 13:12 14:19 15:13 16:4 17:4 20:23 21:1,3 21:4,14,22,25 24:10,13 27:17 31:2,25 46:10,15 47:16 53:1,14,19	action 39:18 40:20 41:10	allowed 38:6	April 1:11	Augustus 27:14,17 27:19 28:2,16 51:2,10
Abbey/St 7:22 8:3	actions 28:10 47:21	alternatively 39:19	Archbishop 32:12 44:13	Australia 43:12
abbeys 1:21 3:10 37:7	actively 50:16	ambit 10:15	Archdiocese 1:18 53:6	Australian 44:13
Abbot 3:19 16:1,2 17:1,2 27:20 37:22 52:24	activity 47:25	amount 14:18	areas 36:9	authorities 34:8 37:23 39:23
abbots 37:21	actual 27:9	Ampleforth 1:21 2:9 3:11 4:22 6:18,21,24 10:23 21:25 23:9,10,17 37:14 46:13 51:21 52:8	argue 10:18	availability 50:13
able 20:5 42:15 44:10,22 48:2 49:25 50:16 53:1	ad 44:20	and/or 17:7 41:17	argument 10:21 11:15,20	available 19:1 54:7
absolutely 33:4 44:21 45:2	add 2:3 54:14	Andrew 3:19	arguments 39:5	avoid 25:1
abuse 1:6 5:10 7:18 8:2,5,10 10:23 12:13 13:1,11,17 13:21 20:24 27:11 27:14,19 28:2 32:14,21 33:8,9 33:15,21 34:9,12 38:2 40:6 47:17 51:2,10	addition 6:15 14:20	Anglican 22:3	arising 25:1	await 41:3
abuser 17:23 46:4 47:13,17,20 48:2	address 2:22 10:11 18:23 20:6,12 28:22 33:18	annual 23:14	Arnold 9:8 17:3	aware 14:1,24 29:8
abusers 10:4	addressed 8:12 19:3 24:19 25:3	anonymity 13:10	arose 27:2	
	adduced 7:23 13:4	answer 27:23 29:25 31:6 49:22	arrangements 10:9 10:10,12	B
	adequacy 10:10	answers 48:2	article 33:11	baby 26:13
	adjourned 54:23	anticipate 16:10 41:21 52:18	aside 35:13,23 36:4	back 9:25 16:9 40:12 43:15
	admitted 17:24	anticipated 4:23 12:22 50:6	asked 27:8 28:1 33:2 34:5 40:19	based 31:12,16
	adopt 31:11	anticipating 51:20	asking 27:17 35:21	basis 19:5 29:19 31:13 43:2 45:13 51:15
	adopted 31:10	Apart 54:13	aspect 36:6 39:4	bear 52:2
	Adrian 5:18 49:5,9	apostolic 9:7 17:4 21:7	aspects 36:11	bearing 19:22
	advance 7:8 15:6 18:18 19:12 54:12	apparent 45:11	assist 15:22 19:21 38:15 41:25 45:19 48:11 49:20 53:7	benefits 11:4
	adviser 16:25	apparently 47:18	assistance 51:13	beginning 25:2
	affect 22:18 44:6	appear 3:6 25:20 35:19	assistant 33:12	behalf 1:9 4:9 25:20,21 28:14 29:4,10,17 30:6 45:23 48:23 53:23
	affiliated 1:22 3:11	appears 35:13	assisted 3:7 29:23 52:10	behaving 23:12
	after-school 26:13		assisting 52:16	behaviour 47:22,24
	age 13:20 38:16		assists 11:2 42:5	beliefs 47:18,21,22
	agenda 4:10		associated 11:14	
	ago 23:14 27:25 28:11 32:17			

believe 43:13	19:17	31:10,17,24 32:4	31:17 32:7,11,14	54:5
Benedict 47:19		32:5,10,18,25	32:19,21 33:8,9	clearly 21:20 24:24
Benedict's 3:6,17	C	34:18,23 39:24	33:21 34:9,12,14	28:6 29:12 39:13
3:24 7:22 8:3,5,14	C18 5:16 45:23	44:3,11,15 46:17	34:16 40:6 44:16	48:5 53:11
9:22 10:19,22	Cade 5:14 25:15	47:19 51:25 52:15	48:23 49:5,9	Cleugh 17:2
11:8 12:2,8 13:12	call 46:4 47:16	53:4	children 8:4 10:12	client 21:10
14:19 15:14 16:4	called 6:25 14:9	caution 9:16	12:10 22:16,19	clients 20:14 28:12
20:22 21:1,3,22	19:2 36:13 39:19	cautiously 47:14	26:10,15,20 31:25	close 47:12
Benedict's' 1:24,25	calling 47:13	central 33:19	33:15 34:3 38:7	closed 27:17
Benedictine 1:17	campaign 21:9	certain 43:9	39:8 40:5 47:12	closely 11:14 12:11
2:5,12 3:9 5:10,22	campaigner 21:13	certainly 21:24	chose 30:22 47:2	closing 52:7
6:16 7:20 8:8	Canon 32:16 33:3	41:4 48:7 50:13	chosen 22:11 34:22	cogent 39:5
12:3 16:2 27:7,10	capable 32:6	chair 1:3,4,5 3:2	Christmas 36:1	colleagues 43:7
27:11 53:5	Cardinal 33:17	7:25 13:14 18:6	Christopher 17:2,3	45:20
Benedictines 27:25	care 17:11,12 26:16	19:9,23 20:2,4	52:25	Collins 5:16 42:22
28:8	26:19 30:9 40:17	22:5,14 24:5,20	church 1:15 3:4	42:24,25 45:21
best 13:7 18:25	carefully 2:6 26:4	25:6,11,18 35:1,3	4:21 7:2,19 8:9,14	55:14
35:15 45:12	41:24,25 54:19	35:7 41:13 45:21	9:19 12:5 22:12	combination 13:4
betray 33:5	Carlile 9:6 18:4,7	45:25 46:6 48:13	22:16,22,24 23:3	combined 10:24
better 51:15	21:5	48:14,22 49:2	23:12,18 25:24	21:25
beyond 9:22 22:10	carried 9:5,6 18:4	50:20 53:21 54:12	26:11,12,17 27:1	come 9:25 16:9
big 26:17 30:14	47:17	54:16 55:4	28:22,22 29:7,14	25:2 35:14,24
Birmingham 1:18	carry 48:21 49:21	Chairman 50:23	29:20 30:3,11,25	comes 44:16,17,24
29:2 33:18 49:15	case 1:16,19 2:6	challenges 44:14,19	31:1,3,10,17,24	coming 39:7 48:14
49:17 53:6	3:10 4:21 5:1,4	challenging 45:12	32:4,5,10,25	53:13
Bishop 9:8 17:3	6:17,19 7:5,21	chance 31:18	33:20 34:18,23	commencing 54:9
bishops' 32:19	8:23 9:16 11:18	change 34:18,19	39:24 44:3,11	commend 43:11
bits 23:4,5	12:1,3,5 15:12,16	changing 34:19	47:19 51:25 52:5	comment 23:3
bodies 8:20	20:18,24 22:11	chaplain 24:14	52:15 53:4	comments 20:9
body 17:11 30:4	30:22,24 31:2	Chapman 5:17	ciphered 14:12	Commission 9:2
32:19 37:9	34:17,21 41:4	45:22,24,25 48:13	ciphering 14:14	16:23 17:11 21:6
born 3:19	42:16 44:13,13,17	55:16	ciphers 15:1	23:8,15 27:18,22
borne 45:1 52:6	47:16 53:13	charitable 46:23	circulate 19:4	28:1 40:16 43:12
Brabners 4:8 5:19	cases 10:7 11:4	Charities 21:6 23:8	circulated 4:4,10	46:3,8,12,25 47:2
break 2:14,15	14:8	46:3	7:1 41:20	47:4,8
48:19	Catholic 1:15 3:4	Charity 9:2 16:23	cited 33:3	Commission's
brief 13:21 20:6	4:21 6:1 7:2,19	17:22 27:18,22	civil 34:6,7 51:4	17:22 54:1
briefly 4:17 10:20	8:8,14 9:13,19	28:1 46:8,12,25	claim 51:7	commissioned 21:4
bring 43:9	12:5 22:12,16,22	47:2,4,8 54:1	claimants 51:7	Commissioner 6:10
brings 44:14,18	22:24 23:3,12,15	Chichester 22:3	claiming 38:15	commitment 28:10
53:22	23:18 25:24 26:11	child 1:6 5:18 7:18	claims 51:4,11,16	commitments 30:5
broad 12:20	26:16 27:1 28:22	8:2,10,13 12:13	clarify 25:7 42:5	30:13
broader 30:18	28:22 29:6,7,12	13:1,11,17 23:4	clarity 53:17	Community 5:24
broadest 44:3	29:14,18,20,22	28:25 30:7,13	clear 8:24 22:20,23	comparable 21:2
broadly 16:10	30:3,11,25 31:1,3	31:8,11,12,14,15	24:6 29:18 32:15	comparatively 9:15

38:3	2:6,13 3:10 5:22	continue 32:2	49:10,11,19 50:9	36:10 37:18
compare 21:1	6:16 7:20 8:8	47:11 51:12	51:19 52:14 53:25	death 34:1
compel 26:24 29:12	12:4 16:3 27:7,10	continued 24:13	54:6,13,20	decades 37:23
compensation	27:12 53:5	Contrary 20:20	cover 11:24	December 1:20
27:19 28:2 51:1	connection 2:10	contribution 43:22	coverage 18:25	3:13,21,22 4:22
complainant 14:9	4:24	43:23 45:8	CPS 36:13,14	15:9 21:21 23:2,7
complainant/vict...	connections 38:17	contributions	created 41:1	27:2 36:23 37:4
13:21	conscious 14:22	43:10	criminal 3:18 11:2	39:21
complainants 5:9	18:14 51:19	conversation 42:6	37:24	decide 35:21 38:5
13:3,9 14:15	consequence 46:24	convicted 3:21	critical 10:11	decided 2:7 23:8
15:21	consequent 18:17	10:23 46:4 47:13	criticised 47:1	37:24
complete 15:5 18:2	consider 2:12 7:25	47:17 48:1	Crown 17:7,15	deciding 25:12
37:25 40:23	9:9 10:3,15,25	convictions 11:2	41:17	decision 27:20
completed 15:9	11:9 13:6 17:18	20:22	crucial 15:24	decisions 2:18
completely 20:16	18:3 19:13 21:24	COPCA 49:11	CSAS 49:10	54:20
35:25 39:6	23:25 25:12,13	core 4:4,12,18,19	culturally 28:23	deemed 40:17
compliance 40:15	33:6 35:22 48:19	4:23 5:3 7:1,13	32:9	delegating 39:25
complicated 15:2	54:18	13:23 14:7,22,24	culture 8:7	deliberate 38:9
concept 43:4	considerable 43:6	15:15,21 16:9	Cumberlege 31:20	deliberately 37:25
concern 20:13	consideration 8:6	19:8,11,16,19	current 52:20	40:2
23:17 33:10 43:18	9:1,10,23 10:7	21:11 25:23 29:4	currently 10:5 50:2	demands 12:7
43:20 44:8	13:2 16:22 17:8	29:10,18 43:11,17	50:4	demonstrated
concerned 36:7	38:24 39:2	43:17 44:1,9,21	custodial 34:4,14	31:24
concerns 14:6,11	considerations	45:2,6 47:5 52:3		demonstration
52:2	24:16	53:11,23 54:19	D	31:3
conclude 16:14	considered 2:6,17	coroner 33:25	D 55:1	department 8:21
concluded 2:16	4:3 6:17 7:4 9:21	coroner's 33:24	date 19:6 54:10	9:4 16:17 21:9
conclusion 3:18	13:23 26:4 36:2	correction 53:25	dates 54:7	34:11 41:18 42:11
11:10	41:24	correspondence	day 25:4	derogation 40:3,23
conclusions 22:17	considering 9:25	21:8	days 3:25 10:18	described 23:1
52:12	21:12 25:10 32:24	Council 6:1 29:6,12	12:7,9 20:16,19	description 13:21
conduct 1:25 36:20	44:25	29:18,22	34:25 35:8,10,13	designated 4:24
36:24 37:12	considers 5:3	counsel 2:21 3:6	35:19,21,23 48:7	despite 27:24
conducted 9:7 17:5	constrained 43:19	4:2 16:5 18:13	48:8 54:11	destruction 38:14
42:15	consuming 15:3	25:20 26:3 29:2	DCI 38:20	detail 13:15,23
confession 33:9	contact 37:22 41:9	29:16,22 30:21	deal 4:17 7:14	50:10 51:14 52:11
confessional 32:14	51:9	41:8 46:6	16:18 19:13,19	detailed 9:22 49:24
32:22 33:16,21	contacted 40:10	country 22:17	23:4 35:7,20,24	details 14:15 51:6,7
52:4	41:7 42:7	26:12 32:23 50:5	36:8 45:10 53:24	determine 10:6
confessor 33:5	contained 13:25	couple 23:14 36:8	dealing 15:19 30:8	determined 2:4
confidential 51:15	content 19:23	course 8:6 9:24	30:10 36:9 43:4	7:21
confine 43:1	41:23 46:1 48:21	11:22 15:23 16:21	43:25 51:16	develop 27:1
confirm 37:17	context 7:23 11:21	25:8,12 27:5	deals 23:3	developing 28:24
confirmed 54:13	12:15 13:2 15:25	35:17 39:10 42:3	dealt 20:7 21:2	developments
Congregation 1:17	32:22 33:24	42:18,20 43:5,12	25:1 33:22 35:11	52:23 53:2

develops 50:15	Donmall 3:8	effected 18:17	everybody 34:16	F
DfE 40:19 42:7	doubt 25:11 29:8	effective 14:4 32:10	evidence 2:8,10	F1 25:21
diary 24:1 36:5	51:22 52:1 54:12	effectively 10:13	3:12,16 6:24 7:21	F12 25:22
difficulties 23:21	Downside 1:21 2:8	23:9	8:23,25 9:25	F13 5:12 25:16,20
diocese 16:24 22:3	3:11 4:22 6:18,20	eight 33:13	11:24 12:15,24	28:15
31:11	10:24 21:25 37:15	Eileen 5:18 49:5,10	13:5,5,8 14:9	F44 25:22
direct 46:24	46:12 51:21 52:8	50:4	16:15,21 18:21	F48 25:22 29:5
directed 34:11	drafted 41:25	either 39:16	19:3 24:2,24 32:3	F49 25:22 29:5
directions 34:7	drafting 16:6	Elliot 5:24 6:3	32:6 37:15,17	F53 25:22 29:5
directly 7:14 26:10	draw 38:17	emergency 21:6	38:14,20 39:20	F80 24:9
26:16	driving 25:9	enable 38:4	41:3 42:12 46:4	face 46:17
disciplinary 8:19	Drusilla 1:8	enables 11:2	47:10,16 48:9	facie 41:4
disclose 33:21 34:8	due 16:21 35:17	endorse 26:6	50:9 52:11,18	facing 44:16
34:12	37:25 38:16 42:3	enforcing 28:24	54:2	fact 11:1,10 18:21
disclosed 15:15	49:19 52:14 54:13	engage 32:10	examine 13:14	22:2 23:8,22 32:8
17:9 33:15	54:20	England 22:12	examined 1:21	factor 25:9
disclosing 33:9	duly 4:6	29:14,21 31:1	21:20	factually 51:3
disclosure 4:14 5:2	duration 4:12 7:10	English 1:17 2:5,12	examining 1:24	failed 31:20 37:22
6:19 13:24 14:7	10:17 11:20	3:9 5:22 6:16	example 31:9,9	37:25 38:8 40:4
14:17,23 15:5,5,8	E	7:20 8:8 12:3	33:24 34:3,23	40:11,13
15:9,12 17:16,18	E 55:1	16:2 27:7,9,11,25	exercise 43:14	failing 40:21
18:2,17 24:23	Ealing 1:24,25 2:10	28:8 53:5	exhaustive 9:20	failings 8:11 21:19
29:23 35:11 38:13	3:5,16,19,23 5:25	enquiries 36:10	16:13,14	39:22
41:3 49:8,15	7:22 8:3,5,14 9:14	39:1 41:5,10	existential 46:18	failures 8:4
disconnect 22:23	9:22 10:5,19,22	Enright 5:13 16:19	existing 45:11	fairly 20:6
discover 42:19	11:8,14 12:1,8	25:15,17,18 30:20	expansion 24:17	fairness 45:4
discovered 46:16	13:12 14:19 15:13	35:3 39:5,13,17	experience 45:13	fall 10:14 24:16
discuss 42:20	16:4,16 17:4 18:7	55:10	45:17	falsely 38:14
discussed 30:21	18:8 21:1,3,22	Enright's 50:25	experiences 5:5	familiar 1:12 44:19
discussion 4:11	22:9,10 24:10,13	enshrined 46:22	15:23	far 15:6 26:24 32:5
19:5 36:3 40:7	30:17 31:2,25	ensure 18:16 22:8	experiencing 37:8	35:19 36:6,10
discussions 44:23	34:22,22,24 46:10	49:23 50:17	expert 31:7	39:1,14 43:3 44:1
disregards 23:5	46:15 47:16 53:1	entire 22:3 39:25	experts 30:7 31:14	50:16
dissimilar 22:2	53:14,19	entirely 34:15	explain 7:5 40:10	fast 34:4
distant 51:22	earlier 12:18 37:10	entirety 22:4 29:20	explored 46:13	fear 33:10
Dixey 6:11	41:20	entries 13:22 36:5	exposure 8:10	February 1:23 3:25
doctrinally 28:23	early 9:15 12:18,19	equally 52:5 53:2,5	extended 23:24	3:25 4:13 6:24
32:9	24:23	escaped 18:5	extending 9:12,21	7:11 10:16 12:8
document 24:23	EBC 22:11 52:25	establishment 38:5	extends 16:20	12:18,21 46:2
documentary 14:18	education 6:12	estimate 45:11,12	extension 11:17	50:3,6,13
doing 22:24 33:2	8:21 9:4 16:18,20	45:15	extensive 21:8	felt 7:7
35:15	21:9 22:15 26:19	Evans 1:8	extent 8:2,4,6,11,12	fetter 44:23
Dom 9:8 27:4,6,13	30:9 41:18	evasive 40:2	13:11 38:2 39:21	finalised 35:12
domain 44:12	effect 6:20	event 35:23 36:5	external 21:23 22:1	finally 8:19 24:20
domestic 32:16		Everitt 6:12	eye 38:24	45:10 47:24

financial 46:24
find 23:5
finding 36:20 37:12
firm 43:18 52:12
first 1:20 3:4 4:18
 7:16 15:7,19
 19:23 29:1 38:6
 43:4 46:2 50:5
Firstly 16:16 50:25
five 3:25 10:18 12:7
 20:16,19 34:25
 35:10,13,19 48:7
 48:8 54:11
five-day 12:14
flagged 49:23 50:6
flout 33:1
focus 7:16 9:21
 11:3,17 12:22
 14:5 15:25 26:23
 43:9 44:18 46:10
focused 15:13
 30:18
focusing 43:8
follow 7:12
followed 12:9,12
following 5:4 14:21
 23:24 29:3 36:18
 41:15
follows 23:22
forbidden 33:4
forced 34:20
foremost 15:23
forgive 37:4 42:10
 54:2
form 25:22 49:6
former 3:19 16:2
 17:1 27:6
forms 3:9
Fort 27:14,17,19
 28:2,16 51:2,10
forthcoming 14:21
 48:4
forum 51:8,17
forward 30:4 32:2
 50:15 52:16

found 33:13
four 12:9 43:1
 45:20
Frank 1:8 25:19
friend 20:7 30:15
front 37:3
fulfil 36:19
full 29:13 42:2 45:9
 51:5
fully 22:8 26:6
 44:22 45:3 46:13
fund 27:10
fundamental 7:11
further 14:20 16:6
 16:9 19:3,6 24:1
 24:21,25 31:7
 35:23 41:3 45:20
 48:11 49:7 50:18
 51:13 54:8,14,17
future 22:19 43:8
 43:19,24 51:22
 52:23

G

G1 5:15 42:22
G2 5:14 35:5
G3 5:15 42:22
G6 5:15 42:23
Gallafent 5:23 6:3
 6:8,21 50:21,22
 50:23 53:21 55:20
Gallagher 6:1
general 11:22
 15:11 47:8 52:14
generally 9:18
 11:20 13:13 21:20
generate 43:8
getting 2:3 43:15
gifted 27:16
girl's 9:14
Girls 11:16
girls' 24:14
give 12:20 13:2,5
 16:23 18:21 19:2
 28:7 30:5,13 32:3

39:20 46:4 53:18
 54:11
given 5:5 12:22
 15:11 18:25 22:21
 28:11 31:18 33:24
 38:20 39:21 48:6
giving 13:7
go 2:24 22:10 31:21
 31:21 32:13 34:11
 35:18 36:6 39:14
 39:16 42:8 51:6
 51:12
going 10:20 12:6
 22:18,25 23:25
 24:24 42:7,8,9,9
 42:11 45:8,12,14
 45:16 48:7 49:20
good 1:4 18:17
 25:18 28:17 35:7
 42:25 49:2 50:23
goodwill 31:13,16
Gordon 4:7 5:11,21
 9:12 10:17,21
 11:6
governance 8:17
government 26:19
governor 24:14
 34:15
granted 4:19 21:11
 29:18 47:6
grateful 27:4
great 45:10
greater 21:24
Greenwood 5:18
 45:22
groups 26:13,13
guidance 32:20
guide 8:22
guilt 17:25

H

handling 37:13
happened 28:4
 36:25 51:1
happening 22:21

23:13,16
happy 42:20 51:14
 52:13
haven 47:11
Haworth 5:25
headmaster 17:1
headmistress 17:20
hear 1:23 3:16
 19:15 20:17 23:20
 52:24
heard 2:8,10 3:13
 8:23 12:16 23:2
 24:1 26:24 31:8
 35:18 36:6 43:3
 45:10,14,17 47:10
 52:21
hearing 1:10 2:1,2
 2:15,19,19 3:3,5,9
 3:14,23 4:10,13
 4:14,22,25 6:23
 7:8,10,11,12,22
 8:24 10:15,19
 11:1,3,11 12:7,10
 12:12,14,16,17,21
 12:23 13:23 15:6
 16:8 18:9,18,21
 19:1,4,7,10 20:13
 20:18 21:21 23:7
 23:21,22,23 24:3
 24:22,25 25:3,10
 26:8 29:9 30:16
 30:20 35:10 36:1
 36:18 37:18 42:21
 44:6 46:1,14,16
 48:4 49:4 50:2
 52:8,14,25 53:16
 53:19 54:6,9,23
hearing's 9:21
hearings 1:20 14:3
 21:2 45:14
held 3:15
help 27:12 43:6,7,8
helpful 14:5 53:9
Henke 18:10
high 42:8

higher 42:17
highlighted 28:6
 31:5
hold 27:15
Holy 17:7
Home 34:7,10
honestly 30:11
hope 14:10 42:5,6
 52:6,25
hopefully 20:5
 28:17 49:23
hostile 21:15
Howe 4:7 5:13 10:2
 10:18 11:7 16:19
 22:14 51:3
Hugh 4:7 5:15
hundreds 22:18

I

idea 43:4
identification 19:2
identified 4:11 7:3
 10:8 19:7 40:8
 49:9
identify 5:7 9:17
 18:22,22 42:16
 49:7
identifying 16:6
identities 13:9
IICSA 6:2 29:6
Imagine 34:6,10,14
immediate 46:24
immediately 12:9
 23:23,24 39:19
immense 33:23
implement 10:9
implemented 8:15
 32:23
implementing
 28:24 32:7 39:25
implicit 45:4
importance 15:24
 22:5,20
important 22:7
 30:2 46:11 47:7

54:4	inquiry 1:6,7,9,11 2:11,21 3:4,7,15 5:3 10:3 11:5,21 11:23 12:6,16,22 13:6 14:17 15:20 15:25 16:5 17:6 18:13,14 21:12 22:9 24:8 25:21 26:24 28:9,11 29:16,17,23 30:2 30:21 31:8 32:17 33:25 34:1 35:22 36:2,9,18 37:11 37:16 39:7,9,20 40:14,14 41:9 44:4 45:6 46:10 46:20 49:14 50:10 50:14 54:8	interaction 21:8 interactions 9:3 interest 5:1,4 6:18 15:15 47:7 interested 44:2 interests 7:5 interfere 38:19 interim 1:11,13 26:25 28:21 39:6 39:10,12 43:5,13 51:19,24 interminably 28:13 intervene 23:8 intervened 37:10 introductions 19:18 invaluable 43:14 48:2 investigate 34:24 36:20 38:1,2 46:12 investigation 1:15 1:17 4:20,24 7:3 7:17,20 8:9,18 9:13,19 25:25 26:3 29:2,7 30:19 30:25 33:18 34:4 37:10,20 40:18 51:25 investigations 12:6 36:25 37:8 38:12 38:14 inviolable 33:4 invite 2:21 36:4 invited 4:5 7:4 inviting 15:21 involved 7:2 17:3 involvement 5:6 16:3 22:15 involves 43:16 involving 37:7 Ireland 32:19 ISI 8:21 21:7,19 40:17 issue 2:7 18:25	20:12,21 24:15,18 26:9,17,21,25 30:21 33:8,19,23 33:25 35:7 50:12 issued 28:21 32:20 34:7 issues 4:11 9:10,20 11:25 20:7 21:14 21:17,23 22:8,10 23:11,18 24:25 25:2,8,13 26:23 35:14,19,24 36:3 36:8 40:7 43:9 44:5,18,24 52:4,9 52:16 53:12 54:18 Ivor 1:8	Kemp 5:24 6:3 kept 8:25 17:21 38:25 Khan 4:8 5:14,15 14:10 17:10 35:4 35:6,7 41:13 42:4 42:6,21 55:12 Khan's 42:14 King 5:20 48:23 49:1,2 55:18 Kingdom 12:11 Kingsley 6:2 knew 37:23 38:18 know 1:16 14:3,6 21:11 23:7 25:21 38:23 42:7 44:20 47:9
imprisonment 3:23 Imran 4:8 5:14 inaction 41:10,11 inadequate 38:7 40:19 incapable 28:23 30:4 34:19 Incidentally 37:11 include 8:6 9:1 including 1:14 8:17 8:20 25:13 31:24 32:13 38:8 inclusive 4:1 inconvenient 23:6 incorrect 51:3 independent 1:5 6:3 9:2 16:17 18:5 34:15 40:23 40:25 41:18 indicate 19:21 indicated 16:7 18:10 41:16 48:16 indicating 6:23 indication 12:20 46:7 53:10 indicative 20:23 indirectly 26:11,16 individual 5:5 10:6 11:4 13:7,15 14:5 19:16 51:16 individuals 8:3 19:2 42:16,17 influence 38:18 inform 22:11 28:9 information 8:19 13:25 16:22 28:18 38:4 39:1 42:18 52:11 inhibit 47:22,23 inhibited 8:9 input 53:3 inquiries 9:2 21:5 21:23 22:1 38:23 39:11 46:16 54:7	inquiry's 1:14 2:18 4:2 9:10 10:6 13:19 14:13 46:6 inspecting 17:12 inspection 21:6 40:17,22,25 Inspectorate 6:4 9:3 16:17 41:19 instances 7:18 13:9 31:9 institute 27:10 institution 34:14 44:8 47:23 institutional 7:17 8:4 11:3 12:25 15:24 18:23 institutions 3:12 6:16 8:7 34:4 44:7,15 46:17,25 47:10 instructions 28:9 insufficient 10:20 20:17 37:15 intend 15:4 43:23 intended 20:6 intention 50:14 inter-related 43:16	J jail 32:13 34:12 James 4:7 5:15 Jamison 17:3 52:25 Jay 1:5 job 38:19 John 9:6,8 17:3,5 jointly 19:20 Jonathan 5:20 20:1 21:10 judge 37:24 judged 16:21 June 1:1 3:15,15 29:10 54:24 jury 37:24 justified 9:24 11:18	L lack 37:20,25 38:13 39:15 land 44:7 large 30:3,8 largest 22:16 26:18 late 25:4 latest 15:9 Laurence 3:19 law 32:16,16,16,23 33:1,3,7,20 46:22 Lawson 6:4 lead 3:6 11:10 leadership 8:18 leading 2:21 learned 20:7 30:15 learning 37:6 leave 41:6 legal 2:23 lends 11:12 length 7:9,10 20:13 24:3 26:5,7 lengthy 19:12 26:2 let's 32:2,3 level 42:9,17 liaise 50:15 liaising 15:1	
		K Karmy-Jones 2:22 2:23,25 3:1,2 20:7 21:18 24:21 25:7 30:15 35:4 36:10 38:22 41:14 42:14 45:22 48:14,23 50:21 53:22 54:16 55:6 keen 53:12 Keenan 33:12 keep 17:15 38:8		

liaison 49:14
lights 30:14
limited 53:13
line 25:15 34:9 35:4
 42:22
linked 12:13
list 7:1,3 16:7,12,13
 16:14 19:5 35:10
 35:12 41:19
listed 3:25 37:19
 50:2
lists 35:11
little 11:12 40:22
live 13:4,5 18:21
loath 45:13
London 5:10
long 48:18
longer 11:1,11
look 20:25 21:17,18
 22:7 36:5 52:15
looked 20:25
looking 27:22 29:1
 34:13 35:18
looks 22:9
Lord 9:6 18:4,7
 21:5
lost 45:17
lunch 2:15

M

ma'am 42:25 45:19
 47:3,13,15 48:3
madam 25:5 28:19
 30:1 31:5,23 32:9
 34:3 41:12 45:25
 46:6 49:2
main 27:1 28:19
major 23:11,11
majority 12:23
 15:12
making 16:11 24:8
 41:21
Malcolm 1:8 25:18
manage 50:16
managed 50:17

management 34:9
mandatory 32:20
 46:21
manner 33:6 37:19
March 12:12
Marie 33:12
Martin 17:1
material 12:15
 13:25 14:12,18,20
 14:25 15:2,11,14
 17:9 42:2
matter 2:1 14:23
 16:20 19:7 27:2
 38:23 41:8 46:19
 46:19,20,21 48:3
 53:17 54:6
matters 2:12 4:3,15
 7:11 11:12 13:16
 15:13 19:11 20:8
 25:12 32:13 49:7
 52:17 53:24
Matthew 3:8
McKimm 6:5
meaning 29:14
means 40:14
measures 23:10
 47:24
medical 38:16
meet 40:13,21
meetings' 34:9
Melbourne 32:12
members 1:7 3:2
 18:6 19:9 34:11
memorably 31:17
men 28:12,13
mention 16:12
mentioned 14:25
 25:7 31:7
merely 26:9
met 30:20,21
Metropolis 6:10
Metropolitan 17:7
 17:14 41:16
million 26:10,15
millions 22:19

Milners 4:8
mind 17:16 19:22
 42:15 45:1 52:2,6
minded 47:5
mindful 11:9
minds 14:5 15:23
 43:8 51:23
minimised 38:2
minimum 28:25
 32:7
minister 34:10
 39:18,19 40:10
ministerial 39:4
 42:9
ministers 16:20
 36:12 41:6
minor 38:3
minutes 48:20
missed 43:21
missing 44:9
mistake 54:3
mix 23:1 31:10
moment 10:1 11:19
 22:22 44:12
momentum 45:17
Monastic 5:24
money 27:16,18
 28:1 47:9
monk 24:10
monks 10:23 20:22
 27:12 38:3,6
monks/staff 37:14
month 29:1
months 27:25
 28:11
moral 27:15
morning 1:4 25:18
 35:7 42:25 43:3
 44:1,6 49:2 50:23
mother 26:13
mouthpiece 29:20
move 50:15
Moving 14:17

N

n 47:12 55:1
name 1:4 13:18
names 14:14
Napley 6:2
national 23:15
 26:19 32:7
nature 8:2,3 9:1,19
 14:1
nauseam 44:20
nebulous 33:10
necessarily 10:25
necessary 10:14
 13:13 19:13 38:1
 40:9 45:2
necessity 10:11
need 4:25 14:22
 18:15 19:7 20:10
 21:17,18,20 24:21
 24:24 26:4 35:18
 36:5 39:9 41:2
 44:20 53:3
needed 25:13 35:17
 39:12
needs 20:19,25
 23:19 28:21 35:22
 35:25 41:24,24
 45:15
neither 13:13
Nelson 6:1,8
never 16:13 40:19
Nichols 33:17
nine 33:13
nine-day 12:12
Nisbet 5:20
Nixon 9:6 17:5
Nolan 31:19
non-cooperation
 38:12
non-exhaustive
 16:7
norms 31:11
note 4:2 8:1 16:8
 48:14 49:3
noted 19:15
notice 18:6 54:12

notified 19:8
notify 54:19
noting 50:12
November 1:20
 3:13 4:21
number 4:18 11:8
 16:11 20:8,21
 21:10,23,23,24
 22:1,2 23:1 36:23
 48:15 51:9,11
numbers 35:8

O

o'clock 2:16
O'Donnell 5:12,21
 19:25 20:5
obligation 40:13
obligations 36:19
 40:5
observation 24:9
observations 4:5
 7:6
observe 6:6
obtained 14:18
 37:16,17
obtaining 18:24
 49:14
obviously 20:4,19
 52:24 53:2
occurring 34:23
Ockwell 6:5
October 54:10
offence 38:3
offences 37:24
offender 38:6
offending 33:14
offered 32:5
Office 34:7,10
officer's 38:19
officers 38:17
Ofsted 6:13 8:21
 21:19 40:17 41:19
Oh 31:21
old 38:16
omission 38:9

Prosecution 17:8 17:15 41:17	34:5 51:18	redress 27:10	reminder 37:19	50:7
protect 8:4 40:5	questioning 27:5	reference 23:16	reminding 36:22	research 33:10,14
protected 13:10	questions 8:17	references 38:9	37:1	reserve 18:1
protection 8:13	12:25 44:24 47:20	referred 26:2,8	remit 11:4	resident 10:5
12:10 23:4 28:25	48:1 49:22	33:11 54:1	removal 46:23	resistance 37:8
30:7,14 31:11,14	quite 45:11 48:5	reform 46:18	removed 40:20	resisted 38:11
31:16 32:8,11,19		reformulation 24:7	repeat 44:20 49:6	resolved 51:11
34:17 44:16	R	refused 31:12	replaced 18:9	respect 1:15 2:8
protocol 14:13	radical 24:7,17	regard 37:16,18	report 1:11,13	3:12,16,18,23 4:3
proved 14:4 40:1	raise 20:8 43:25	40:3 53:8	23:14 26:25 28:20	4:22 9:18 12:1,8
provide 7:7 14:22	54:11	regarding 37:14	28:21 32:21 34:1	12:10,12 13:5,11
15:5,7,10 18:11	raised 7:14 11:6	50:12	39:6,10,12,17	14:8 17:11 18:11
39:9 42:17 43:9	14:6 16:18 29:9	regards 27:14	43:5 51:19,20,23	18:13 49:4
47:11 48:2 49:24	48:6 49:16 52:3	43:17	51:24	respectfully 11:17
51:14 54:10	54:19	register 40:20	reported 13:18	respectively 4:9
provided 6:22	reach 22:18	regret 46:20	32:18 37:9	respond 38:22
13:24 47:11 48:9	reaching 52:11	regulating 17:12	reporting 8:18	41:14
providers 15:2	read 13:4 26:1 37:4	regulation 33:25	32:20 33:8 39:23	response 4:5 13:1
26:18	real 41:2	rehearse 26:5	46:21	21:15 24:11 29:3
providing 15:10	reality 23:13 28:14	relates 44:10	reports 9:3 40:17	responses 7:17 11:3
30:8 42:12 50:8	really 18:24 36:11	relating 7:5 12:25	43:13 46:19	18:23 49:24
proximity 47:12	42:12	14:19 29:5 52:22	represent 4:9 6:11	responsibilities
psychotherapist	reason 29:25 33:6	relation 2:12 3:5	19:25 44:2 51:4	8:20
33:13	35:2	8:16 12:1 20:9,25	representations 6:7	responsibility
public 3:23 4:25	reasons 38:16	24:23 26:7,25	6:13 19:11	27:15 36:12 40:4
12:10 30:3 44:12	rebut 32:4	28:10 29:23 30:13	representatives	40:24
47:7,8 51:16	recall 27:3	32:12 36:11,13,17	2:23 51:9 53:4	responsible 41:7
publicly 19:14	receive 5:2 47:4	36:24,25 37:13,21	represented 5:7,11	restricted 53:4,6
22:24 40:8	received 4:6 26:1	38:11 39:4,6,22	5:13,14,15,17,19	restrictions 38:7
published 1:11 2:4	28:5	41:14 46:1,2,3,15	5:20,21,23,25 6:2	return 11:19 17:17
2:18 46:20 51:21	receiving 38:5	47:7,13 48:5 49:8	6:4,12,14,20,22	27:2
purpose 9:16 46:8	recognise 12:19	49:14,15,17,20	7:7	reveal 32:13
put 23:9 35:9 36:25	22:5,6 27:15	50:1,8,25 51:1,4	representing 18:7,8	revealed 32:14,22
39:21 52:19	34:21	51:18,20,24 52:3	19:19 25:16 28:3	33:21 34:9
puts 39:13	recommend 47:6	52:16,19,22 53:2	28:7	review 8:25 9:4,6
putting 30:4	recommendations	53:14	represents 29:13	16:15 17:6,16,21
	8:12 9:18 10:13	relevance 23:12	35:4 43:18 46:11	18:2,5,12 42:2,15
Q	recommends 46:21	relevant 49:12,22	request 16:1 17:14	49:21
QC 2:22 5:15 6:21	reconcile 47:21	relief 44:14	17:19 18:3 40:19	reviewing 14:25
14:10 17:10 18:10	records 38:8 49:12	remain 48:15	requested 49:19	17:18
35:4	recruitment 8:18	remarks 1:3 55:3	requests 14:21	reviews 8:13 10:8
question 10:4,11	red 30:14	remember 29:8	15:10,17,19,21	11:8 21:3
16:19 24:5 27:4	redaction 13:20	32:11	16:6,8,11 17:16	revisited 45:15
27:23 30:1 31:6	14:13	remembers 50:9	20:10 41:7,22,23	48:3
	redactions 15:1,2	remind 7:24 30:16	required 11:11	Richard 9:8 16:1

right 13:10	scheduled 10:18	sense 44:3	37:6	12:2,8 13:12
rise 30:16	53:17	sent 15:20 39:18	simply 20:16,24	14:19 15:14 16:4
risk 33:22 34:1	schedules 35:12	sentenced 3:22	24:8,18 34:25	17:17,20 20:22
39:8,12 40:5 45:7	scheme 27:11	September 32:25	35:13 49:7,8,16	21:1,3,22 24:5
45:16	school 1:24 2:1,5,7	serious 20:13 23:11	49:19 50:1 51:3	47:19
road 45:1	2:8,9,11 3:6,24	26:21 37:7	52:17	staff 20:22
role 10:6 29:5	9:14,23 11:15,18	seriously 21:15	sincere 47:18	stage 9:15 12:18,19
43:16,19 51:23	16:4,17 17:2	23:19	Sir 1:7 25:18	24:23 35:9 36:4
roles 8:20	21:14 22:1 24:6	servants 34:6,7	Sitting 1:6	38:20 39:3 50:4
Roman 1:15 3:3	24:15 40:20	served 15:10	situation 23:10	50:11 52:18
4:20 7:2,19 9:18	school's 21:15	Service 17:8,15	25:2	stages 15:5
12:5 25:24 29:7	schools 1:22 3:11	41:17,17	six 4:11 27:25	standards 28:25
44:3,11 51:25	6:4 9:2 26:10,12	services 16:16	28:11	32:7 40:21,24
52:15	37:7 40:18,23,25	17:12	size 35:1	stands 34:18
room 19:22	41:18	set 1:13 7:25 9:10	skills 38:1	start 53:18
round 25:12	scintilla 32:6	16:8 19:22 20:15	Slater 4:7 5:11,21	starting 52:1
Royal 43:12	scope 4:12 7:9,10	22:14 30:14 35:13	9:12 10:17,21	state 6:11 29:12
Royan 6:11	7:16,19 8:24 9:11	35:16,23 36:4,16	11:6	36:12 39:15 40:4
rule 4:14 14:21	9:12 24:8,16,17	41:25 52:7	slightly 38:21	40:11,13,24
15:10,17,20,25	36:9	setting 4:2 13:16	small 14:16	stated 29:2
16:6,11 17:19	Scorer 5:12,22	settled 52:12	social 16:16 17:11	statement 15:17,19
18:3,15 20:10	19:25 20:3,4 25:6	severe 39:12	17:12 40:17	15:20 16:11 17:14
41:7,21,23	26:6,8 31:6 34:25	sex 13:20	solicitors 5:16,19	18:11 33:17,19
run 34:15	35:17 55:8	sexual 1:6 7:18 8:2	18:14	41:21,23 46:7
rushing 24:2	Scottish 28:3,15	8:10 10:4 12:13	soon 18:15 19:8	statement-making
	seal 33:3	13:11,17 33:15	sooner 45:16 53:16	42:1
S	second 1:23 11:6	40:6	Soper 3:20	statements 4:14
sacrament 52:4	29:9 46:3 51:18	shape 4:13 12:17	sort 33:9	18:15 29:24 50:8
sacramental 33:3	54:6	12:21 46:1	sorts 52:17	status 4:20 21:11
sacrosanct 32:15	Secretary 6:11	sharing 8:19	sought 46:7	29:19 46:23 47:5
sad 43:21	section 39:11	sharp 44:14,18	speak 2:24 12:24	statutory 37:9,22
safe 31:25	see 17:7 21:12	Sharpling 1:8	30:5,12	39:23 40:24
safeguard 10:12	22:22 26:22 34:13	25:18	special 23:9	stay 50:14
safeguarding 8:13	45:14 50:15	Shearer 5:18 31:8	specific 6:15 15:15	stepped 24:12
8:16 9:4 10:9,10	seeing 22:21	48:24 49:5,10	16:3 30:17 42:16	steps 10:8 27:9
13:1 16:25 17:6	seek 49:5	50:4	42:17	28:16 42:19,20
18:24 22:22,25	seeking 17:22	Shipperlee 17:1	specifically 3:5	stone 35:16
23:15 38:9 39:22	24:18 54:2	shoe-horning 20:18	15:7	stood 18:9
40:1 44:17 52:20	seen 11:21 23:10	short 6:22 48:6,21	spent 12:23	stopped 47:25
saying 24:18 34:8	28:20 30:22	shortcut 42:4	sphere 30:18	strand 3:7
35:17	selection 4:15	shortly 2:19 11:13	split 1:19	structural 31:5
says 22:24	15:17 18:20	significance 11:25	St 1:24,25 3:6,17	structurally 28:23
scale 26:9 33:22	seminar 32:24	significant 14:18	3:24 8:5,14 9:13	31:23 34:19
schedule 13:16,22	send 18:15	similar 49:16,19	9:22,23 10:1,19	structure 29:1 40:1
14:1 53:16 54:8	senior 34:6	similarly 32:10	10:22 11:8,15,19	52:5

<p>studies 1:16 30:22 30:24</p> <p>study 1:19 2:6 3:10 5:1,5 6:17,19 7:5 7:21 8:24 9:17 11:18 12:1,3,5 15:12,16 22:11 31:2 34:22 47:16 49:15,20 53:13</p> <p>subject 2:1 9:24 13:19 17:8,13 23:22 24:9,10 40:18</p> <p>submission 6:22 10:5 22:23 24:3 27:1 28:19 29:4 29:17 35:8 36:15 36:16 38:25 40:4 40:12</p> <p>submissions 2:17 3:1 4:3,6,16 7:4,6 7:13 10:2,20 17:10,22 19:15,17 19:20,24 20:3,16 20:20 22:15 25:5 25:17 26:2,6,8,22 28:7 29:3 30:17 30:23 32:11 35:6 36:23 37:2,3 39:13 41:12 42:14 42:23,24 43:1 44:23 45:24,25 46:8 48:9,12,17 48:18,21 49:1,4,6 50:18,22 52:7 53:23,25 54:2,4 54:17 55:6,8,10 55:12,14,16,18,20</p> <p>submit 11:17 13:13 37:11 39:24</p> <p>submitted 13:2 29:11 36:18 49:4</p> <p>subsidise 47:9</p> <p>substantial 25:23</p> <p>substantially 15:8</p>	<p>substantive 1:19</p> <p>Successive 40:16</p> <p>sufficient 2:11 5:1 11:24 35:20 38:4 39:1,8</p> <p>suggest 10:3 12:14 17:22,23 19:16 48:8</p> <p>suggested 8:1,22 17:13 19:1 52:10</p> <p>suggesting 24:7</p> <p>suggestion 18:2 50:25</p> <p>suggestions 16:10 17:10</p> <p>suggests 39:17</p> <p>suitability 30:24</p> <p>suitable 54:10</p> <p>Sunday 26:12 32:18</p> <p>support 28:4</p> <p>supported 10:17 11:7 13:7</p> <p>supports 13:25</p> <p>supposed 31:3</p> <p>sure 1:12 42:4</p> <p>survivor 25:23</p> <p>survivors 5:11 27:11,14 28:3,15 51:10</p> <p>Switalskis 4:8 5:17 54:3</p> <p>system 31:15 32:20</p> <p>systematic 40:22</p> <p>systems 31:13,16</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">T</p> <hr/> <p>take 2:14 3:17 6:15 19:10 20:10 21:14 25:10 28:8 32:2 42:18 44:10 48:19 49:18</p> <p>taken 11:12 27:9 27:20 28:10,16 38:24 39:18 42:20</p>	<p>49:17</p> <p>takes 11:23</p> <p>talked 30:23</p> <p>talking 26:14</p> <p>tampered 38:13</p> <p>task 14:16 39:25</p> <p>taxpayers' 47:9</p> <p>teachers 10:23</p> <p>tell 32:21 34:8</p> <p>telling 33:1</p> <p>tenets 47:19</p> <p>terms 7:16 15:11 18:20 22:15 23:21 24:5 35:8</p> <p>testimony 15:22</p> <p>thank 3:2 20:2,4 25:5,6 35:2,3 41:13 42:25 45:21 48:13 50:18,20 53:20,21 54:16,17 54:21</p> <p>thematic 11:24</p> <p>themes 9:17</p> <p>thing 53:8</p> <p>things 1:13 45:14</p> <p>think 14:9 24:20 35:12 39:5,11 40:9 44:21 45:1 48:20,23 53:22,25 54:4</p> <p>thinking 35:14</p> <p>third 11:15 31:18</p> <p>thorough 22:14</p> <p>thought 30:1</p> <p>thousands 22:19</p> <p>threat 46:18</p> <p>threatening 38:16</p> <p>three 13:3 14:8 20:6 22:4 43:15</p> <p>tight 22:6</p> <p>time 15:3 16:14 18:17 19:1 20:11 24:1 25:10,13 27:6 35:16 36:1,2 40:11 41:11 45:10</p>	<p>45:12,15 47:18 48:5,14 53:19</p> <p>timeframes 15:11</p> <p>timely 14:23</p> <p>Times 32:18</p> <p>timescale 25:8</p> <p>timetabled 50:4</p> <p>timing 18:13 22:6 23:21 35:8 48:5</p> <p>today 3:8 4:3,11,15 5:7,12,13,14,16 5:17,19 6:1,5,7,13 6:14 18:7 19:12 20:4,17 26:7,23 28:4,18 29:11 35:21 39:16 44:25 45:11 48:7,17 50:24 54:18</p> <p>today's 30:16</p> <p>topic 10:14 15:18 29:8</p> <p>topics 7:24 8:22,25 9:9 10:7 35:12,20 36:2 48:6</p> <p>total 3:22</p> <p>touch 50:14</p> <p>training 8:17</p> <p>tranche 15:7 44:1 44:10</p> <p>tranches 44:4</p> <p>transcript 2:20</p> <p>transferred 38:3</p> <p>trial 3:18</p> <p>troubles 38:21</p> <p>true 29:14</p> <p>trust 26:1 37:16</p> <p>trustee 24:13</p> <p>trustees 27:16</p> <p>try 50:16</p> <p>trying 21:13 42:12</p> <p>Tuesday 1:1</p> <p>turn 4:18</p> <p>turned 28:14</p> <p>Turner 16:25</p> <p>turning 7:9 12:17</p>	<p>28:19</p> <p>two 1:19 3:12 7:13 13:3 14:8 21:3,5 26:23 31:18 36:11 39:7 45:25 46:15 48:20 49:7 50:5 50:24 53:24</p> <p>type 26:14</p> <p>types 52:2</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">U</p> <hr/> <p>UCD 33:12</p> <p>unable 3:8</p> <p>unacceptable 40:6</p> <p>underling 42:11</p> <p>understand 6:6,8 12:9 18:8 27:21 30:3,7 31:15 35:17 39:6 54:9</p> <p>understanding 24:12</p> <p>understood 49:18</p> <p>undertaken 10:8</p> <p>underway 2:3</p> <p>unequivocally 29:13</p> <p>United 12:11</p> <p>unqualified 40:2</p> <p>unwelcome 45:18</p> <p>update 53:1</p> <p>urgency 19:8</p> <p>urgent 26:25 28:20</p> <p>use 27:18 28:1</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">V</p> <hr/> <p>valuable 43:10</p> <p>value 21:12</p> <p>various 44:5,18</p> <p>vast 15:12</p> <p>victim 25:23</p> <p>victims 27:19 28:2 51:2,10</p> <p>view 6:15 11:11 16:21,22 18:24</p> <p>views 13:6 17:23</p> <p>visible 45:5,6</p>
---	---	---	--	--

visitation 9:7 17:4 21:7 38:10	wider-reaching 52:14	50:13	3 55:6
vital 12:24 44:21	willing 18:11	year's 3:14	30 4:11
vitality 30:2	Wilson 44:13	years 3:22 21:10 31:19 40:7	31 4:5
volunteered 27:24	wish 2:24 6:23 19:15,24 27:2 42:4 45:9 47:14 48:19,20 54:14	Yeo 9:8 16:1 27:4,6 27:13	35 55:12
vulnerable 26:15 26:20 30:9	witness 4:14 15:17 18:20 19:5 24:24 29:24 35:11 38:15 50:8	young 28:12	<hr/> 4 <hr/>
<hr/> W <hr/>	witnesses 12:24 18:22,23 20:10 23:2 31:7	<hr/> Z <hr/>	4 3:25 8:1 50:3
wait 28:13 32:1	wonder 38:21 42:7 48:17	<hr/> 0 <hr/>	42 55:14
waive 13:10	word 29:14	<hr/> 1 <hr/>	45 55:16
Wales 22:12 29:15 29:21 31:1	words 31:22 33:5	1 2:16 26:10 55:3	49 55:18
want 20:12 23:4 24:6 47:8	work 1:14 21:13 24:14 33:11 54:8	1(b)(ii) 36:17	<hr/> 5 <hr/>
wanted 20:8 30:16	worked 47:23	10.30 1:2 54:23	5 1:1
warrants 11:1	working 18:18 53:18	11.45 2:14 48:15	50 55:20
way 14:4,5 19:22 33:5 35:9,15 37:1 38:22 39:21 41:15 43:19 53:24	world 45:7	11.55 54:22	<hr/> 6 <hr/>
website 2:18	worth 2:4,7 37:1 42:18	13 51:4	6 3:15,21 29:10 54:24
Wednesday 54:24	worthwhile 36:22	15 31:19	<hr/> 7 <hr/>
week 54:9,10	Wright 9:5 17:5 21:4	15-minute 2:14	<hr/> 8 <hr/>
weeks 22:4 23:14 23:24 32:17 50:5	writing 26:7 48:10 51:22	16 40:7	8 3:25
welcome 1:3,9 46:6 51:13 52:15 53:15 55:3	written 7:6 20:15 26:22 28:7 43:1 49:4,6	18 3:22 4:4 8:1	84 10:2
welcomed 49:13	wrong 31:21 51:6	19 5:16 37:2 45:23	87A 10:3
went 29:22	wrote 32:17	<hr/> 2 <hr/>	<hr/> 9 <hr/>
West 5:10,20 20:1 21:10	<hr/> X <hr/>	2 26:15	9 4:14 14:21 15:10 15:17,20,25 16:6 16:11 17:19 18:3 18:15 20:10 29:1 41:7,21,23
Westminster 12:13 16:24	X 55:1	20 55:8	
whilst 43:25 51:22	<hr/> Y <hr/>	2000 37:15	
whim 34:17	year 1:21 3:14,21 6:24 13:17,18 24:22 27:3 30:1 36:23 37:15 50:2	2002 40:22	
White 38:20		2002/2003 41:1	
wholly 10:19		2004 17:12	
widely 8:9,15 22:13 40:8		2009 9:5 17:5,13	
wider 4:20,24 12:3 12:5 20:24 23:11 25:24 30:18 45:7 53:3,12		2011 9:7,8 18:4	
		2017 29:10	
		2018 1:1 2:4 15:8 54:24	
		2018/19 1:14	
		2019 1:23 3:25 50:6	
		21 2:4 3:22	
		24.3 39:11	
		25 55:10	
		28 33:25	
		29 54:10	
		<hr/> 3 <hr/>	