I, Lord Carey of Clifton, will say as follows:

1. In this witness statement, I address matters which were not covered fully in my first and second witness statements, dated 9 and 28 February 2018 respectively, and will include answers to the further questions asked of me in the Inquiry's letter dated 19 March 2018.

2. References in this statement to my second statement are given as "WWS000143: paragraph number". References to the Gibb Review report are given as "INQ000560:paragraph number".

Culture and practices in dealing with safeguarding

3. I have been asked about how the "culture and practices of the Church have changed in dealing with safeguarding since [I] ceased being Archbishop of Canterbury". To a large extent, I believe my answer is implicit in paragraphs 20-22 of my second witness statement (WWS000143), in that I have little knowledge of today's policies and procedures. However, I do sense that, in terms of hearing from victims and complainants, and focusing on their experiences and current
needs, the culture of the Church has been transformed in recent years. Although I felt that the pendulum had swung too far in the opposite direction in relation to Bishop George Bell, I very much accept that I was too far removed from the voices of survivors when I was Archbishop, and, while sympathetic, I lacked a full enough understanding of the impact of abuse on their lives.

4. The major change has been the amount of resources, in terms of time, money and personnel that are dedicated to safeguarding. When I left office, one part-time safeguarding adviser based at Church House had recently started in that post, serving the central church bodies. Dioceses were also appointing mostly part-time safeguarding advisers. There are now many more staff working in teams on a full-time basis. There is also now training for everyone in ministry, be they lay or ordained.

5. Not having been offered this previously, I recently decided to ask the Diocese of Oxford, where I have a PTO, for training. It is important for all clergy with licences or PTO, including those of us who are long retired and are not working with children or vulnerable people, to have access to this training, in order to inform our vigilance as well as improving our ability to respond appropriately to any adult survivors whom we may encounter in the course of our continuing (albeit limited) ministry. I was delighted to be among fifteen other retired clergy on my recent (C3) course, and to learn that all retired clergy now have to go on a course every three years. I found that safeguarding has a much higher profile in the church than it had even a few years ago.

Clergy Discipline

6. I have been asked about my involvement in clergy discipline cases. The Clergy Discipline Measure 2003 came into effect in 2006. I retired as Archbishop in 2002. I can only recall dealing with one case under the previous regime of the 1963 Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction Measure, though there may have been others. This was about a clergyman who had been sent to prison for financial dishonesty. It used to be the case that clergy were "defrocked" if they went to prison. That meant there could be no doubt or argument about whether they could be allowed back into ministry. I do not remember any case relating to sexual abuse. We did use
the Caution List, but this was seen more as a means of getting people back into ministry after a period of discipline, than as a form of discipline.

The Ball Brothers

7. I have been asked about whether my correspondence with the Ball brothers was anything out of the ordinary. Looking back, it is clear that there was a great deal of correspondence over the years with the Ball brothers. It may seem like a huge volume but I was dealing with an enormous amount of correspondence and, at the time, this felt like an occasional matter that would arise every few months or so in an extremely busy life, though there were patches of intense and persistent pressure from the Ball brothers. As Archbishop, my primary pastoral relationship was with the bishops. It was my job to pastor them, just as it was a bishop’s job to pastor the clergy, and the clergy the laity. This pastoral relationship was extremely important. I took great pains to assist and support bishops in trouble — these included very poor bishops in other parts of the Anglican Communion but also bishops in the province of Canterbury for whom I had more direct responsibility.

8. In that context, I invited Peter Ball to stay at Lambeth on a couple of occasions because Eileen, my wife, and I always had a ministry of hospitality. I do not recall Michael coming with him or to stay separately. Our regular guests at Lambeth would include clergy and bishops. We occasionally hosted people, including bishops, who were undergoing forms of crisis in their ministry. We visited the Ball brothers in Cornwall in May 1993, primarily because I had heard that Peter was very ill from his psychiatrist[Redacted]. My former chaplain, Graham James, had also moved down to Cornwall to become Bishop of St Germans and we wanted to visit him and his wife at the same time.

9. The Ball brothers spoke of impersonating each other as a practical joke, but I never heard of them taking each other’s places in a pastoral or official ministry. This would have been a complete breach of trust.

Return to ministry and advice received on this

10. Peter Ball was permitted to return to ministry on a gradual basis and was supervised firstly in the parishes and under the authority of the parish priest in which he had his primary ministry. This was made explicit in his permissions to
officiate ACE003298_149 and ACE003298_147. Until 2016, I had forgotten even
that I had granted Ball any permission to officiate. When I saw this document
again, I understood it as referring to the Diocese of Truro and Province of
Canterbury only in the sense of describing the location of the two parishes to which
it was limited, like an address: they were situated in the Diocese of Truro, in the
Province of Canterbury. I understand that some commentators have explained this
document as being a special kind of PTO, a "Provincial PTO" granting the recipient
permission to officiate throughout the Province of Canterbury, as might be given to
a visiting priest from overseas and I note that Bishop Sargeant stated to Moira
Gibb that "the Archbishop's Permission to Officiate" was "considered to be the
most limited authority in ministry" (INQ000625). The contemporaneous
correspondence demonstrates that the PTO was in no sense seen as a broad
permission when it was granted, but rather, was limited to the two parishes in
Cornwall to which it referred. It was "Provincial" only in the sense that it was
granted by me, as Archbishop of the Province of Canterbury, rather than by the
Bishop of the Diocese of Truro, as would normally have been the case. Although I
remember little of this, there are clues as to the reasons for this in some of the
documents to which I shall refer below.

11. I have been reminded that, in a letter to Bishop Bentley in August 2000
(INQ000311_21), I referred to Ball as having "my Provincial authority to exercise
non-episcopal ministries", and I cannot explain this. As Professor Mellows has
noted (ACE001425_14) even though the three year permission granted in
September 1995 had by then expired (and I appear to have forgotten my verbal
statement to the House of Bishops at their meeting in January 1997, as to which
see below). However, Ball's permissions from March 1995 and from September
1995, despite being "Provincial" in the sense of coming from me, were strictly
limited, and by reference to the correspondence, the Inquiry will see how this came
about.

12. This may be a convenient point at which to address an implicit criticism in the Gibb
Review report (INQ000560: 4.4.8-4.4.9) to the effect that I might not have followed
the advice of my Chaplain, Colin Fletcher, in June 1994. It is true that I was not
without advice about the sort of media attention which might follow a grant of PTO,
and I have not suggested that I was. However, it is not the case that I ignored
advice. Rather, there was a prolonged consultation between me and my senior
colleagues, John Yates, Colin Fletcher, Andrew Purkis and, at times involving Lesley Perry, about how best to respond to the repeated requests we had been receiving at Lambeth, not only from the Ball brothers, but also from other supporters, that Peter Ball be allowed to resume ministry. The passage from Dame Moira's report does not acknowledge that this was the context of the passage which she quotes from my Chaplain's advice. As mentioned in my second witness statement (WWS000143), I resisted these calls, not allowing Ball back into ministry for two years, and in doing so, I was acting on the advice of these colleagues. It can be seen that in June 1993 (WWS000172), when Lesley Perry warned me in her memo of 2 June 1993 of the "widespread public relations ramifications if Peter takes on any form of ministry for some time", I responded with a note to my secretary, Eleanor (WWS000193), "I'm sure I should have some time with AP//Lesley+/John re: this. Is Friday possible?" Following Ball's visit to Lambeth in September 1993, my letter to him of 13 September 1993 (ACE003298_177) was carefully correcting his interpretation of what I had said:

"We did not discuss that you should be licensed in the diocese of Truro in the New Year! It is important that we take one step at a time, and I am most anxious – as are Lesley Perry and Andrew Purkis – that you should be protected from the intrusions of the press."

13. Inevitably, as these were my press and public affairs advisers, their advice was generally couched in terms of adverse press attention or public comment, and these were genuine concerns, but they were also more palatable reasons for me to use in my correspondence with the Ball brothers in order to explain my resistance to a swifter return to ministry. These reasons avoided my having to make judgements on what Ball had or had not done, when I simply did not know enough about it, and when all my Christian instincts pointed towards forgiveness and reconciliation for the person with whom I was dealing. As I have already admitted, the person I was relating to was Ball and not his victims, and the consequences of that I greatly regret.

14. On 28 September 1993, I asked Bishop John Yates (WWS000185) to look over my draft letter to Michael Ball – "...could you help me to make it 'clear', 'kind' but 'tough'!!! I am fed up with the Ball brothers' inability to take no for an answer!" I have seen a draft of this date, amended in Bishop Yates' handwriting
(WWS000183), and the final version of the letter (ACE003298_175-176) reminds Michael Ball that if his brother were allowed back into ministry so soon, "Voices would quickly be raised from within the Church also, maintaining that less rigorous standards apply to bishops than those applicable to ordinary clergy." I do not believe that I did in fact treat Peter Ball more leniently because of the fact that he had been a bishop, and not a parish priest, and so was in some sense more worthy of consideration. That would not have been my attitude at all. However, what was in my thinking was the extent to which Ball had suffered public humiliation on having to resign as Bishop of Gloucester, in a way that would not have happened to a parish priest. That perception, that Ball had been punished enough already, our lack of information from the police about the true extent and nature of the offending, and the very real practical and legal difficulties over invoking the EJM, had been the key factors in my decision not to commence formal ecclesiastical discipline. In that sense, the punishment he had already suffered arose from his status as a bishop and well-known public figure: his fall was greater than that of someone who might have resigned quietly and changed profession. I was aware, however, that my treatment of Peter Ball was open to misinterpretation and it was a point that I made to Michael Ball on more than one occasion.

15. I have previously referred (WWS000143:80) to the Provincial Registrar's advice to me in March 1993, as relayed to me by Bishop Yates' memo of 15 March 1993 (WWS000188). There is an important and interesting undated note in Bishop Yates' handwriting (WWS000150), recording more advice from the Provincial Registrar, Frank Robson. Unfortunately, we cannot be sure exactly when it was written, but it seems, from its content, to date from September 1993. The note records the difficulty arising from the fact that Ball had not been found guilty in any ecclesiastical court:

"There can therefore be no legal bar to his officiating in churches, and he can fairly say that he has had no opportunity to defend himself."

I believe that the next two points in the note relate to Michael Ball, rather than Peter Ball, and illustrate the difficulty we faced in that Peter was supported by his twin brother, who was also his Diocesan Bishop. It could not simply be a matter of refusing the requests. We had to consider what Michael Ball might do next, in terms of giving his brother permission to officiate in his own diocese:
“He [Frank Robson] would not advise you (or anyone!) to take proceedings against a bishop for disobeying an Archbishop in the context of the canonical "oath of due obedience". It would be "immensely complicated, to say the least"... 

“He confirmed that if a bishop appointed or licensed someone on the Caution List in defiance of the P or C category, there is in the end little or nothing the Archbishop could do about it, in law.”

The note of the advice concludes:

“He added that he thought you would be in a stronger position in expecting +Michael to obey your directions in this instance if you were able to be definite about a time limit – e.g. Peter should not be authorised for any public ministry before (say) one year, or 18 months, or two years from his resignation.”

The Inquiry will note that I allowed Ball back into carefully limited and supervised ministry two years after his resignation, the longest period of time mentioned by the Provincial Registrar in this advice, as carefully reported to me by Bishop Yates.

16. Another example of my taking the advice of Bishop Yates on dealing with the continuing pressure from Michael Ball is at (WWS000182), which appears to be a draft we both worked on in reply to Michael’s letter of 1 October 1993 (WWS000180) leading to my reply of 4 October 1993 (ACE000705). By 9 November 1993, another letter must have been received from Peter Ball, already containing “fantasies about reversing his humiliation in the press etc.” (per Andrew Purkis’s memo to me of that date, WWS000181). In Bishop Yates’ absence at Synod, Andrew stepped in to offer advice about exploring prison ministry for Ball (which I gladly accepted), and the Inquiry will no doubt hear from Dr Purkis about this, although, to assist the Inquiry, I will here give references to a number of notes/memos from him: 22.2.94 (ACE000763), 11.3.94 (ACE000776), 15.3.94 (ACE000783) and 18.3.94 (ACE000788).
17. On the next draft letter I have seen, which was in reply to Peter Ball’s of 28 February (1994) I was again seeking advice from colleagues, including my Chaplain, Colin Fletcher. I cannot detect, from the drafts I have seen (WWS000177, WWS000174, ACE000773, and ACE000779), one of which is dated 11 March 1994, to which revision I was referring when I wrote in an undated memo to my Chaplain (WWS000155) that I was not happy with the hardness of the revision, but Andrew Purkis has written by hand on this memo expressing satisfaction with the draft as amended by me, although he did not like “the fuzzy ending”. My colleagues were, in 1994, starting to recognise Peter Ball as the “arch-manipulator” described in Colin Fletcher’s undated manuscript note (WWS000159).

18. On 26 April 1994 Bishop Yates wrote another memo to me, referring to his reworking of a draft letter by me, “after consulting Colin also” (ACE000794). The memo makes reference to a letter from Graham James (Bishop of St Germans, a suffragan Bishop in the Diocese of Truro), which had been copied to the Ball brothers, and which I have not seen at this point. Bishop Yates said that he had drafted some extra sentences:

“...to explain why you are not authorising any public ministry at this stage. Otherwise I guess your letter will be interpreted in Truro as a harsh and unexplained restriction of the suggestions made by the Diocesan staff”.

He offered to show the draft letter to Colin, Andrew and Lesley. While it is clear that I was maintaining a firm line against Ball returning to ministry, taking account of the advice of both my colleagues at Lambeth and the Provincial Registrar, I continued to receive requests to consider a speedier rehabilitation for Ball.

19. On 19 May 1994, Bishop Yates wrote a long and detailed memo to me (WWS000166), apparently prompted by receipt of a letter from the former Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr Donald Coggan, dated 16 May 1994 (WWS000152), indicating that he had been in touch with Peter Ball by letter and that it seemed to him that perhaps Ball’s greatest need was for some work to do. He continued:
"You will obviously know more than I do about this tragic case. I simply write to express the hope that he might be given your permission to resume, in however limited a capacity, the exercise of his Ministry."

Bishop Yates' memo of 19 May 1994 therefore dealt with a number of possible options,

"in the hope of breaking the sad deadlock into which we seem now to be held — persistent, rather manipulative attempts by the Balls to get you to "authorise" Michael [sic — must mean Peter] to officiate, meeting equally determined advice to you from your staff and others that any significant relaxation of your inhibition might be bad for Peter and disastrous if reported in the press."

20. The options set out in this 5 page handwritten memo ranged from telling Ball that I could never sanction a return to public ministry, to allowing him a PTO in the Diocese of Truro at some point in the future, to "testing the waters" (by which he meant press reaction) at All Saints' Falmouth (a project that had evidently been suggested by the Balls by this stage), to stepping back and leaving it to Michael Ball, the Diocesan Bishop, to do as he saw fit, while advising against public ministry, and pointing out that I would not be able to defend him if he went against that advice. Bishop Yates reminded me that I had no formal or legal power to prevent another bishop giving Peter PTO and continued, "Though I suspect it is a very slight danger, there is the possibility, I suppose, that Michael might defy your advice and go ahead with some authorisation on his own authority as a diocesan bishop." Bishop Yates suggested I might take the options to a group of senior bishops for discussion, but I have no recollection of doing this and my letter of 27 May 1994 to Michael Ball was clearly written in the light of the long memo of 19 May, based on a combination of Bishop Yates' options 2 and 4, in relation to which he had not expressed any clear reservations.

21. My letter of 27 May 1994 (WWS000165), no doubt because it had advised against Peter assisting All Saints' Falmouth and against "semi-private meetings with clergy even in Lis Escop" (the Bishop of Truro's home) provoked a bitterly critical response from Michael Ball of the same date (WWS000154), which included the following:
"Concerning the major paragraph in your letter. I will obey you over All Saints Falmouth and have cancelled Peter celebrating there. You say that if he did you would not be able to defend us publicly. The difficulty is that you have never defended us either privately or publicly in any way. That has been a great disappointment all along and I feel bound to say so.

"Obviously I will be glad if the situation were reviewed after the summer. In the end the Church has to make up its mind whether forgiveness, reconciliation and restoration is part of the Gospel, or whether like so much of the media it has no hope to offer those who despite having done some wonderful ministry (which has never been acknowledged in Peter’s case) have offended."

22. A manuscript note on my reply to Michael Ball of 2 June 1994 (WWS000158) shows that Bishop Yates made some slight revisions and approved it as "firm but caring". It appears that I then met with Michael Ball’s suffragan, Graham James, and wrote to Michael Ball about this on 17 June 1994 (ACE000821), raising with him the questions that I needed Michael to raise with his senior staff before a return to ministry could proceed. It can be seen that I was, at this stage, raising questions in relation to Peter Ball’s possible return to ministry in the Diocese of Truro that autumn, 1994.

23. I received a letter from Peter Ball dated 14 June 1994 (ACE000815), saying that he could not bear to be the cause of dissension between me and Michael. I was clearly referring to this letter (see the 7 points to be addressed) when I wrote in my memo (handwritten, in the airport) of 18 June 1994 to Bishop Yates and Andrew Purkis (AJP/1),

"This is an annoying, troublesome + manipulative letter! I have no intention of replying to it immediately but I wouldn't mind some exploration of the seven points he raises."

24. There followed an exchange of memos between my staff – Bishop Yates, Andrew Purkis and Colin Fletcher - while I was away, on the topics raised by Ball (AJP/2 and ACE000837). I have seen various draft versions of Colin Fletcher’s memo to me of 29 June 1994 (WWS000168 and WWS000176) and what appears to be a
final version is at ACE003298_165/ACE000839. Words similar to those quoted by Dame Moira (INQ000560: 4.4.8) do appear in each of these versions, although clearly couched in terms which indicate that the “searching questions” (as these drafts put it) were those anticipated from the press, and that these were questions that would be asked if Ball were to return to some form of public ministry during the autumn. Consistently with the advice, Ball was not allowed back into public ministry at all during 1994, and not until two years had passed since his resignation. Dame Moira’s criticism (INQ000560: 4.4.9) appears to be focused on the way in which I expressed myself in my letter to Peter Ball of 26 July 1994 (ACE000852), but the Inquiry, having had the benefit, I trust, of reading all the correspondence together in chronological order, will appreciate that I was trying to strike a very delicate balance in order to avoid provoking another tirade from the Balls. A draft of what became the letter of 26 July 1994 is at ACE000849_001-002 and a comparison of this with the final version will show how closely I was following advice. I notice that my Chaplain included the following comment in manuscript in one of the drafts of his 29 June memo (WWS000168):

“I was left feeling very angry after reading the correspondence. Peter is manipulative, status-ridden and hypocritical (about money and obedience) and has put an intolerable burden on you.”

25. In any event, after all the effort which went into my response to Peter Ball in June-July 1994, the next turn of events seems to have been that I suggested Colin Fletcher have a talk with Graham James, the Bishop of St Germans, no doubt with a view to testing the opinion of the senior staff in the Diocese of Truro, and he reported to me on this conversation in a memo dated 5 July 1994 (ACE000844). Bishop Graham was at this stage hoping that the senior staff, who were due to meet for an hour in advance of their forthcoming meeting with the Bishop (Michael Ball), would recommend to Bishop Michael that Peter should return to public ministry outside the Truro Diocese. Colin Fletcher continued:

“Then, if all went smoothly, the way would be opened for ministry to begin in the Diocese itself sometime next year....

“All this makes a lot of sense to me – though there is no certainty that this is what they will recommend.”
There is no suggestion, therefore, that Colin Fletcher was advising me against Peter Ball returning to ministry at all. His 29 June memo reservations were about him returning to public ministry in the autumn of 1994, and in early July he is citing with approval a plan for Ball to start cautiously outside the Diocese of Truro and then begin ministry within his brother’s diocese in 1995, if all went well. My manuscript annotation indicates that I proposed to await Graham James’ letter.

26. The response from Bishop Graham, carefully explaining the views of the Truro senior staff, was dated 12 July 1994 and is at ACE000845_1-2/ACE003298_163-164. Whilst emphasising their wish that it would prove possible for Bishop Peter to exercise a public ministry again and how much they had come to appreciate his friendship, he expressed uncertainty about how a return to ministry might be received among the clergy and laity. Bishop Graham rightly wrote, “In any case, it must surely be more apposite to determine when would be the right time for Bishop Peter to exercise a public ministry again given his own particular circumstances, rather than simply to decide on timing on the basis of likely public reaction.” As Colin Fletcher’s memo had anticipated, the Truro senior staff at this point believed that Peter Ball’s first public engagements should take place outside the Diocese of Truro. Having no memory of any of this, I do not know what happened to that proposal. Bishop Frank Sargeant’s notes of our meeting with Peter Ball on 23 November 1994 (ACE003298_151) show that the proposal had reverted to one of a “limited and supervised ministry under the Revd David Hewlett [sic]” (the priest-in-charge of St Feock’s, where Peter Ball lived) in consultation with his Churchwardens and/or PCC and subject to the agreement of the Bishop of Truro and his senior staff (and see exchange of letters 14 and 19 December 1994 between Bishop Sargeant and the Bishop of Truro about this – WWS000164 and WWS000190). This permission was to be granted by me, as Archbishop, if all agreed. I have annotated a memo to me from Bishop Sargeant dated 29 December 1994 (ACE000823) with the following comment: “Frank, I feel it is essential that the P.C.C. should give its blessing + not to be coerced into doing so”. Bishop Sargeant wrote to Dr Hewlett on 30 December 1994 (WWS000175) to explain the proposal and seek his agreement. As noted in my second statement (WWS000143:118) I was keen to ensure that the local parish gave its full support freely and without pressure (see WWS000196).
27. It can be seen from Bishop Sargeant's memo of 3 February 1995 (WWS000163) to me that he was seeking clarification on a few points raised by Dr Hewlett and that a second parish (All Saints', Falmouth) had now invited the ministry of Peter Ball, with the PPC having recently voted unanimously for it. The first request was that it should be made clear that the request to exercise a limited ministry should come from me, rather than from the Bishop of Truro, to which I agreed. The reason was given as follows, "He [Dr Hewlett] is keen to be in the clear if the press become interested, and he would want to be able to say that the authority and the initiative for Bishop Peter Ball's re-entry into ministry comes from Lambeth". This seems to have been linked to fears about any possible suggestion of nepotism that might have been associated with the Bishop of Truro granting his own brother permission to officiate, as had previously been intimated in the Bishop of St Germans' letter to me of 12 July 1994:

"You ask whether there are special implications in the fact that he is the Diocesan Bishop's brother. Most certainly there are. It complicates matters considerably since Bishop Michael is in a position to authorise his brother's ministry. That is why we believe the responsibility for Peter's return to public ministry must be seen to lie elsewhere, that is with you. That is also why we do not believe it appropriate for him to return to a limited ministry in the Diocese of Truro only, as you suggest."

28. The second query from Dr Hewlett relayed to me by Bishop Sargeant in his 3 February 1995 memo was about what "strictly limited permission" means, "whether we are going to issue a permission to officiate, and whether the extent of Bishop Peter's permission would be at his [ie Dr Hewlett's] discretion". He was raising this point in the context of his own possible departure from St Feock's in the summer, but Bishop Sargeant reassured him that it would be a permission to officiate and that it would be under the supervision of the Rural Dean and the two Churchwardens when or if Dr Hewlett left. My handwritten response to this was, "Limited to their congregation: not episcopal (so he doesn't act as a Bishop). He is subject to the incumbent". I see that Dr Hewlett wrote to Bishop Sargeant on 27 February 1995 (WWS000162) to report on the PCC meeting at which Peter Ball’s ministry had been discussed:
“The mood of the PCC was one of whole hearted support and a motion approving his being licensed to St Feock was unanimously carried....I hope this gives the Archbishop the necessary assurance that the PCC has given its full support and that Bishop Peter will be able to begin his ministry here soon.”

29. My very brief annotation in relation to Bishop Sargeant’s 3 February report on the unanimous request for Peter Ball to be allowed also to minister at All Saints’, Falmouth was, “As (2)”, meaning that this permission was also to be limited to their congregation and subject to the incumbent. I see that, in view of the PPC’s unanimous vote, I granted my permission for Peter Ball to preach, on one occasion, at All Saints, Falmouth on the morning of 5 February 1995 (WWS000157).

30. It is important to note that, following on from the above preaching engagement by Peter Ball, the Bishop of St Germans, who had the previous summer (12 July 1994) cautioned me against allowing Ball back into ministry until “the right time”, wrote to me on 8 February 1995 (WWS000184):

“Two years on from Bishop Peter’s retirement, it strikes me as right in principle that he should be restored to an active – if initially limited – ministry. I’ve checked informally with the other members of the senior staff and we are all convinced that All Saints, Falmouth would find great benefit from Peter’s ministry, as well as being a secure place from which his gifts could be used again”.

31. Bishop Sargeant had evidently been in touch with the Provincial Registrar about the PTO, as appears from his memo to me of 7 March 1995, before the PTO had actually been issued (WWS000169). He was reporting to me on requests from a rector of a parish in Brighton for Peter Ball to be allowed to conduct the wedding of “one of Peter Ball’s potential Community members” in June and a message from the Diocese of Gloucester that he had been asked to conduct his godson’s wedding there. In the context of the former, Bishop Sargeant wrote,

“The Bishop of Chichester has asked what sort of licence Peter will have when you restore him to officiate and to discover whether it will be limited
merely to the diocese of Truro or allow him a roving commission which could make it possible for him to officiate in this diocese."

Bishop Sargeant expressed his view,

"I am not inclined, personally, to suggest that he should be given a permission other than in the two parishes of Truro diocese at the moment. "Frank Robson informs me that there is a Canon which allows people with permission to officiate to do so on a one off basis, with the permission of the incumbent concerned, but I have not had this written into Peter's permission because I think it will open the floodgates at the moment, and I would prefer us to play it cool. Do you agree?"

My reply is not recorded here, but my response can be inferred from my response to Peter Ball's next request.

32. I can see with hindsight that Peter Ball's habit of giving the widest possible interpretation to any permission I gave him was demonstrated very shortly after the granting of this first PTO. On 4 April 1995, I wrote to Bishop Sargeant (WWS000189):

"...I thought you and I had decided that he ought not to go to Culdrose, the naval station, at Easter. Perhaps you could remind him that we have given him permission to officiate in local parishes and so I am disappointed that he has now taken this as a carte blanche to accept any invitation!"

Curiously, since it appears that he would not have had the opportunity of discussing this with me (he was just back from Tunisia and trying to respond to messages left by me), Bishop Sargeant wrote to Peter Ball on 7 April 1995 (ACE001026),

"I have managed to clear off all the lines for you to go to Culdrose for the Easter vigil and Eucharist. You will realise that the Archbishop's Permission has to be matched by that of the Diocesan bishop and in the case of Culdrose the Bishop to the Forces"
33. In immediate response, Peter Ball wrote to Bishop Sargeant on 8 April 1995 (ACE001027) in a manner which seems to suggest that he had been disappointed by the strictly limited, local permission he had been given, apparently comparing this with the wide interpretation he had given to what had been said at the meeting on 23 November 1994:

"Dear Frank

"Thank you so much for your letter. I am deeply grateful for all that you do for me, and I hope and pray that you will have a very happy Easter and rest.

"For your ears alone, not George's please, all the changes since November, when I was so encouraged have affected my rehabilitation enormously and I am not sure that I will even be able to go on with the local things – I am just so fearful now, that I won't have full support should the Press hassle me, and I can't bear any more.

34. By May 1995 (ACE001043) Ball was asking for his ministry to be on a wider basis in the diocese, now that it had been running for two months without criticism or media attention and in July 1995 the Bishop of St Germans wrote (WWS000151) to me suggesting that Ball should, for the first time, be allowed a to perform an episcopal act in confirming candidates at RAF St Mawgan on 6 August 1995 and explaining Ball's personal connections. Bishop Graham wrote: "It seems to me that this was a suitable occasion when Bishop Peter might exercise a ministry more specifically episcopal if this has your permission". I have not seen (and do not remember) my response to this, but later comments of mine (for example, on Bishop Sargeant's memo of 12 December 1996, referred to below) suggest that, at least intermittently, I resisted requests for an episcopal ministry, which would primarily have been confirmations, although I do seem to have delegated the handling of Ball's requests to a large extent to Bishop Sargeant during 1995 and 1996.

35. On 9 November 1995, Bishop Sargeant wrote to a supporter of Ball's (Tim Alexander) assuring him that the Archbishop was in constant touch with Peter Ball and that he came to stay from time to time (WWS000179) (some of the content of this letter was incorrect, as appears from a letter he wrote to Bishop Kemp, to whom he had made a similar statement about provision of housing for Ball). He continued, "The Archbishop has issued a licence for him to preach in the Southern
Province and this is as much as he requests at the moment.” However, in so writing, Bishop Frank was clearly trying to put Ball’s permission at its highest, in order to satisfy this correspondent. (He also used the terminology of an “Archbishop’s Provincial Licence” in his letter of 20 January 1997 to the Bishop of St Germans, as explained further below.) As mentioned in my second statement (WWS000143:129), I declined to allow Ball to carry an episcopal staff at the Midnight Mass at Christmas 1995, because of the signal that would give that he had “an explicit permission to act episcopally as if [he] were recognised as a Bishop in the diocese” (ACE003298_138-139/ACE001104).

36. Yet I have seen that in January 1996 I was willing to agree to Ball carrying out a confirmation at Stowe School later that year (ACE002071) as was confirmed in my letter to Ball dated 18 March 1996 (ACE003298_59), when I also agreed to him accepting an invitation to confirm at Radley College. I think what may have persuaded me was the rather less public nature of a confirmation held in a school chapel, as compared with allowing Ball to hold himself out to the world at large as being a Bishop, and the knowledge that he (and his history) were well known to those inviting him to officiate. Further, as noted below, I believe there was a special connection between Ball and these particular schools, Stowe and Radley. On the Lambeth files (presumably, therefore, copied to us by Michael or Peter Ball) there was a letter dated from Richard Morgan, the Warden of Radley College to Michael Ball, dated 8 March 1996 asking if it will be in order to invite Peter Ball to confirm boys and preach at Radley (ACE001108). He also notes “the grapevine has it that the Head of the C of E wants Peter back in action. She has good judgement if that is true.” As regards Stowe, there is clear evidence that Ball was a personal friend of the Headmaster (WWS000195). I realise that this has no bearing on whether or not he posed a risk, but, as I have explained, that was not something we focused on at the time and his personal friendship would have made me feel that it would have been unkind to refuse the request. In any event, my letter of 18 March 1996 (ACE001112) read as follows:

“Many thanks for your letter of 13 March. I am very happy for you to accept Richard Morgan’s invitation to confirm, to preach, etc, and, of course, the same goes for Stowe. Indeed, I thought I had given you the go-ahead some time back and my apologies if my positive reaction had not reached you.”
37. It does not seem to have been until 2001 that the issue of confirmations re-emerged, when Colin Fletcher raised with my next Chief of Staff, Bishop Richard Llewellyn, the issue of whether Peter Ball should be confirming in schools. This seems to have been prompted by a conversation between me and Andrew Nunn, as noted by him on 29 January 2001 (ACE003298_78), in which he wrote:

"The Archbishop said that it had never been his intention that +PB should do work in schools. He instructed that it should be told of the background and that the Archbishop advised that the confirmations should not take place. If they chose to disregard the Archbishop’s advice, it was their own decision."

This, of course, aligns with my manuscript note on Frank Sargeant’s memo to me of 12 December 1996:

"encourage you to use Peter for priestly Ministry in your Dioceses. Brilliant with guidelines (i) priestly rather than episcopal; (ii) inform Archbishop of the Province; (iii) if you use him in Schools/YP for his sake, supervise."

38. Bishop Llewellyn’s memo to me dated 19 February 2001 (ACE003298_50) narrates his discovery of the 5 February 1997 statement to the House of Bishops. This had stated that Peter Ball might now be regarded in the same way as any other retired bishop but that I should be notified (by bishops) of any invitations to Peter Ball to exercise any public episcopal function. Bishop Llewellyn’s 19 February 2001 memo to me continues:

"When I brought this to your attention, you confirmed that this was the case but that it was unwise of him to accept invitations to minister publicly at schools, and that I should write to him discouraging him from doing so.

39. However, Bishop Llewellyn reported that, when he wrote to Ball as I had asked (and I had approved the wording of his letter) (ACE003298_56-57), Ball telephoned, in my absence abroad, and argued that he had understood my letter of 18 March 1996 to give him, in effect, a "carte blanche" regarding schools work. In both my view and Richard Llewellyn’s, the letter did no such thing, but Ball appeared to be relying on telephone conversations which I could not remember, and had written another of his long, wheedling letters (5 February 2001 at ACE003298_52-55). In concluding his memo of 19 February 2001 (ACE003298_51), Bishop Llewellyn wrote,
"Whatever – if Bishop Peter has been doing public visits to schools since 1996 – which, in all good faith, he has – without any interest from the tabloid press or any other potential source of trouble, then my suggestion would be to allow him to continue. I believe that if trouble was coming from that quarter it would have come by now.

"If you are content to go down this road, I will communicate this to Bishop Peter, and I know he will be delighted."

My manuscript reply reads:

"Yes, I agree. But I have a strong feeling why there were special reasons for him going to Stowe. I am astonished he’s been to over 20!!"

40. I hope, therefore, that the Inquiry will see that I consulted fully and acted in line with both the advice of colleagues and the local responses from Cornwall that I received when dealing with Ball’s originally unexpected, but then persistent, requests for a return to a limited, supervised and unpaid ministry. That advice, and the local responses, seem to have become increasingly sympathetic to Ball’s ministry as time passed, but my abiding impression is that I acted on advice. I also hope that this examination of the documents will help the Inquiry to understand that while, as Professor Mellows observed at paragraph 34.7 "The Provincial Permissions to Officiate are curious documents" (ACE001425_14), I did not, until 1997, intend them to be construed as giving Ball permission to officiate throughout the Southern Province, and even then, only as a priest. As Professor Mellows noted at paragraph 34.6, the two permissions were expressed to be limited to named parishes, and the only example he gives of my having put a wider interpretation on them was in my letter of 11 August 2000 to the Bishop of Gloucester (INQ000311_21), as mentioned above, although I appreciate that Bishop Sargeant used the terminology of a “Provincial Permission” on one or two occasions as outlined above. The permissions expressly required the consent of the Diocesan Bishop to be obtained, and I accept, as I believe I accepted when I met with the Bishop of Gloucester on 10 October 2000, that I was incorrect in suggesting otherwise. My statement to the House of Bishops in no way changed that: it
confirmed that Diocesan Bishops were at liberty to treat him as a retired bishop, if they so wished, but keeping Lambeth informed.

41. Peter Ball appeared to have several friends and contacts in public schools, as a result of which he received numerous invitations to preach or conduct confirmation services there. As a retired bishop, Ball’s offence and caution had been high profile and notorious in church and nation. It was highly unlikely that anyone inviting him to participate in their ministry would have done so in ignorance of this. I do not remember any of the details, but it seems from the documents I have seen that Peter Ball was initially referring every invitation to Lambeth for permission, but he later seems to have inferred that he was at liberty to accept them without referring them to me or my Chief of Staff. He would, however, always have needed the permission of the Diocesan Bishop in order to carry out confirmations in a given Diocese, and it would have been the responsibility of the school chaplains to obtain this. I take this from the documents at ACE003298_49-60, _63, _65-78, from which I also note that I was uneasy in 2001 that Ball was conducting a ministry in schools (see ACE003298_67, 78 and _76) and was astonished when told in February 2001 that Ball claimed to have conducted as many as 20-25 confirmations over the preceding 5 years. It is the case, however, that a confirming bishop would never meet candidates unaccompanied. He would be introduced to them briefly before the service, by the chaplain or incumbent who had prepared the candidates for confirmation, and then, perhaps, meeting them socially with their parents and godparents after the service.

42. In July 1995 (ACE006587) I was informed by a letter from Peter Ball that he was President of the Anglican Scout Fellowship and that “they refused to take my [sic] after the affair”. I have no recollection of this correspondence, but I take this to mean that he had tendered his resignation but that this had been refused. In the letter he told me he had been asked to attend their AGM, to be held near Chingford, but that he had declined to stay overnight because he “felt it would be unwise”. Looking back, I think I would have seen this as an indication that he was acting in a responsible way. Of course, an AGM was not specifically a young people’s event but a gathering of adults responsible for running the organisation.

43. Bishop Michael Ball supported his brother unwaveringly. I believe their relationship as identical twins created an unusually strong bond between them. Because he
was a Diocesan Bishop, Michael Ball wielded considerable influence. He exerted pressure on me and my colleagues at Lambeth to an extent that I sometimes considered excessive. There was at times a sub-text that Michael would resign if Peter were treated unfairly, although Michael's view of unfair treatment of Peter seemed at times to equate to Peter's requests not being complied with. The vociferous and unswerving support of a Diocesan Bishop made it easier for Peter Ball to insist on his demands being met. This is what I meant when I wrote in my statement for Dame Moira Gibb (INQ000617_3) that Peter exercised a continued influence through his brother, in spite of his resignation.

44. It may be useful for the Inquiry to examine the genesis of the often-cited statement to the House of Bishops in February 1997 ACE003298_125). As will be seen, this was never couched as an instruction to Bishops to deploy Ball, but merely approval of their doing so, if they so wished. Thus, there was never any question of Bishop Bentley having to allow Ball to officiate in any way in his diocese. I have little or no first-hand recollection of this and was surprised to be reminded that I had made such a statement to the House of Bishops, but I have seen my letter to Ball of 2 December 1996 (ACE001134), in which I commented that I intended to tell everyone at the next House of Bishops meeting in January 1997 that he could exercise a full ministry if they wished to use them in their dioceses. The background to this appears to have been that I had seen Peter Ball over lunch in November 1996, just before a meeting of the General Synod (ACE003298_134-135). Ball's letter of (date illegible, but perhaps 25 November 1996, as received 28 November 1996) suggests that this was an informal occasion, at which my wife, Eileen was present, but Ball immediately seems to have latched onto the idea that I might somehow commend him to the other bishops. He wrote, "What will be wonderful is to know that in time the Bishops hear that you can commend me again and that I will be truly able to celebrate that fortieth next June having your words of greeting and goodwill." The Inquiry will note how he later cited the discussions with me over lunch to Bishop Frank (when I was away on sabbaticical) as the basis for some very significant claims. These are set out in his letter of 24 January 1997 to Bishop Frank (ACE003298_129), in which he wrote,

"You may remember that I saw the Archbishop last November. He said two things. First, that he now saw me as fully restored and because more things had come to light that he would like to go back to law about my resignation. I
said "No" to that, so he said he would tell the next House of Bishops Meeting about my restoration."

45. I am shocked to read this now. I am quite sure that all the notions of going "back to law" about his resignation came from Ball, not me. Whatever it was that I had said to him over lunch in November 1996, the claims which Ball started making about my views in 1997 were not true. These included his statement to Bishop Jim Thompson in a letter dated 15 April 1997 ACE001162_1/ACE001170 claiming that I had "completely restored" him, apologised to him and "wanted to go back to law about [his] resignation". By 2 May 1997, Jim Thompson wrote to me of Peter having suggested to him that there had been "some new recognition of his accuser's malice" (ACE001170). The Inquiry will no doubt have recognised that Ball was a prolific correspondent and campaigner in his own cause, and the effects of his lobbying bore fruit. Naturally enough, his trusting supporters took what he wrote at face value, such as the Revd H J Sutters, who, I now see, wrote to Bishop Kemp on 7 January 1997 (ACE001140_1) as follows:

"I gather now that the Archbishop is completely satisfied that the charges made against him were groundless and malicious, and that the police agree. The Archbishop apparently has suggested that he withdraw his resignation..."

46. This is an inaccurate and misleading summary of my views and comments, and it seems that Ball was promulgating such rumours, based on what he had said to me, rather than vice versa. Although it is difficult for me now to reconstruct my thinking at the time, I believe my letter to Canon Ian Pulford in December 1998 (ACE001197), apparently in response to a call for me to make a public statement in support of Peter Ball is an accurate reflection of this:

"I don't think your letter acknowledges the difficulties of making any statement, when the police prosecution services stated that they had enough charges to bring a guilty verdict in court; and it was because of that judgement that Bishop Peter resigned. I am quite convinced that Peter is not guilty of three-quarters of the things the national press say he committed; but it is impossible to declare him innocent. This means it is equally impossible for me to come out in strong support of him because in all conscience I could not do that..."
"I was caught up in this in the earliest days of the accusations against him and if anything could have been done then or, indeed, be done now, he would have found me fighting fiercely for him. Therefore, you must read into my silence that it is far too complex to give a simple yes/no verdict about Peter’s behaviour in the past”

47. I had been receiving numerous criticisms for my harsh and unjust treatment of Peter Ball from almost as soon as the news of his resignation broke. In response to one such, from a Mr C B Howden (ACE001207) I wrote on 10 February 1999:

"Perhaps you could explain to me the basis for your opening statement that "the charges made against Bishop Peter (Ball) a few years ago have now been proved to have been falsified and totally scurrilous". This is certainly not my understanding of the matter because, as you know, the police were quite prepared to press the most serious charges again[st] the Bishop prior to his resignation. I can assure you that I have the greatest regard for Peter and I only wish with all my heart that his name could be cleared; but, alas, I fear that this is not the case."

An example of just how far the rumours departed from reality is in Mr Howden’s further letter to me of 15 August 1999 (ACE001232):

"It would appear that the person who made the allegations is now in prison and has since indicated that the whole affair was a pack of lies on his part!"

48. I can see from the documents that Ball lobbied me to help him re-open his case in the summer of 1999, but then changed his mind. Although my letter to him of 5 October 1999 (ACE001236) was sympathetic and supportive, I was at pains to instil more realism in my letter to him of 15 November 1999 (ACE0001237):

"You mention the letter you have had from the Home Office saying that the Caution was not a conviction but that it is totally irrecoverable. However, Peter, I don’t think this does open the way to questioning the legality of what happened because the acceptance of the Caution was an admission of guilt."
As one lawyer has mentioned to me, 'No caution can be given without the person cautioned freely admitting the offence'"

When Ball revisited the idea once more from late 2001 into 2002, I resisted this, on advice from the Provincial Registrar, in my letter to Ball of 19 April 2002 (ACE001284) and I note that the Provincial Registrar had himself written to Ball on 18 December 2001 (ACE003298_15-16).

49. Returning to events leading up to the 1997 statement to the House of Bishops, I can see that on 12 December 1996 (WWS000167), Bishop Frank wrote a memo to me in response to my request for advice on how to convey this message to the House of Bishops. This was in the context of the forthcoming retirement of Peter’s brother, Michael. When Michael Ball retired as Bishop of Truro, the remaining difference between their respective positions as two retired bishops would become apparent, and had to be considered. My handwritten notes on this include “encourage you to use Peter for priestly Ministry in your Dioceses. Brilliant with guidelines (i) priestly rather than episcopal; (ii) inform Archbishop of the Province; (iii) if you use him in Schools/YP for his sake, supervise”. Bishop Sargeant’s advice remained, as it had always been, that “the discretion to use Peter lies with individual diocesan bishops”.

50. Bishop Sargeant made the same point to the Bishop of St Germans when writing to him on 20 January 1997 (ACE003298_130). It is plain from this letter that I was, by now, on sabbatical. Sadly, I can remember nothing (for example of the prior meeting between me and Peter Ball) that would enable me to shed light on the telephone conversation between Bishop Sargeant and the Bishop of St Germans which seems to have been the impetus for this letter. In it, Bishop Sargeant is giving his interpretation of what I had said to members of the House of Bishops who were present on the previous Thursday morning, presumably 16 January 1997, so that this can be passed on to Peter Ball who, of course, would not have been present. He said that the highest it could be put was that “now Peter Ball may be used on the widest basis in the Southern Province at the invitation of the bishops.” Similarly, in his reply to Bishop Sargeant on 6 February 1997 (ACE003298_122), the Bishop of St Germans wrote, “I also told him [Ball] that the Archbishop had specifically said that Peter could now exercise his ministry anywhere without reference to the Archbishop, but that if he was to perform
episcopal acts such as confirmation then it would be wise to inform the Archbishop (rather than seeking permission) so that this was known at Lambeth in case there was any difficulty raised by a third party or the media." He continued, "All this seems eminently reasonable to me on the part of the Archbishop, but I'm not sure I really understand what more Peter may want."

51. In reality this was not a great departure from the already prevailing position, in that, despite the limitation of the PTO to the two Cornish parishes, I had allowed him to attend one or two other engagements within and outside the Diocese of Truro by this time, including the confirmations at Stowe School and Radley College (and it later turned out that he had in fact accepted a significantly larger number of extra-diocesan invitations, although these would always have necessitated the permission of the relevant Diocesan Bishop). Judging by the Bishop of St Germans' account of what I said to the House of Bishops on or about 16 January 1997, the only new aspects of the announcement were a) allowing Ball to exercise priestly ministry outside the two Cornish parishes without my specific permission on each occasion and b) no longer requiring him to seek permission from (but simply to inform) Lambeth, if he wished to perform episcopal acts.

52. Despite knowing that I had gone on sabbatical, and having apparently already asked Bishop Graham James about this, Peter Ball wrote to Bishop Frank on 24 January 1997 (ACE001148), as noted above, about what he called his "restoration" and suggesting that he did not know exactly what had been said to the House of Bishops Meeting and that he thought that no minutes had circulated. He also said he thought that quite a lot of the bishops had left by the time I spoke about Peter Ball's position. As I have said, I cannot remember this meeting, but I am sure that it would have been minuted and imagine I made my comments to the Bishops towards the end of the meeting, under Any Other Business. Following on from this, Ball asked Bishop Frank to ask me, on my return, to add something to the next circular to the House of Bishops. He proposed the following wording:

"Bishop Peter Ball may now be regarded in the same way as any other retired Bishop; but should he be invited to do any public episcopal acts, for his own protection, it would be helpful if you would let me know."
53. I have no recollection of the words I had used in January 1997, but the best clue must be my manuscript annotations on Bishop Frank's memo of 12 December 1996, as quoted above. The Inquiry will note the differences between my notes and Ball's draft wording, the most significant being that I had written "priestly rather than episcopal" and Ball had elevated this to "may now be regarded in the same way as any other retired Bishop". The Inquiry will note that it was Ball's draft wording, verbatim, that was circulated by Bishop Frank to all members of the House of Bishops on 5 February 1997 (ACE003298_58). This is not, for one minute, to suggest that Bishop Frank had acted without my authority, although I do now wonder why, having written to the Bishop of St Germans on 20 January 1997 (ACE003298_130) that this matter would not receive my attention until well after my return from sabbatical, he then proceeded to deal with it in my absence. I suspect the intervening letter from Peter Ball dated 24 January 1997 may explain this. There exists a copy of an email sent to me on 3 February 1997 (ACE001151/ACE003298_126) (sent from the email address of Andrew Nunn, but evidently drafted by Bishop Frank) summarising Ball's request and quoting his preferred wording.¹ This has been printed and faxed back to Bishop Frank from an apparently US fax number on 4 February 1997, with my handwritten annotation, "Frank, I'm happy with this. George". I am unable to shed any light on how or why I changed my mind about how to differentiate Peter Ball's retired status from that of any other retired bishop, but it does appear I acted rather hastily in approving the form of wording proposed by Ball, and certainly when I was abroad on my sabbatical without ready access to advice from my colleagues.

The Inquiry's further questions

1. Paragraphs 52 - 67 of Lord Carey's second witness statement make reference to the seven letters received at Lambeth Palace after Peter Ball had been arrested in December 1992. In 2000 it was made clear to Lord Carey that there were 7 complaints that had not been resolved in 1993. An explanation of why no action was taken in 2000 following receipt of this memo.

2. Please refer to the chain of events set out in documents ACE001249, ACE001251,

¹ INQ000560: 3.7.19 talks of an earlier draft having "best interests of the church" rather than "his own protection", but I have not seen a version of this draft announcement with the phrase "best interests of the church".
ACE001252, ACE001253 and ACE001255 and paragraph 32 of David Bentley's witness statement (INQ000311). Whether in 2000, following his review of the files, Lord Carey accepted that Peter Ball should not have been granted PTO and an explanation of why he took no steps to revoke the PTO in place at that time or take any other steps to resolve the outstanding complaints about Peter Ball.

54. To answer these questions it is necessary to explain the sequence of events in 2000.

55. I have looked at the documents to try to piece together what must have happened. I can see from a letter to me from Peter Ball dated 16 July 1999 (ACE001227) that he had previously sent me "all the papers about my case" and that this seems to have been in the context of wanting to, as he put it in this letter, try to see if his caution could be "downgraded". He seems to have derived some encouragement from some comments I, and the police, had made to him ("I sent you all the papers about my case, simply because of what you had said, and because the police had said how sympathetic they were"), but I have no idea what this may have been, and, as I have noted above, his tendency was to over-interpret what I said to him. As he had evidently sent me some papers before writing to me on 16 July 1999, these may well be the papers which I asked my PA, Mary Eaton, to give to my Chief of Staff, Bishop Richard Llewellyn as noted in her memo to him on 5 July 1999 (ACE001221). This memo records, "The Archbishops asked me to give you the enclosed papers which are self-explanatory. He suggests that we may need to bring in a wise and independent person... to come in and go through all the archived files relating to Peter Ball's resignation."

56. Mary Eaton's memo has been annotated by Bishop Llewellyn on 21 July 1999: "Peter Ball phoned to say 'hold everything; please do not approach anyone for the moment!'" Although Peter Ball seems to have changed his mind about this on this, as on other occasions, the file review seems to have gone ahead. On 26 May 2000 (WWS000191), Bishop Llewellyn wrote in an email to the Bishop of Winchester, "It so happens that my colleague here at L. has, at my request, recently read through the whole of the file and produced a very helpful summary. I knew that, sooner or later, this matter would raise its head again." The Memorandum itself (ACE003298_89) records that "the re-examination of the file
has been prompted by letters and telephone calls in support of, and critical of the lack of the Church’s concern and pastoral care for, Bishop Peter.” In this connection, I note that Mr CB Howden, to whom I had written in February 1999 (ACE001207), responding to his criticisms, renewed his correspondence with me in August 1999 (ACE001232) and with Bishop Llewellyn in July 2000 (ACE003298_93-94). However, it does seem that Ball’s 1999 request that I seek to re-open his case with the Home Office was still in Bishop Llewellyn’s mind in September 2000, as he refers to this in his response to me of 19 September 2000 (ACE003298_83).

57. The resulting Memorandum was retrospective, rather than making recommendations for the present or future. It was drafted in response to the criticism that the treatment of Peter Ball had been too harsh. Inevitably, therefore, it focused on the indications of guilt, while noting that there were no substantial papers on the file about the offence itself, and that the offence of indecency which Ball had admitted to Bishop Ronald Gordon was “lying naked on a bed next to a naked eighteen year old man (Todd)”. The authors of the Memorandum, Richard Llewellyn and Andrew Nunn, concluded that Ball’s treatment had been more lenient than it might have been, rather than the contrary, but they did not make any recommendations for the future curtailment or ending of Ball’s ministry, nor for a risk assessment, let alone suggesting any disciplinary measure against him, even if such a thing had been possible so long after the event.

58. At the time, as my response shows (ACE003298_85), I read the Memorandum as being over-critical of me, though I recognised that this was unlikely to have been the intention of the authors. I replied in some detail, stressing what Peter Ball had in fact suffered, and maintaining that I still sometimes wondered whether I could have done more for him. I echoed the authors’ uncertainty about what, exactly, it was that Peter Ball had done and returned to my 1993 idea of wishing I had seen the “Police Report” (see my second statement WWS000143:95-99). I wrote, “It was very difficult to get to the truth of the matter. Even to this day I have not seen the Police Report. So much of the claims (para.3) depend on various people’s interpretations of incidents. It was – and remains – difficult to find out what actually happened.” In the course of preparing this witness statement, I have seen the
February 1993\(^2\) Gloucester Police Report to the DPP, running to some 326 pages and analysing the evidence of 63 witnesses. When one compares the sparse clues which had reached Lambeth Palace in 1992-93 about Ball’s patterns of behaviour with that Police Report, the contrast is stark.

59. I plainly read paragraph 3 of the Memorandum, which included this sentence, “Seven additional accusations from other men (or on their behalf) are detailed in the file”. I recognise that I was aware of there having been other accusations, but the Memorandum did not direct my attention to these or suggest that there was anything further to be done about them. So where the Inquiry says that “In 2000 it was made clear to [me] that there were 7 complaints that had not been resolved in 1993”, I believe it would be wrong to infer that I had grounds for taking any further action about them at that time, and it does not appear to have occurred to either of the authors of the Memorandum, Richard Llewelin and Andrew Nunn, any more than it did to me, that anything further should be done about the letters. They remained on file and were considered by the Mellows review panel (Professor Mellows, Kate Wood and Paul Morris) in 2008 and Andrew Nunn informed Northants Police about them in July 2008 (see paragraph 48 of Kate Wood’s statement to this Inquiry). It is instructive to note how the ex-detective and safeguarding professional immediately saw the need to refer the letters to the police in 2008, in a way that none of us had considered in 2000. It is, however, a matter of record that even the resulting Northamptonshire Police investigation did not result in any prosecution of Ball.

60. Meanwhile, on 18 July 2000 (per INQ000311_20) Peter Ball wrote to the Bishop of Gloucester, David Bentley, apparently (I have not seen the letter from Ball under reply) asking for permission to officiate at a marriage at Icomb Church in Gloucestershire on 31 December 2000 and to talk to an Alpha Group in that parish in September 2000. At first I thought it was pretty churlish of David Bentley not to allow Peter Ball to officiate at a wedding — although this was, technically, a public ceremony, it was likely that only invited guests would attend (INQ000311_21). But on reflection I recognised that Bishop David was the Diocesan Bishop and took responsibility for the unity of the diocese. He clearly felt that having Peter Ball conducting a ministry in Gloucester was divisive and difficult for his diocese. There

\(^2\) It is undated but evidently pre-dates 15 February 1993 (OHY003480_42).
was an exchange of letters (INQ000311_21-22) and a meeting and the
disagreement was resolved. Although I have no recollection of saying words along
the lines that David Bentley reports in paragraph 32 of his witness statement
(INQ00311_6), I think it is perfectly possible that I spoke in that way, and may well
have looked back at prior correspondence between us on the topic before our
meeting.

61. I have been asked by the Inquiry "whether in 2000, following his review of the files,
Lord Carey accepted that Peter Ball should not have been granted PTO". The
wording of the question reveals the possibility of either or both of two
misapprehensions. The first is the notion that in 2000 I formed the view that Peter
Ball should not have been granted PTO, and the second is the suggestion that I
conducted a "review of the files" at that time.

62. As to the first, the issue which I discussed with the Bishop of Gloucester on 10
October 2000 was whether he had the right to refuse Ball permission to officiate in
the Diocese of Gloucester. Having reminded myself of the nature of the permission
granted, I readily accepted that the Bishop did have the right to refuse, as I had
done when the issue arose previously, e.g. in 1995 (INQ0311_12). That was not an
acceptance that Ball should not have been granted PTO.

63. As to the second, the Inquiry seems to have inferred from Bishop Bentley's
comment in paragraph 32 of his witness statement about my having "looked
through the file" (INQ00311_6) that I had carried out some more extensive "review
of the files". That impression may have been fortified by the fact that the 4
September 2000 memo to me from Bishop Richard Llewellyn and Andrew Nunn
(ACE001251) dates from a similar period. However, while it is the case that the
September 2000 exchange of memoranda appear to have been attached to the
briefing note which Richard Llewellyn prepared for my meeting with the Bishop of
Gloucester on 10 October 2000 (ACE001255), the September exchange was
largely unrelated to the issue to be discussed between myself and Bishop Bentley,
and certainly was not prompted by it. I did not, in fact, carry out anything which I
would describe as a review of the files. Bishop Richard Llewellyn and Andrew Nunn
reviewed the files in order to advise me on the discrete question of whether I had
been too harsh on Peter Ball, but that review was not directed at questions about
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the 7 complaints received in 1992-3 or the appropriateness of the grant of PTO to Peter Ball.

Later events

Emeritus Canon

64. I have been asked whether I was consulted about Eric Kemp's decision to make Peter Ball an Emeritus Canon of Chichester. This was a purely diocesan matter and I have no recollection of being consulted about it. It would be rare for a bishop to consult with me about the appointment of a canon or even for me to learn later of such appointments. It seems clear from the documents that Bishop Kemp, despite, apparently, having received some very troubling comments from Brian Tyler, remained convinced of Peter Ball's basic innocence. If that was so, it does not surprise me that he did not consult me about the appointment.

Mellows Review

65. I was not aware of the Mellows Review ACE001425, which was commissioned by my successor. It has only recently been drawn to my attention in preparing this witness statement. Professor Mellows did not recommend Ball being placed on the Lambeth List at the time of his review, nor did he appear to say that this ought to have been done at the time. However, I do, with hindsight, agree that Peter Ball should have been put on the Lambeth List to recognise the seriousness of what he had done. Although the fact that his name was on the Lambeth List would not have been publicly available, it would have set Ball's expectations from the outset and made it easier to decline his requests. It was a decision that, in September 1993 I wrote to Michael Ball of having agonised over: "I did not do so, for in the end I believed him to be basically innocent, and as you well know, my personal regard for him is very high. But I will not conceal from you that the decision was one I needed to agonise over, and as you also know only too well, a priest put on the List is not likely to be restored to public Ministry for several years." What this comment does not reflect is that I do not believe I saw the List as being appropriate for someone whom I believed to be sick and retired from ministry. It was useful as a guide and check on those who might, in due course, be restored to active ministry, something I did not envisage for Peter Ball at the time when this was
under consideration and advice from the Provincial Registrar was received (March 1993, WWS000143:80).

**Ball's prosecution 2014-2015**

66. One factual point I omitted from my second statement (WWS000143:91) about the call I had with DC Upton in the autumn of 2014 is that she asked me whether I would be willing to be a witness and I said yes. I did say, however, that I believed this should be left alone and that Peter Ball had suffered enough.

67. In my statement to the press on 7 October 2015 after Peter Ball had been sentenced, I said that the church had "failed many victims and allowed abusers to flourish". I meant by this that the Peter Ball conviction – high profile though it was – was, by that time, only one of a number of similar scandalous cases of abuse. I was commenting on the fact that previous practices and attitudes had failed these victims and allowed the minority of abusers among clergy and church workers to go unpunished and often undetected.

**David Roberts**

68. The Inquiry has identified some documents which show that I wrote a routine letter of recommendation for one of the clergy in my diocese in 1990, when I was Bishop of Bath & Wells. If I have correctly identified the David Roberts about whom I have been asked, it appears that, in December 2012, he was convicted and imprisoned for sexually abusing a teenage boy in the 1980s. In April 2013, he was prohibited for life from any ministry, following a process under the Clergy Discipline Measure. I think that the Inquiry has asked me about this matter, because it has been provided with documents dating from June 1986, which show that the Churchwardens, Archdeacon and two Bishops (including Nigel McCulloch, former Bishop of Manchester) (ACE021764_1 and ACE021765_1) had some knowledge of the complaints that had been made about David Roberts. However, it appears that none of these individuals realised that the relationship Roberts had with a boy was abusive, and much of the correspondence relates to quite different complaints about Roberts’ ministry and temperament. The Churchwardens appear to have told the Archdeacon that the complainants (who were not the boy himself) "headed up a small clique which was against David". The discussions and events referred to
set out in ACE021764 and ACE021765 took place the year before I became Bishop of Bath & Wells and I had no recollection of the name of David Roberts when asked about him by the Inquiry.

69. I can see from the documents at ACE0217905 that Roberts wrote to me on 31 July 1989 (ACE0217905_3) about his proposed study leave for April and May 1990. I evidently knew about his proposed sabbatical already, and he writes of having spoken to me about it at his ministerial assessment in April 1989. He was writing to ask me for the name of a charitable trust I had mentioned to him on that occasion, to which he could apply for help with the cost of his trip. My secretary did her best to answer this enquiry.

70. On 10 February 1990 (ACE021792_4), Roberts wrote to me again, referring to his final preparations for his long study leave from 2 April to 10 June 1990 and asking if I would be willing to write a letter of introduction and commendation. I was evidently satisfied that I knew enough about him to do so, as I would have done for all the priests in my diocese, having by now been there for 3 or 4 years.

The Gibb Review

71. I have been asked whether I agree with the accuracy of the chronology produced by Dame Moira Gibb at INQ000735. This is a 270 page document which someone has drafted by reference to the documents at Lambeth Palace and quotes from them extensively. I do not think it would be feasible or sensible for me to try to comment on the accuracy of that piece of work, which I am sure the Inquiry will evaluate for itself, if and to the extent that it proposes to rely on it, by reviewing all the documents in chronological order, and comparing them with INQ000735. One of the Objectives of the Gibb Review included the provision of a detailed timeline of the response within the Church of England, and I assume that INQ000735 is the result of that exercise.

72. Archbishop Justin Welby commissioned Dame Moira Gibb to review the Church of England’s response to the abusive conduct of Peter Ball, after his conviction on two charges of indecent assault and one of misconduct in public office. Dame Moira and her team were given access to all the documentation held by the Church at Lambeth, although not, as I understood it, by the Gloucester Police, in relation to
Peter Ball to see whether there were lessons to be learned. I understand that the
victims of Peter Ball were given opportunities to share their experiences and the
impact of those experiences on them. I was happy to cooperate with that Review
and indeed with IICSA, because it was clear that mistakes had been made.

73. For some time after Peter Ball's conviction, I had been asking the Bishop at
Lambeth, Nigel Stock whether I could see the file held at Lambeth because I was
getting regular press enquiries from the summer of 2015 onwards as documents
were leaked or were released under Freedom of Information Act requests. It was
clear that journalists knew much more about the details than I did. For example,
journalists kept asking questions about Brian Tyler, a private detective of whom I
had no recollection at all. I did not even remember his name. My memory about
these long-distant events was increasingly unclear. It was not until March 2016 that
I was given access to the file at Lambeth Palace. This helped me to prepare for the
Gibb Review.

74. Simultaneously, IICSA was also beginning to look into the Anglican Church, and
Peter Ball became a strand of the inquiry. At the first preliminary hearing in this
investigation in March 2016 it became clear that my role would be under particular
scrutiny. The Church of England at first advised me that the Archbishops' Council
was represented as a core participant and I would be assisted through the legal
firm advising them, but this offer was withdrawn and instead I was offered separate
legal advice. In this new situation, I prepared first for the Gibb review with my legal
adviser and then after this we applied for core participant status to IICSA.

75. The meeting on Monday 5 September 2016 with Dame Moira Gibb was a difficult
one. In my view, Dame Moira had formed a view in advance that I, or my
colleagues at Lambeth Palace, must have been aware of the very incriminating
reports of Brian Tyler, the private investigator employed by the defence team, and
probably seen it. In fact, there is no evidence that anyone at Lambeth saw Tyler's
reports, although there is evidence that John Yates met with Brian Tyler. She also
surprised me in the meeting, by revealing that a member of Gloucester police had
visited Lambeth Palace and asked for any correspondence of relevance. When I
expressed the depth of my surprise on hearing this, Dame Moira undertook to
check. She subsequently wrote to my solicitors on 14 December 2016, to the effect
that, although she had not had formal confirmation from Gloucester police, she had
heard evidence from the officer who had led the investigation at the time, DI Murdock, that he had visited Lambeth Palace on 22 December 1992, but was given only one letter, that from [Name Redacted]. She continued, “There was no suggestion of course that the Archbishop knew about this meeting”. She later confirmed that Mr Murdock said that he had met with Bishop John Yates.

76. I remain astonished at this chain of events. For one thing, I am very surprised that this meeting is not mentioned anywhere in the files at Lambeth Palace. Mr Murdock told Dame Moira that “he had an appointment to meet with John Yates at Lambeth Palace as arrangements had been made that JY would hand over any evidence relating to PB, letters in particular...” (INQ0000648_4). However, there is absolutely no record of this meeting being arranged or taking place and John Yates was an inveterate note-taker and writer of memoranda. Everything of any moment relating to his involvement in this case can be found in the file at Lambeth.

77. I have been told that John Yates only handed over the least incriminating letter of those which had been received at Lambeth, of which there were seven by 22 December 1992. This was the very day on which I wrote to a mother who had raised concerns (ACE003053_5) [Mother of AN-A108], saying, “If you have any light to shed on any incidents affecting young people, do please get in contact with the Gloucester Police.” On the same day, I also wrote personally, by hand, to one of the victims (ACE003053_10-11, AN-A99) so at least these two letters would have been clearly in my mind, had Bishop Yates asked me about a request from the police for letters. Indeed, my letter to AN-A99 shows that I was both shocked and moved by his account. This claim by Mr Murdock calls into question the integrity of John Yates and I strongly want to defend a colleague I valued very highly but who has since passed away and cannot give his own evidence.

78. I understand that there is evidence that Mr Murdock was in London on 22 December 1992, such as the statement of DC A Wasley (OHY000091_47), but that his own witness statement does not mention this and that his report to the DPP, although it covers Mr Murdock’s discussions with Bishop John Yates about matters of ecclesiastical discipline, does not mention the alleged failure to hand over these letters.
79. I have now had the opportunity of reading the notes of Dame Moira's interviews with Mr Murdock on 22 August 2016 (INQ 000648_1-17). These are instructive. First, they reveal Mr Murdock's emphasis on how much difference the production of "the letters" by Lambeth Palace would have made to the police investigation. Secondly, and as a consequence, they go some way to explaining the reason underlying Dame Moira's shocking (to me) statement that (INQ000560: 5.1.7) "Cover-up and collusion fall on a spectrum that includes carelessness and partiality" in a context which clearly indicated that this was her judgement on my involvement. This, of course, was a judgement immediately seized upon by the media and by Archbishop Welby, who quickly assented to the idea that my alleged carelessness and partiality amounted to cover-up and collusion and requested (in effect) my resignation as an Honorary Assistant Bishop.

80. To take the first point, Mr Murdock explained to Dame Moira that in order to prepare for his interview with her, he had gained access to the 1993 Gloucester Police report to the DPP and had "tried to select instances where members of the Church had been made aware of the indecency allegations". At various points in his interview, Mr Murdock emphasises what a difference having the additional letters from Lambeth would have made, but most explicitly at INQ000648_12:

"WM said the church is wrong in that it did not pass all the information they held to him in the course of his investigation. If they had done so the outcome may have been different. PB would have been seen as a serial offender who was abusing his position. What they did in 1993 was right but had they had the information back then there could have been two or three other charges which would have created pressure to bring the case to court."

81. It will be for those representing me to go into the detail of why this seems unlikely, but in summary, I understand that AN-A93, AN-A99, AN-A108, AN-A108 and at least one other who appears to have been the author of one of the letters to Lambeth gave statements to the police, as did the two victims in Cambridge about whom Ros Hunt had alerted the Bishop of Ely, and I gather that at least one of the authors was classed by Mr Murdock in the category of witnesses whose evidence was merely supportive. Indeed the report to the DPP notes that the significance of the evidence of AN-A93 was not at first appreciated even by the police: OHY003488_45. In the second version of Mr Murdock's Gibb
interview notes at INQ000649_11, he mentions that the report to the DPP included “s mention of House”, which clearly refers to AN-A108, whose mother had written to Lambeth complaining about Vickery House. Since it is clear that the Gloucestershire police knew of an allegation against Vickery House and interviewed a great many former members of Ball’s “Scheme” in East Sussex, and that all the allegations apart from Neil Todd’s related to activity in Sussex, I find it very hard to understand Mr Murdock’s reported statement to Dame Moira, “He feels that they would have discussed the PB issues with Sussex in the early stages and if they had known about these other allegations back in 1992/93 he would have contacted Sussex and reported the matter to them asking if they were happy that Gloucestershire dealt with it. Alternatively he would have asked if they would like to work together.”

82. I gave a short written statement to Dame Moira repeating an apology I made to victims after the conviction of Peter Ball in October 2015. The statement (INQ000617) was also intended to convey to Dame Moira something of the extremely difficult context of 1992 and 1993, and the extensive duties and responsibilities I had as Archbishop of Canterbury. I was not trying to make excuses, but I knew that it might be difficult for anyone, including Dame Moira, to understand what being Archbishop of Canterbury is like. I hoped that she might understand how things appeared at the time, rather than with the advantage of hindsight – snippets of information which now, dissected from everything else that would have been passing across my desk or through my mind at the time, and neatly placed together, appear to raise obvious alarm bells or to be connected, did not at the time. I simply could not hold in mind all the details of everything that I had seen or been told. I was trying to engage in so many different spheres of activity and to retain the developing strands of all the different narratives.

83. I also intended, in my short written statement to her, to make the point to Dame Moira about how different the times were in 1992 when I and my colleagues did not have the same understanding of ‘grooming’ and ‘safeguarding’. When Richard Llewellyn wrote in the Memorandum of 4 September 2000 that Ball had admitted to "lying naked on a bed next to a naked eighteen year old man", this did not sound to me like child abuse, or indeed any other form of abuse. I think I was also of the view at the time that forced penetrative sex was significantly worse than other types of sexual offending. It has only been as I read the statements of the victims
of Peter Ball, both from the time of the Gloucestershire police investigation in 1993 and for IICSA, as they have been made available to me as a core participant, that I have gained a better understanding of how abusive Ball’s behaviour was and the lasting trauma it has caused for so many people.

84. I felt that Dame Moira Gibb’s report ‘An Abuse of Faith’ failed in one very significant respect, in that she merely paid lip service to the different culture there was in the 1990s. The responses of most of my contemporaries at the time can be gleaned from the documents and appear to have been very similar to my own. Just one example might be Bishop Roy Williamson’s clear statement to Dame Moira (INQ000604_2) that what he had heard first-hand from Neil Todd was not abuse: “RW then said the young man was tearful at times but articulate but RW has to say there was never at any stage in their conversation any suggestion of impropriety on the part of PB. There was no suggestion of abuse of any kind, none whatsoever.” The Inquiry will bear in mind that it was from this witness that I received the account of the allegations of Neil Todd.

85. I also find it curious that Dame Moira (INQ000560: 3.4.16 and 5.2.2) suggested that the letters from complainants or concerned parents ought to have been passed to Brian Tyler. As I have explained at WWS000143:76, Tyler was appointed by Ball’s defence team, DI Murdock recognises this in his Gibb interview (INQ000648_9), although at one point the notes record, “In his report BT admits to knowing of other serious complaints against PB that had been made by individuals from all over the Country. BT was acting on behalf of the Church so why did he not mention these to WM at their meeting?” It is not clear from the note who said this, but it may be a source of Dame Moira’s confusion.

86. I recognise that it may be said that some of my colleagues tried to warn me against allowing Peter Ball as much latitude as I did, although I believe that the picture that emerges from the documents is that I did follow advice and was influenced by those around me. However, there were many who demonstrably knew a great deal more about what Ball had done than I did, who were still very supportive of him, indeed, far more unequivocal in their support than I was. Although, as I wrote in September 1993 to Michael Ball, I believed that Ball was “basically innocent”, this does not mean I had no uncertainties. I had resigned myself to not getting to the bottom of what he had actually done, when I realised that the police were not
going to share information back in March 1993, but I knew that the caution meant that he had admitted an offence of gross indecency. I wrote to one of his supporters, C B Howden in February 1999 (ACE001207), in response to his assertion that the charges against Ball had "now been proved to have been falsified and totally scurrilous":

"This is certainly not my understanding of the matter because, as you know, the police were quite prepared to press the most serious charges against the Bishop prior to his resignation."

87. I will give some examples of those who, despite knowing a good deal more about Ball's actions than I did, remained very supportive of him. Chris Peak, the Diocesan Registrar of Gloucester, who, we now know, was acting as Ball's personal criminal solicitor, had attended a meeting accompanied by his colleague, Chris Read, with Ball, Tyler and his QC (David Lane) on Sunday 24 January 1993 (RTY000001_172). Of this meeting, Tyler writes,

"...we talked of the evidence relating to the allegations made by Todd, relating to the conduct of the Bishop. During the course of the conversation, it was very obvious that Bishop Peter did not understand the implications and the full nature of the allegations made by Todd. I explained to him what Indecent Assault was, and what Gross Indecency was, and after a few moments he agreed that he had in fact had an erection and had reached a climax during the encounter with Todd."

88. It is also apparent that Chris Peak was aware of at least two other complainants, from his comments in a letter to Brian Tyler dated 15 January 1993 at RTY00001_11. This refers to Ball having been arrested for offences against both Clifford Hodgson and another (other than Neil Todd). Less than two years after the 24 January 1993 meeting and receipt of the reports from Tyler, on 2 January 1995, Chris Peak wrote to me supporting Ball's return to ministry, referring to "the ordeal which Peter suffered at the hands of the press". He argued,

"Peter's health was badly affected by the police enquiry and media attention. As he recovers, he needs employment to help him towards rehabilitation. He is capable of such wonderful work as you know. Bearing in mind the severe
punishment he has suffered, I hope you will now agree that he may take up an appropriate post in which his unique talents may once again be deployed for the good of the church and to the glory of God."

89. The second example is that of Bishop Eric Kemp. It is clear from his statement to the police that Bishop Kemp met Neil Todd on 10 December 1992, and that Neil told him of naked cold showers, kneeling naked with Ball each night to say the penitential psalms and,

"that one evening he and Peter lay together naked on a bed and that Peter had kissed Neil, and that Peter had had an emission".

However, Ball is reported by Bishop Kemp as denying this and kneeling naked with Todd to pray, when Bishop Kemp later telephoned him about this. He only accepted that there had been cold showers. It is not clear that Bishop Kemp received not only the summary report sent to him by Mr Tyler on 23 March 1993 (RTY000001_204_207), but also Tyler’s second report,³ which appears to be that at RTY000001_170_185. The former included another graphic account of the meeting with Ball on 24 January 1993. Despite this, Bishop Kemp remained in favour of allowing Peter Ball to minister in the Diocese of Chichester (see, for example, his letter to Frank Sargeant of 31.3.95) and wrote in his memoirs that Ball had been the victim of mischief-makers.

90. Thirdly, Dame Moira herself has noted (para 4.1.2) that some of Ball’s own victims remained some of his staunchest supporters for many years. The Inquiry has heard during the Chichester hearing the evidence of AN-A8 who just laughed when the police called him and asked if he had ever been asked if he wanted to get into a shower with Peter Ball, and from AN-A7 who said that he was "still in the Peter Ball fan club" at the time of the investigation in 1992-93. At Lambeth, we had received at least one letter from a man [Name Redacted] who had experienced Ball’s bizarre practices at first hand and found them of spiritual benefit.

91. Finally, the Inquiry may consider that the Gloucestershire police, the CPS and the DPP were those with both experience of criminality and the fullest overview of the

³ See WWS000153.
allegations and patterns of behaviour revealed by the testimony of the many people they interviewed, yet the outcome of the thorough and extensive police investigation was a caution for one offence only, committed against Neil Todd. According to the Gibb review,⁴ both the police and the CPS were aware that Ball had not unequivocally or formally admitted guilt, which Dame Moira says is a pre-requisite for a caution (INQ000560: 5.3.4). Dame Moira Gibb wrote (INQ000560: 5.2.1), "The Church's management of those seven letters, containing allegations against Ball, is perhaps its greatest failure in these events." Although I have accepted that we failed to recognise what the letters were pointing to, I am puzzled by Dame Moira's assessment of the scale of the failure when I compare the, for the most part, brief content of those letters with the full body of evidence received by the police (see, for example, OHY000086, OHY000087, OHY000088, OHY000089, OHY000090, OHY000091, OHY000092, OHY000093, OHY000096 and OHY000098). As Dame Moira herself concedes, "., the Church will not have been helped by some aspects of the way in which other arms of "the establishment" approached their duties." My own feeling is that was a considerable understatement.

92. I must stress that I have no recollection of a conscious decision not to pass the letters to the police, as Dame Moira concludes there must have been (5.2.9). My general and abiding sense was that it was the police who had the information and insight, rather than vice versa. Given Bishop John Yates' extensive notes about other matters, it seems inconceivable to me that the possibility of passing the letters to the police even occurred to us, let alone that a decision was taken not to do so. Even if DI Murdock's visit had not been pre-arranged (as the lack of documentation about it would seem to suggest), I cannot think that Bishop Yates would have responded to a request for information from the police without coming to discuss it with me. This would have been a difficult and delicate decision, to which we would have given careful thought. As I said in my second statement, we would have been predisposed to treat the correspondence as private, and the police's request would have placed us in a dilemma.

⁴ See also the Police Report at OHY003480_40: "The defence solicitors have acknowledged their willingness to accept a caution, but has the criteria been fulfilled? Is there a need to formally interview again? (Viz Note 2A of Guidelines)."
93. I have given much thought to why, apart from respect for their confidential nature, even if no request was made by the police, we might not have thought of passing the letters to them. I can see that the letter from [Name Redacted] voiced no concerns of his own about Ball, referring only to second hand information which he himself found hard to believe. This letter was plainly not, at the time, regarded as one containing an allegation on which Ball needed to be challenged, as he was at the meeting on 29 January 1993 in relation to the five letters from those who were clearly complaining ([AN-A10] Name Redacted) about his son, [AN-A99], (about her son) and [AN-A93]. Name Redacted's comments were also couched in terms supportive of Ball. [AN-A10] had written apologetically about a private meeting with Ball over ten years earlier, when he was 21, referring to his "(maybe) irrelevant 10 ½ year old story, which is of a personal nature". Again, this would not have been perceived as an account of child sexual abuse, although it was raised (anonymously, to preserve confidentiality) by Bishop Gordon with Ball at the meeting on 29 January 1993. I had encouraged [Mother of AN-A10] to go to the police (ACE003053_5) and [AN-A93] had said that he was informing the police (as well as me), and clearly did so (his statement is at OHY000087_43). He was reporting what had happened to him some 12 years previously, when he had declined Ball's indecent request. Incidentally, he did express himself as being "very happy to let matters rest, considering the Bishop's resignation" in a further letter to Bishop Yates on 2 April 1993.

94. Of the seven letters identified by Dame Moira, this leaves two others: those of [Name Redacted]'s father and of [AN-A99] [Name Redacted] had written:

"We did not and do not consider the information appropriate to pass to the police, though you are entirely free to make whatever use of it that you wish."

Judging by Bishop Yates' reply to this on my behalf on 11 January 1993 (ACE003053_7), we took this to mean that [Name Redacted] did not wish his letter to be shown to the police, for he wrote:

"On his behalf, I am to tell you that he entirely endorses and supports your decision not to pass the information you have about [Name Redacted] to the Police (though all the information we have here suggests that the Gloucestershire
Police have been conducting their investigation with impeccable care and tact."

This letter had shocked me, but it did not disclose an obvious criminal matter and seemed much more directed at my confronting Peter Ball about what he had written than about anything which might be of concern to the police.

95. I cannot believe that I ever saw the narratives by Mr Tyler, such as that cited in paragraph 71 above, or in which he wrote,

"Without doubt, the Police have powerful evidence of years of masturbation and abuse of young men by Bishop Peter."

Reading anything like that would, I am sure, have had a very significant impact on my thinking and attitude towards Ball. We now know (INQ000560: 4.1.6) that Ball’s admissions, to Bishop Kemp and at the meeting attended by Brian Tyler, came from a man who had made a young man roll naked in the snow and then beaten him until he bled, for admitting that he masturbated. Then we knew no such things about Ball. This is a large part of what I mean when I refer to our failure of attention to Ball’s victims: had we encouraged them to come forward with more details and given them confidence that they would be believed, we might have gained at least a greater degree of understanding. It was our failure in the church at this time, and for several years to come, not to encourage victims to come forward and tell their stories. Even in 2008, after the Mellows Review, it appears that Professor Mellows’ advice to contact the writers of the various letters to tell them about the outcomes of this review was not followed, although their permission was sought to pass their letters to the police. I, by contrast, seem to have been receiving advice not to follow up with those who had written.

96. On 4 February 1993, following his meeting with the Provincial Registrar and Peter Ball and his solicitor (Chris Read) in Oxford on 29 January 1993, Bishop Ronald Gordon wrote to Bishop John Yates (ACE900435) about the letters received from

"If PB resigns, or is sent to trial, I feel sure no more need be done about them. If he were to resume ministry as Bp of G, it might be wise to prepare a
defence against the possibility of any of these correspondents complaining no notice had been taken of their representation. I have in mind something like: “PB has undergone enormous suffering and humiliation over the past few weeks. The Archbishop has spoken with him and is as sure as it is possible to be that there will be no recurrence of the kind of misjudgement you brought to the Archbishop’s attention.

“I doubt if [AN-A10] would write — he was very keen to preserve confidentiality and his complaint was of an incident 10 years ago; [writer redacted] invites the Abp to ignore his letter if the Abp sees fit; [AN-A93] again describes an incident that occurred [illegible] years ago. However I should not be surprised if either [writer redacted] or [AN-A99] were to write again. Presumably, if it seemed necessary, you could offer to see them.

Also I wonder whether you’d want to consider making the [AN-A108] letter available to Eric Kemp, in the light of her reference to Vickery ... House”.

97. I note that this last piece of advice was followed when Bishop Yates wrote to Bishop Kemp on 29 March 1993 (WWS000160), commenting that [Mother of AN-A108] account sounded sensible and convincing, not least because she specifically repudiated any desire for punishment or revenge; she was concerned only that other people should be protected from harm.” On the same day, Bishop Yates confirmed to [Mother of AN-A108] that he had written to Bishop Kemp with her information (ACE000583). I have little doubt that Bishop Yates would have conveyed the rest of Bishop Gordon’s advice to me.

98. Nonetheless, on 18 March 1993, I wrote a memo to Bishop John Yates and Andrew Purkis by hand (ACE003298_188), as follows:

"Peter Ball
Are there any ‘loose ends’ to be tied up?
i People to write to...
ii Follow-up to ‘victims’
iii Letter to those who wrote to me privately"

I believe that this note shows that I was taking the initiative in checking whether I ought to be following up in any way with those who had written to me. It also
shows that my abiding impression was that they had written "privately". I am sure that my use of inverted commas around the words "victims" derived from a concern to make no assumptions about what Peter Ball had or had not done to them, until I had been able to find out more. About a week prior to this, in an annotation on a memo from John Yates dated 10 March 1993, I had written, "I would like to speak to a Senior Policeman about Peter (ACE003298_193)."

99. As I re-read the late March 1993 correspondence, I am struck by how much we were relying, at that particular time, upon some further information from the police about the allegations they had investigated. We were aware that their investigations had been wide-ranging. With the caution having been accepted, this was plainly the point at which disciplinary action was under consideration, but I felt hampered by my lack of understanding about the real nature of Ball's offending. As Kate Wood put it in her report of 5 May 2009 (ACE014362), after reviewing the materials available to me at Lambeth:

"The file held at Lambeth does not detail the offence. It does though seem that the offence involved PB and NT lying naked together. The file does not make clear whether there was any physical contact between the two however a tentative enquiry with the police during the course of this review has provided information to suggest that the summary of facts provided by Gloucester police to the CPS stated that there was mutual masturbation between PB and NT."

If only I had seen the police report that has now been shown to this Inquiry, it would have transformed my understanding and my whole approach to Ball.

100. Although I can now see hints at greater insight on the part of some of the correspondents with Lambeth Palace in 1993 (particularly those who had met the victims or at least met those who had met them, such as the Bishop of Southwell and the Bishop of Ely, and those who had professional expertise in this area, such as the letter from someone who had counselled the sexually abused ACE000274), it should be borne in mind that I was relying primarily on those around me, who were predominantly from an older generation of churchmen, principally Bishop John Yates and Bishop Ronald Gordon, as well as the Provincial Registrar, Frank Robson. Bishop Yates, who had been Bishop of Gloucester before he became
Bishop at Lambeth, chaired the General Synod Board of Social Responsibility Group responsible for the 1979 Gloucester Report on homosexual relationships. As his obituary in the Independent shows (https://www.independent.co.uk/news/obituaries/the-right-rev-john-yates-reforming-bishop-of-gloucester-790033.html), he became known as a reforming bishop, in favour of the ordination of women and with a practical approach to ministering to the hungry. It may be instructive for the Inquiry to note that the Gloucester Report contained the following comment:

"It is clear that there is a class of child molester, who is typically attracted by young children (often of either sex) whom he wishes to fondle or whom he invites to touch or inspect his genitals. Such behaviour, more pathetic than immediately dangerous, is understandably greatly shocking to the parents of the child, and in some cases the child himself will be frightened and disturbed, though there may be no long-term ill effects."

This is, of course, not cited in criticism of Bishop Yates, but to remind the Inquiry that, although a reformer, he was a man of his time.

101. On 25 March 1993, Bishop Yates wrote to me in advance of my planned meeting with the Ball brothers in Canterbury on 7 April 1993 (ACE000572):

"If you have to think about discipline (the Caution List, for example) perhaps Frank Robson should be asked if he can come to Canterbury and/or Ronald Gordon...

However, now that he has retired, as well as resigned (has Peter really come to terms with that?) the Caution List may not be appropriate. An alternative might be a letter from you to Peter laying down certain stipulations about his activities in future, so that you may be seen to be "ministering discipline."

102. On 25 March 1993 Bishop Yates wrote to a Mr W E Fulford (WWS000170): "The Church's enquiry has not yet been completed and is therefore still sub judice." I am sure that what Bishop Yates had in mind here, by way of continuing enquiry, was the enquiries he was making of the police. On the same day, Bishop Yates wrote to the Bishop of Southwell (the diocese from which Neil Todd originated), thanking him for his letter about Neil Todd, and saying this "fills in one or two of the
spaces in the strange and worrying jigsaw’. We still felt there was no clear picture emerging.

103. On 26 March 1993, I wrote to the Diocesan Communications Officer in Truro Diocese (ACE003298_184):

"Though I am deeply sorry for Peter, who has been a marvellous suffragan bishop and has showed great promise in Gloucester, there is clear evidence of misdemeanours that would have indicted any clergyman under the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction Measure. We can’t have two standards in the Church. Although the police investigation may have finished, I know that my responsibilities have not, and I have no doubt that more work needs to be done at many different levels."

On 29 March, Bishop Yates wrote to [Mother of ANA108] (ACE000583):

"The Archbishop well understands that from your point of view the wellbeing and future of your son will be the main concern. The Archbishop cannot of course put the clock back or undo what may have been done in the past; he can and does offer his own personal sympathy, and, on behalf of the whole Church, his regret for any incidents which may have been disturbing or untoward."

This same letter re-iterated the theme, "...the Archbishop’s own confidential enquiries into the whole matter have not yet been completed, though I am sure you would concur with the hope that if decisions about Bishop Peter’s future do emerge from those enquiries they will escape the glare of lurid publicity in the media."

104. Then, on 29 March 1993, we see the note to me from Bishop Yates (ACE000578), relating to having set up a call for me with the Chief Superintendent, John Bennett of Gloucestershire Police for the following day. As I explained in my second witness statement (WW000143:98-99), I was disappointed to find that Mr Bennett was unable to tell me anything and this led to my letter of 31 March 1993 to the Chief Constable (ACE000591).
105. I have been asked by the Inquiry for my responses to Dame Moira Gibb’s conclusions on various topics covered in the Gibb review. I believe I have dealt with these as follows:

a. The failure to pass the seven letters from other complainants (there were in fact only five that could be classed as complainants) to the police. Please see above and WWS000143:52 et seq, especially 62.

b. The letter of support provided to the Chief Constable of Gloucester. Please see WWS000143:84 and below.

c. The failure to take action under ecclesiastical law. Please see WWS000143:99 and 109-110, as well as various places in this statement.

d. Allowing Peter Ball to return to ministry. Please see WWS000143:115-133 and above.

e. That Peter Ball’s behaviour was trivialised. Please see below.

106. I believe the reference to a "letter of support" is to my letter to the Chief Constable dated 5 February 1993 (ACE000437) (wrongly described as dated 5 January 1993 in my second witness statement (WWS000143:84), because this was how it was referenced in the question put to me by the Inquiry). I knew that "special pleading" would be entirely inappropriate and said so in my letter. I realised that I was potentially opening myself up to criticism by approaching the Chief Constable. Nonetheless, I felt it my pastoral duty to one of my bishops to pass on the many positive things I had learned from others, principally those who had passed through his community, about Ball. As I wrote:

"I thought you should have my general reactions to Peter but, I repeat, in no way am I seeking to interfere with your investigation or influence the decision which the Crown Prosecution may have to make. I am totally committed to the principle that clergy should accept the highest possible standards of personal conduct. In particular, all clergy entrusted with youngsters should behave with priority [sic],\(^5\) compassion and respect. Moreover, it is incumbent on bishops to set a lead in such matters."

107. As I hope is clear from paragraphs 98-103 above and from my second witness statement, the moment for considering internal discipline for Ball was after the

\(^5\) I believe I meant "probity".
police had concluded their investigation, and decided on a caution, in other words, March 1993. Bishop Yates wrote a memo to me on 15 March 1993 (WWS000188):

"Frank Robson and John Rees are studying the Measure and its implications for Bishops who may fall under censure. Frank gave me an interim summary of the position by telephone, which is as follows:

A Diocesan Bishop clearly cannot be arraigned in a Diocesan Consistory Court. Therefore nothing like the established 'shortened procedure' whereby a clergyman who admits guilt can be sentenced to deprivation and disqualification etc is available to the Archbishop in respect of another Bishop.

The only way to proceed would appear to be by the appointment of an Episcopal Committee of Convocation which would hear the case. It appears to be a matter of a Bishop having the right to be judged by a group of his own Peers. If such proceedings ever came into being, legal aid would be available to the Bishop in question, presumably with results reminiscent of the Henfield case.

There would appear to be no reason why the Archbishop should not place the name of a Bishop on the Caution List under the usual 'P' or 'C' categories, though such action would naturally remain confidential."

108. From this note of advice it can be seen that no one was recommending either that I take disciplinary action or that I place Ball's name on the Caution List. Indeed, although I think the latter would have made it easier for me to resist Ball's requests for an ever increasing ministry (which, in March 1993 I had no reason to anticipate - quite the contrary), for a finite period, I suspect that he would have resisted any attempt to restrict his activities after that period had expired. Further, it would, as Bishop Yates advised, have been confidential, so I would not have been at liberty to tell any of Ball's many supporters that this was the reason for restricting his ministry. Barring Ball permanently from ministry would only have been achievable via the complicated and expensive route outlined in the note, and - absent any clearer guidance from the police or any other statutory authority - I would not have seen this as justified on the basis of what I then knew.
109. As Bishop Yates’ memo to me of 25 March 1993 indicated, it was by no means clear and obvious to us that discipline was needed, over and above his resignation and loss of office: “If you have to think about discipline (the Caution List, for example)...” (emphasis added). Frank Robson had attended a 3 hour meeting with Bishop Yates and Bishop Gordon on 25 January 1993, at which they had quite plainly discussed the “worrying letters” (para 1 of memo to me from Bishop Yates dated 2 February 1993 – ACE003298_30-32) and both Frank Robson and Bishop Gordon had met with Peter Ball on 29 January 1993 for the purpose of discussing those with him (see their respective notes at WWS000146 and WWS000161). None of these colleagues was advising that Ball should be disciplined after he had accepted the caution, yet I would venture to suggest that they knew a great deal more about the details (and the letters) than I did at this stage. I believe that Bishop Yates provided me with at least some of the letters in readiness for my meeting with Peter Ball on 7 April but I doubt if these included those viewed as supportive. I have seen a copy of [AN-A93] letter to which is attached an undated note to me from Bishop Yates (WWS000187), which reads, “Is this correspondence something you may want to have by you when you see +Peter at Canterbury? I have written to the other people who wrote to you, except [Name Redacted] – (unnecessary).”

110. I do not believe that it was a case of our having trivialised Ball’s behaviour but of not seeing it for what it was. By comparison with the expertise and evidence available to the Inquiry in 2018 about how Ball operated, I was acting in almost complete ignorance. As Dame Moira herself wrote of me – and up to a point I would agree with this – “He had a degree of personal compassion for Ball that is not matched by an understanding of the nature and consequences of Ball’s abusive conduct.” (INQ000560: 4.4.7). However, I do not think Dame Moira recognised how much easier it was for her to recognise the nature and consequences of Ball’s abusive conduct in 2016 than it was for me in 1993.

111. Dame Moira implied in paragraph 5.1.7 of her report that I was careless and partial in my approach to these events. I would like the Inquiry to consider carefully whether the former criticism is justified. The latter I accept, to a degree, but only because I suspect that few of us would naturally and easily rely on the accusations of an unknown stranger over the protestations of innocence from a highly regarded
colleague. This is plainly a danger to be guarded against in such situations in the future, by placing decisions in the hands of safeguarding advisers who are sufficiently removed from personal knowledge of the alleged perpetrators and professionally qualified, to be able to make dispassionate and impartial decisions. In the case of Peter Ball, although I have no recollection of it now, there is a distinct flavour of mistrust for AN-A92 running through some of the documents. When I do my best to recall these events in an objective and even-handed way, it seems likely that this would have percolated through to me somehow, and influenced my thinking to a degree, as it did that of my colleagues.

Events on publication of Gibb Review

112. Archbishop Welby requested my resignation in a letter dated 21 June 2017 (WWS000192), the day before publication of the Gibb Review report, knowing that I, too, had received a pre-publication copy. That day, I also received a telephone call from the secretary to the Bishop of Oxford, Steven Croft, asking me to see him and this was arranged for the morning of Saturday 24 June 2017, at my home. Bishop Steven also wrote to me on 21 June 2017 (WWS000171) and, while offering pastoral support, said:

"Archbishop Justin has already written to you recommending that you should consider carefully your position as an Honorary Assistant Bishop. From what I have read and understood of the Review, on a first reading of the report, I do concur with his judgement. To lay down your ministry voluntarily at least for a season would be an appropriate public recognition of the serious nature of the Review's conclusions. If you determine not to take this course then, as you will understand, I will need to consider whether I will at that point need to revoke your license for a season."

I understood this to mean that, if I did not resign as an Honorary Assistant Bishop, my PTO would be removed. In fact, I can now see that the letter could have been understood to say that if I did not resign all ministry, then I was likely to be deprived of it anyway, but, at the time, and at the ensuing meeting with Bishop Steven on Saturday 24 June 2017, that is not how I understood it.

113. At the meeting on Saturday 24 June 2017, I agreed to comply with the Archbishop's request for my resignation, although made it clear that I only agreed
to step down on a temporary basis. Bishop Croft told me at our meeting that I would no longer be able to take services in our local church, although no steps were taken formally to revoke my PTO.

114. We discussed the terms on which I would announce this verbally to our local church and agreed that I would relay the congregation that I was to stand down “for a season”. This is reflected in the exchange of emails between me and Steven Croft on Monday 26 June 2017 (WWS000186). I had expected the temporary nature of my resignation to be reflected in Bishop Croft’s statement to the press on that Monday, but he said he had only intended the phrase, “for a season” to be used in the verbal announcement at my own parish church, and that to have put that in the press release would have invited further questions. He wrote to me by email at 12:05 on 26 June 2017, “We are simply reporting your decision to stand down at the present time.” He also shared with me the prepared answer, should the question be asked:

“How long is this arrangement going to last?
All parties are open to reviewing the situation once the IICSA review and other related enquiries have run their course.”

115. Over that weekend, I heard from the Bishop of Bristol to the effect that I would not be allowed to speak at a Memorial Service and from the Bishop in Europe that I could not lead a Retreat (even though one would not need to be ordained to do either). I wrote to Archbishop Welby on Sunday 25 June 2017 (WWS000194), expressing my disquiet at some of Dame Moira’s conclusions and my disappointment at the way in which he had approached the matter of my resignation as an Assistant Bishop. I believed that Justin Welby should have met with me before the report was published, warning me that Dame Moira’s report focused on me to the extent it did and explaining his reasons for asking me to resign. I was particularly distressed that, at the press conference on 22 June 2017, he seemed so readily to have repeated allegations of “collusion” and “cover-up” without first hearing what I had to say. I thought that I had agreed to step down as an Honorary Assistant Bishop, not to resign all ministry, including that of a lay nature and was shocked at the extent of the limitations imposed on me, which went way beyond what I had understood or anticipated.
116. Archbishop Welby’s reply of 4 July 2017 (WWS000173) seemed to assume that Ball’s offending had been a clear and simple matter of child abuse, such as he would have been able to recognise and deal with, in that era of the early 1990s. He declined to meet with me to discuss these matters for two stated reasons:

"First, were any formal complaint to be made against you under the Clergy Discipline Measure as a result of the matters touched on in Dame Moira’s report, it would come to me for initial consideration; and my ability to deal with it fairly could be seen as having been compromised had I discussed those matters previously with you.

"Secondly, in due course, I will have to spend much time giving evidence to the Independent Inquiry on Child Sex [sic] Abuse, and cannot run the risk in that context either of giving the impression in any way that we may have colluded about what I say. I am sure to be asked whether I have been in contact with you about it."

He continued,

"As regards to care for you, you will remember well from your time as Archbishop (and this has become much more stringent with the Clergy Discipline Measure process) that, as Archbishop, I cannot both provide personal pastoral care and also undertake the quasi-judicial duties that fall with the office in relation to the disciplinary process."

He went on to offer me the pastoral support of Bishop Peter Price.

117. It seemed to me to be absurd and unjust to refuse a meeting with me in anticipation of a complaint. More crucially, I was being kept out of any form of ministry – even that which would be allowed to a lay person – for an indefinite period, without any due process or right to be heard on the topic. I therefore wrote to the Archbishop of York on 10 July 2017 (WWS000156), copied to the Bishop of Oxford and to Archbishop Welby, asking for a complaint to be brought against me under the Clergy Discipline Measure, rather than having this possibility hanging over my head for many more months or years, and being deprived of ministry in the meantime. Having taken advice, Archbishop Sentamu replied to me at some length on 17 August 2017 (WWS000178). His letter included reliance on practice guidance relating to alleged abusers being kept informed of the internal
management of the case, as guided by the statutory authorities, which I understood to mean that I was being treated in the same way as an alleged abuser. No complaint has yet been brought against me under the Clergy Discipline Measure, but this correspondence did have the effect of leading to my being allowed back into ministry. Archbishop Sentamu wrote to me on this topic:

"...by your resignation as an Assistant Bishop in the Diocese of Oxford, this does not mean that your ministry as an ordained Bishop in the Church of God has come to an end. That can only be done by a prohibition for life and looking at the matters covered in the Gibb Report I cannot envisage how such a prohibition could be imposed by any Metropolitical Authority\(^6\) in England. Therefore my advice is that you should allow the dust to settle and apply for a PTO to the Bishop of Oxford in the new year. This will of course require you to apply for DBS clearance."

118. I have not, therefore, pressed the point about the unlawfulness of my having been effectively deprived of my ministry as an ordained Bishop without due process, and confined myself to asking for PTO (even though this had never formally been removed), which was granted on 23 January 2018 by the Bishop of Oxford.

Statement of Truth

I believe that the facts stated in this witness statement are true.

Signed: DPA

Lord Carey of Clifton

Dated: May 2\textsuperscript{nd} 2018

\(^6\) ie that pertaining to an Archbishop