

circumstances the story would have been laughable.

Peter's acceptance of a Police Caution therefore left many questions unanswered. Friends sensed, rightly so, it turned out that this had been under duress. The part played by [AN-A92] was inexplicably not publicised. In fact to the astonishment of those in the know he went on to become ordained. He is a convincing blagger, but did he achieve ordination by blackmail too? I believe the diocese of London needs to give account for ordaining a psychopath and sexual predator.

As Peter regained strength following his breakdown and whenever it was suggested to him that he should seek a review of the caution, his answer was always that it represented a kind of insurance that the matter would now rest and it was in accommodation to 'Holy Church' which he would not wish to see drawn into court.

I later heard from Brian Tyler's own mouth that George Carey and others were clearly most concerned to save their own skins. As Brother [Name Redacted] now in Australia said to me in 2013 'It sounds as though the Church of England sacrificed Peter' George Carey later tried to make amends for not supporting Peter more effectively by having him to stay as a guest.

It was evident that apart from the involvement of [AN-A92] Peter came to believe that in a number of instances he *had* behaved inappropriately or allowed inappropriate behaviour to go on unchecked and needed to repent and amend his ways.

This is further borne out in a letter published in the Church Times of 24 March 2016 quoting a primary source[a solicitor at the Police interview] for Peter's 'total honesty ['He sang like a canary']

As well as the formal statement that followed his caution, in conversation and in writing over the ensuing years he craved forgiveness and understanding from friends whom he repeatedly said he had let down. There is not the slightest suggestion that he committed any offences after the caution which I believe as a consequence was spent. On the 40th anniversary of his ordination at a service in Eastbourne in 1997 he yet again publicly apologised for his failures.

Bishop Kemp was adamant in his published memoirs and, as a canon lawyer no doubt chose his words with care and without fear of contradiction when in 2006 he attributed Peter's downfall to 'mischief makers.'

I remain personally convinced that a trial in 1993 would have exposed some of Peter's accusers to be exaggerating and at least one to have been a calculating fraud, as well as revealing some extenuating factors in any genuinely improper conduct on his part. I regret that this did not take place. I certainly was aware that the caution was considered at the time the best arrangement for the church if not for Peter. I am therefore not sure how something I and many others knew is now considered a 'secret deal?'

In 2008 I was looking for a move from my current parish to East Sussex. The Archdeacon of Lewes, Philip Jones, made this difficult for me in a number of ways with the result that I felt forced to finally give up in despair. The point about this which is relevant to the present enquiry is that Peter