

**ROYAL COMMISSION INTO INSTITUTIONAL
RESPONSES TO CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE**

**Public Hearing
(Day 21)**

Level 17, Governor Macquarie Tower
Farrer Place, Sydney

On Monday, 25 November 2013 at 10.00am

Before the Chair: Justice Peter McClellan AM
Before Commissioners: Justice Jennifer Coate
Mr Robert Fitzgerald AM

Counsel Assisting: Ms Gail Furness SC
Mr Simeon Beckett

1 <PATRICK COMBEN, on former oath: [10am]

2
3 <EXAMINATION BY MR BECKETT CONTINUING:
4

5 MR BECKETT: Q. Mr Comben, where we left things on
6 Friday, I think I was asking you some questions about the
7 response of the Diocese of Grafton to Mr Harrison's
8 substantial letter of 15 September 2006. Do you recall the
9 450 pages?

10 A. Yes, I do recall that.

11
12 Q. As I understand it, you read through all or at least
13 a substantial amount of that material that had been
14 provided by Mr Harrison?

15 A. I would have read it all.

16
17 Q. You prepared a schedule, didn't you?

18 A. Yes, I did.

19
20 Q. I will just show you a copy of that. Could tender
21 bundle 39 be brought up. It is in exhibit 3-2. If we go
22 to the second page, is that the schedule that you prepared?

23 A. Yes.

24
25 Q. If we go back to the first page, there is a letter
26 dated 26 September where you provided that schedule to
27 Mr Roland; is that correct?

28 A. That's correct.

29
30 Q. So do I take it that the schedule was prepared on or
31 before 26 September?

32 A. I think it took me a couple of days to read the
33 matters. Mr Beckett, may I also just clarify one matter
34 from the other day? You showed me Mr Campion's first
35 letter to us and there was some red underlining on it, and
36 I think I looked perplexed but said that's the sort of
37 thing I would have done. I think that red underlining was
38 done at the moment that this came in, because I saw on this
39 reference to Campbell Brown and then, for the first time,
40 went back to Mr Campion's original letter. I think that's
41 when it was done.

42
43 Q. Thank you for that clarification. As I understand it,
44 you provided a copy of this schedule to Mr Roland so that
45 it would assist with his work being done in processing of
46 the claims; that's right, isn't it?

47 A. Yes, sir.

1
2 Q. Did you provide a copy of that schedule in September
3 2006 to Bishop Slater?
4 A. I'm not sure. I didn't treat it within the office as
5 a highly confidential document. It would normally have
6 gone to the professional standards committee,
7 Bishop-in-Council and probably, more likely, I would have
8 spoken to it to Bishop Slater. But I'm not certain about
9 that.
10
11 Q. Let's deal with those other matters. Did you provide
12 a copy of that schedule to the professional standards
13 committee?
14 A. I believe so, yes.
15
16 Q. Who did you give it to?
17 A. The members of the professional standards committee.
18
19 Q. At a particular meeting?
20 A. I believe so. I don't have a clear recollection, but
21 that would be my normal practice.
22
23 Q. The reason I ask you that is because there is
24 a professional standards committee meeting on 21 November
25 where you do not appear to be present. We do not appear to
26 have any notes from professional standards committees after
27 September 2006 until 2007. Is it possible, then, that you
28 did not provide a copy of the schedule to the professional
29 standards committee at its meeting?
30 A. It is possible and it should be made clear that
31 perhaps the reason why there were not meetings of
32 professional standards committee was that, at that time, my
33 wife was being diagnosed with terminal illness and I was
34 away a fair bit.
35
36 Q. She was a member of the professional standards
37 committee at the time?
38 A. My wife?
39
40 Q. Yes.
41 A. My wife, who is now dead?
42
43 Q. I'm sorry. I apologise.
44 A. Yes, no. I was talking about Ms Catt, my later wife,
45 not my late wife.
46
47 Q. Thank you very much. All right. I apologise.

1 A. I'm not sure whether Ms Catt was or not.
2
3 Q. Mr Comben, we have the schedule at tender bundle 39.
4 You heard Mr Gerber's evidence earlier in the hearing. He
5 says he did not receive a copy of the schedule. Is that
6 your recollection as well?
7 A. I don't recollect him not receiving it, but by that
8 time I think --
9
10 Q. Do you remember providing it to him?
11 A. No, I do not.
12
13 Q. Is it likely, then, that you did not provide him
14 a copy of that particular schedule?
15 A. I would accept that that's probably so.
16
17 Q. Do you also accept that he did not receive a copy of
18 the 450-page compilation of documents that Mr Harrison had
19 provided to you?
20 A. I certainly accept that.
21
22 Q. So do I take it by that that by the time we get to
23 September 2006, you have received the substantial dossier
24 from Mr Harrison, but effectively you determined that the
25 matter would be dealt with within the Diocese of Grafton?
26 A. In terms of keeping at bay any common law claims, yes.
27
28 Q. Perhaps I should be a bit more specific: it would be
29 dealt with within the Grafton office of the Diocese of
30 Grafton without reference to the professional standards
31 director?
32 A. Certainly within the Grafton office. If we had
33 thought that we needed the professional standards director,
34 we would have called upon him.
35
36 Q. I wonder if exhibit 3-3, tab 1, the ordinance, could
37 be brought up, particularly clause 24. Just read clause 24
38 to yourself, Mr Comben.
39 A. Yes.
40
41 Q. You are aware, then, that the information in your
42 possession as a result of the material provided by
43 Mr Harrison fell within that particular clause, in the
44 sense that it comprised information?
45 A. Yes.
46
47 Q. And that you had an obligation under subclause 24(1)

1 to provide that information to the professional standards
2 committee?
3 A. Yes.
4
5 Q. I think you accepted a moment ago that you had not
6 provided that material to the professional standards
7 committee, at least in 2006?
8 A. I'm not sure that I accepted that. I accepted that
9 I don't have a recollection, but they would certainly have
10 been made aware of precisely what was in that.
11
12 Q. In any event, the professional standards director was
13 never brought into the process of dealing with these
14 particular claims, was he?
15 A. No.
16
17 Q. I wonder if SJH-15 could be brought up, please. Just
18 before we go to that, Mr Comben, you said that certainly in
19 2005 there had been a considerable amount of media with
20 respect to the group claim?
21 A. Yes.
22
23 Q. And that you felt, and the diocese felt, under quite
24 a deal of pressure as a result of that media in 2005?
25 A. And the conduct of the solicitors, yes.
26
27 Q. I think you said that you were not surprised when
28 Mr Harrison's letter dated 6 January arrived?
29 A. I said I was expecting it.
30
31 Q. And the press continued throughout 2006; that's
32 correct?
33 A. I think so, yes.
34
35 Q. I wonder if SJH-15 could be brought up. We've been
36 told that this was an interview that you gave to the
37 Northern Star on or about 26 September 2006?
38 A. I don't think that's correct.
39
40 Q. Please read it, and I will ask you about it.
41 A. Yes, I'm aware of it. I know.
42
43 Q. Do you accept that this is the transcript, or at least
44 a statement, of a number of quotes that you gave to the
45 Northern Star in or about September 2006?
46 A. I don't accept it's a transcript. It's a media
47 release.

1
2 Q. It's a media release?
3 A. Yes.
4
5 Q. Did you draft the media release?
6 A. Yes.
7
8 Q. And am I right about the date - it was about September
9 2006?
10 A. About, yes.
11
12 THE CHAIR: Q. And was it released?
13 A. Yes.
14
15 Q. And did the newspapers take it up?
16 A. Yes. I think it was my way of responding to some
17 material in the Northern Star. It was really my response,
18 I suppose, rather than a media - but it was a media
19 release, but I think --
20
21 Q. Before you released it, did you speak to the bishop
22 about it?
23 A. I would have done, yes. I had already done some media
24 in response to these claims, generally just giving
25 a factual background. I wouldn't have put out a media
26 release without talking to him, no - or response, maybe,
27 yes.
28
29 MR BECKETT: Q. Mr Comben, you say in that media release
30 at paragraph 3 that the claimants had:
31
32 *... substantial threshold legal and*
33 *responsibility questions [which] remain*
34 *totally unresolved.*
35
36 Do you see that?
37 A. Yes.
38
39 Q. You say that your "legal advice is clear" about those
40 hurdles?
41 A. Where do I say that? Where does it say --
42
43 Q. Sorry, that's the sixth paragraph.
44 A. Yes.
45
46 Q. Then you express concern:
47

1 *... that a number of people mentioned as*
2 *alleged perpetrators are not and never were*
3 *staff members of the home or even church*
4 *workers.*

5
6 A. Yes.

7
8 Q. And that:

9
10 *... many of whom are still living, named as*
11 *alleged perpetrators have a right to state*
12 *their response to the allegations and even*
13 *have their day in court.*

14
15 A. I was there following up on the ordinance, yes.

16
17 Q. And you then say that:

18
19 *There are ... substantial factual errors in*
20 *the material given to us about the home and*
21 *its management.*

22
23 Do you see that?

24 A. Yes.

25
26 Q. So do I take it from that that you were concerned to
27 cast some doubt about the strength of the claim to the
28 media, were you not?

29 A. I was at pains to ensure that people understood there
30 were two sides to the issue.

31
32 Q. And, as you did there, you wanted to do that by
33 casting doubt upon the strength of the claimants' claims;
34 is that correct?

35 A. I don't think that sort of thought went through me at
36 any stage, but certainly I wanted to say - because we were
37 still getting people from Lismore saying the home was
38 good - to say, yes, there are two sides to this.

39
40 THE CHAIR: Q. Had you at this stage spoken to anyone
41 who raised allegations that they were abused at the home?

42 A. No. I had corresponded with Mr Campion, obviously.

43
44 Q. Did it occur to you that perhaps you shouldn't be
45 talking in an argumentative way in the press until you had
46 been able to talk to these people?

47 A. No, we were responding to a very argumentative view,

1 a very bullying view, from the solicitors acting for the
2 other side, so I responded appropriately.

3

4 Q. So once into the fight, you stayed there; is that the
5 way it looks?

6 A. I think your Honour has summed it up, yes.

7

8 Q. Now, do you think that's the right way for the church
9 to respond to these sorts of things?

10 A. We still had not resolved in our minds the issue which
11 you raised, your Honour, on Friday afternoon about there
12 being a common law level and a pastoral level and that
13 I believe we were still at that stage looking at the common
14 law claim and the very threatening and powerful words, to
15 quote Mr Campion, of his own solicitors.

16

17 Q. What do you think now, on reflection?

18 A. Oh, I was wrong.

19

20 MR BECKETT: Q. One of the things you say is that:

21

22 *Increasingly I see these matters as being*
23 *a challenge to the very community of*
24 *Lismore.*

25

26 A. Yes.

27

28 Q. They are very strong words, are they not?

29 A. They were very true words.

30

31 Q. Well, they were true, but they were also likely to be
32 seen, were they not, by the claimants as an attack upon
33 their claims of sexual abuse at the home?

34 A. People of 60 or 80 years of age were coming to us and
35 saying, "That place was a good place. We've always
36 supported it."

37

38 Q. Mr Comben, I want to ask you about the effect upon the
39 claimants. I understand what you have to say about those
40 other people. I am asking you about the effect on the
41 claimants. Did you not think that that phrase, "Challenge
42 to the very community of Lismore", was to be an assault, if
43 you like, upon the claimants?

44 A. I did not perceive it in that way, so I did not.

45

46 Q. You say later on:

47

1 *Some of the matters complained of might*
2 *have been standard practice in Australia*
3 *some decades ago.*

4
5 A. Yes.

6
7 Q. "Some of the matters" - you haven't indicated what the
8 phrase "some of the matters" means?

9 A. No.

10
11 Q. It is possible, is it not, for a claimant who had
12 alleged child sexual abuse to interpret that as an attack
13 upon their account of child sexual abuse?

14 A. That's a very long bow.

15
16 Q. Well, "some of the matters" is not defined, is it?

17 A. No.

18
19 Q. And one of the matters that were being complained of
20 was not just physical or psychological abuse, but child
21 sexual abuse?

22 A. And the word "sexual" is not used there in any way.

23
24 Q. But by using a general phrase like "some of the
25 matters", it's possible, is it not, for a claimant who had
26 suffered from child sexual abuse to consider that you were
27 attacking their claim because that abuse was standard
28 practice at the time?

29 A. I know of no history where standard practice in
30 Australia has involved sexual abuse.

31
32 Q. But, Mr Comben, you didn't say that?

33 A. No.

34
35 THE CHAIR: Q. Mr Comben, I think we understand what you
36 say there, but can you just help the Commissioners: what
37 did you have in mind as being common practice?

38 A. Two matters particularly. One was that one of the
39 complaints was that kerosene had been used on a woman's
40 hair to get rid of nits. My understanding from around the
41 diocese was that it had been a standard practice. The
42 other was that someone had complained of having their hair
43 brushed roughly.

44
45 Q. Well, the complaints, of course, went way beyond that,
46 didn't they?

47 A. Yes, they certainly did. They certainly did, yes.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Q. Those two matters were at the margin of the complaints that you knew about, weren't they?

A. Yes.

Q. The complaints that you knew about extended to gross physical violence and sexual abuse, didn't they?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you think, perhaps, that in responding in that way, by just going to the margin, you might have been misleading?

A. No. I believe I was responding to Mr Harrison's view of keeping this group together so that some of those marginal claims were going to be lumped in with very clear, very extreme sexual abuse claims, and I was trying to say to people, "This covers a wide range", whereas Mr Harrison was clearly trying to keep it as a group, as I can understand the tactic was.

Q. So you saw this as a tactic, did you?

A. Well, responding to say that there's another side has to be described as a tactic, as a response.

Q. Do you think at this stage you were playing local community politics; is that what you were doing?

A. No.

Q. Well, when you talk about a "challenge to the community of Lismore" and "some of the matters", being the matters at the margin, do you think some people might think that you stepped into the world of local community politics?

A. It never occurred to me in any way of local community politics; maybe into the politics of the church against a legal claim, but not community, and I also had in my mind the individuals talking to us about it being a good facility. I believed I had a responsibility to respond to those and say, "Yes, we know that there was good about the home."

MR BECKETT: Q. In the penultimate paragraph on the page there, you say:

Some of the complaints being raised are a potential affront to all those individuals who willingly gave their time

1 *and money to a home that in their eyes did*
2 *an essential and great job.*

3
4 Do you see that?

5 A. Yes, yes.

6
7 Q. So essentially what you are saying there is that the
8 claims should not be put forward because of that affront to
9 those individuals who gave their time to work in the home?

10 A. I'm saying the ones at the margin, to use his Honour's
11 words, were ones which - certainly I was also mindful of
12 the Mrs Ezzy response to complaints that had been made
13 about her.

14
15 Q. Yes, but again, you used the words "some of the
16 complaints", without any differentiation as to which
17 complaints they could mean?

18 A. I would have thought that saying "some of the
19 complaints" was to say there are different groups. If
20 I had said "the complaints", I could understand your
21 argument, sir, but to say "some of the complaints" --

22
23 Q. But "some of the complaints" could also mean the most
24 serious complaints there as causing affront to those who
25 had worked in the home, could it not?

26 A. I again say that's a very long bow, which I never
27 dreamt of.

28
29 Q. Mr Comben, following this letter, I think there were
30 some representations received from Mr Harrison; in fact,
31 Mr Harrison was furious about this particular press
32 release, wasn't he?

33 A. I don't know what Mr Harrison felt, no. I have no
34 idea.

35
36 Q. Do you recall Mr Harrison threatening injunctive
37 proceedings with respect to this particular letter?

38 A. I do remember him threatening injunctive proceedings.
39 Was it about this letter? And he asked me to withdraw,
40 I think.

41
42 Q. Yes, and, in the end, you did, I understand?

43 A. Yes.

44
45 Q. And you advised Mr Roland that the release would be
46 withdrawn; is that correct?

47 A. Yes, yes, that's right.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Q. So you realised, did you not, that it had caused
affront to the claimants as a result of its release?

A. I realised Mr Harrison was upset.

THE CHAIR: Q. Mr Comben, just one further matter on the
press release. You talk about the complaints being an
affront to people who gave their time and money?

A. Yes.

Q. "In their eyes did an essential and great job" -
I take it there you are referring to members of the
community who gave of their time and money; is that right?

A. Very much so, sir.

Q. Sorry?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. So it is those people who told you it had done a great
job?

A. That the home had done a great job, yes, sir.

Q. Not ex-residents?

A. Oh, yes, there was a substantial amount of press done
by an ex-resident, who is a teacher in Ballina, who kept on
saying, "This is not right."

Q. We now know, of course, that that person wasn't
correct, don't we?

A. We do, indeed.

Q. What period of time was that person at the home?

A. I can't remember precisely, but during a period when -
I think it would have been the early '60s, when a number of
the complainants were also there.

THE CHAIR: Do we have any of that press?

MR BECKETT: We have some of that press in evidence.
I think there is crossover between - without mentioning the
person in open court - a number of siblings, as
I understand it, who were resident at the home, who were
prominent in the media in 2006, and there was crossover in
time with [CA], if not with Mr Campion, when they were
resident at the home.

THE CHAIR: So we have the press somewhere in the

1 material?

2

3 MR BECKETT: Yes, we do.

4

5 THE CHAIR: Could someone find that and let us know?

6

7 MR BECKETT: I'll have it found.

8

9 THE CHAIR: Mr Beckett, someone else can do that for us.
10 If one of your assistants there can find it for us, I would
11 like to see it.

12

13 MR BECKETT: Q. Mr Comben, as I understand it, then,
14 shortly afterwards you then took steps with Mr Roland to
15 brief first Mr Sheaffe and then Mr Blake as counsel to help
16 you on legal advice with respect to the claims?

17 A. Yes. To advise on liability, I think.

18

19 Q. By 21 and 22 November, we know now that Mr Harrison
20 had spoken to Mr McLary, the professional standards
21 director in Brisbane, who works reasonably closely with the
22 primate of the Anglican Church, and I understand that
23 Mr McLary called you on about 22 November 2006?

24 A. That's correct.

25

26 Q. Had you had any contact with the primate or with
27 Mr McLary before then about the North Coast Children's
28 Home?

29 A. I would have thought so. I can't remember specifics,
30 but I was certainly very conscious that they were very much
31 aware of the allegations being made, and Mr Rod McLary was
32 by no means a close personal friend, but I had had
33 substantial dealings with him while I was in Brisbane. We
34 had had some dealings with him at registrars conferences.
35 I think there had been some communication at some level
36 prior to that.

37

38 Q. I will show you a document; it is a file note to the
39 archbishop. It is RM-2, if that could be brought up,
40 please. If we could just scroll up.

41 A. Yes.

42

43 Q. Have you read that now?

44 A. Yes.

45

46 Q. As I understand it, Mr McLary called you to speak with
47 you about the state of negotiations, if you like, with

1 Mr Harrison and the group claims?
2 A. That's correct.
3
4 Q. You set out to him the position of the diocese as
5 at November 2006?
6 A. Yes, that's correct.
7
8 Q. He sets out a number of points with respect to those.
9 I will go through some of them. That the diocese had at
10 that time declined responsibility for the children's home.
11 That's the case, isn't it?
12 A. Where is that?
13
14 Q. The first dot point.
15 A. Yes.
16
17 Q. The statute of limitations issue had been raised?
18 A. Yes.
19
20 Q. And was being relied on?
21 A. Yes.
22
23 THE CHAIR: Q. Mr Comben, this file note is dated after
24 the letter of 10 October from Foott Law & Co, which is
25 SJH-19. That's the letter that attaches to it the material
26 that I understand you prepared by way of the "Response and
27 Facts on 'the Church Home'", "Diocese of Grafton"; do you
28 remember that collection of documents?
29 A. Yes.
30
31 Q. In those documents, you included the constitution of
32 the home?
33 A. Yes.
34
35 Q. Do you remember that?
36 A. Yes.
37
38 Q. And you know what I put to the diocesan solicitor
39 about the content of that?
40 A. I do.
41
42 Q. So by the time you were speaking to Mr McLary, you
43 knew of the legal structure of the home, didn't you?
44 A. I knew of its constitution, yes.
45
46 Q. You knew that the property was owned by the trustees,
47 being the trustees of the diocese?

1 A. Yes.
2
3 Q. And you knew that they were required to operate in
4 accordance with the relevant Church of England Trust
5 Property Act?
6 A. Yes.
7
8 Q. And you knew of the management structure of the
9 facility?
10 A. Yes.
11
12 Q. And the obligation for that management to be
13 conducted, effectively, by members of the church, didn't
14 you?
15 A. Yes.
16
17 Q. You also knew, of course, of the allegations that it
18 was ordained people who had committed some of the
19 atrocities in the facility?
20 A. Yes.
21
22 Q. When Mr McLary records you as saying to him, "It was
23 never owned by the church", was that accurate?
24 A. I believe it was and still do believe that.
25
26 Q. Never owned by the church?
27 A. No.
28
29 Q. Although the owners were the church's trustees?
30 A. And as Mr Roland said on Friday, as a bare trustee.
31
32 Q. Do you understand what that means?
33 A. Yes, a trustee that holds and has no other
34 responsibility; queried at times as to whether there is
35 ever a bare trustee.
36
37 Q. That's right, and the responsibility, of course, was
38 vested in the rector and the members of the management
39 committee, wasn't it?
40 A. Yes.
41
42 Q. They were all church people, bar a few?
43 A. Yes.
44
45 Q. The church, you still suggest, didn't have
46 responsibility for this facility?
47 A. The argument that we would have put at the time was

1 that whilst the organisation and its constitution put all
2 those links to the Anglican Church, the diocese, in actual
3 fact, when it was created originally, they had attempted to
4 have the church be the auspices or the owner. That had
5 been refused on a number of occasions for a decade and
6 a half and that whatever was in the constitution, it was
7 still necessary that in whatever the linkage, the diocese
8 had to accept that, which it never did. And we would --

9
10 Q. I understand the legal argument. I want to take you
11 to a different question.

12 A. Yes, sir.

13
14 Q. It is crystal clear that although there is a legal
15 argument - you have just sought to adumbrate it - the
16 responsibility of the church, in the practical sense, is
17 made plain by the constitution, isn't it?

18 A. Having listened to the evidence on Friday and the
19 argument you are putting, I am coming to that view more and
20 more.

21
22 Q. That's the first step in this. The second step is
23 that you knew that some of the alleged abusers were
24 actually ordained members of the church, didn't you?

25 A. Yes, I did.

26
27 Q. Did that not raise in your mind, irrespective of the
28 common law position, that the church that you were acting
29 for must accept at least some responsibility for the damage
30 that was said to have been done to these people?

31 A. Yes, it did.

32
33 Q. And did that not mean that, in your mind, in the way
34 that you advised those who you were helping, you had to say
35 to them, "We have to put aside the legal situation; we have
36 to, in an exercise of Christian charity, now sit down with
37 these people and do what we can to help them"; did that
38 cross your mind?

39 A. Yes, it did.

40
41 Q. What did you do to meet that obligation?

42 A. We did very little, because of the difficulties with
43 Mr Harrison. We did nothing, because of the difficulties
44 with Mr Harrison.

45
46 Q. When you say "difficulties with Mr Harrison", it would
47 have been an easy thing for you, wouldn't it, to say,

1 "Look, we understand the legal position. We can debate the
2 legal position, but we are the church and we understand
3 that we have some responsibility here. We also understand
4 that it is said that people have been seriously damaged by
5 what we have done as the church"?

6 A. Yes.

7

8 Q. "Can we sit down and talk to you now about how we can
9 properly help these people"; did that occur to you?

10 A. In a form, yes. Was it crystal clear and did it
11 materialise? No.

12

13 Q. You see, you would have known, as you say, that the
14 fight was joined, that the solicitors acting for these
15 people had an obligation to seek out, as much as they
16 could, a position where, if you were choosing to bargain in
17 a legal context, they could do the best they could for
18 their clients?

19 A. Yes.

20

21 Q. You understood that, didn't you?

22 A. Yes.

23

24 Q. Wasn't it your obligation to put that to one side and
25 say, "Look, we understand that we could debate this through
26 lawyers, but we, as a church, have an obligation to sit
27 down and talk to you now to do what we can to help these
28 people"?

29 A. And what coloured our response was the belief, which
30 we later knew, that the advice being given by Mr Harrison
31 to his clients was far in excess of the expectations that
32 we could have hoped to have got if we had said, "Look, we
33 owe you some obligations. Strip out the priests; deal with
34 those separately, and let's talk about the others."
35 I don't know what the response or the outcome of that would
36 have been, but that was clearly in front of us.

37

38 Q. Was not the obligation, however we frame it, to do
39 what you could to help these people recover from the damage
40 that had been done to them?

41 A. Yes, as we had done in the cases before this group,
42 yes.

43

44 Q. And if that was going to cost a lot of money, then
45 wasn't it the church's obligation to meet that cost?

46 A. Yes.

47

1 MR BECKETT: Your Honour, my instructing solicitor has
2 been able to locate two of the articles. Could 34AA and
3 34AC be brought up, please. AA is dated 17 June. AC is
4 dated 30 June.
5
6 THE CHAIR: That headline is not a good start to what you
7 were looking at.
8
9 THE WITNESS: No, your Honour.
10
11 MR BECKETT: Q. Could we scroll down. In the next
12 article there is reference - in the fourth paragraph, and
13 then halfway through the next column as well.
14
15 THE CHAIR: Q. Ms O'Neill was in charge at what period
16 of time?
17 A. About the '60s to early mid '80s.
18
19 MR BECKETT: Matron Martin was there, I think, from the
20 1940s through to the end of the 1950s.
21
22 THE CHAIR: Yes, very well. So is that what we've been
23 able to find?
24
25 MR BECKETT: Yes. There is also a mention in 34AC, if
26 that could be brought up, which is a letter to the editor
27 from [CA] responding to those who spoke favourably about
28 their experience at the home.
29
30 THE CHAIR: Very well. So we've been able to find one
31 article; is that right?
32
33 MR BECKETT: I think we haven't put in all the media;
34 there was a substantial amount of media that we were able
35 to locate.
36
37 THE CHAIR: Before we write a report about this, we should
38 identify all of those.
39
40 MR BECKETT: Yes.
41
42 Q. If we can then return to RM-2, this is the
43 conversation with Mr McLary that you had?
44 A. Yes.
45
46 Q. Essentially, Mr Comben, at the end of this, the
47 position put to Mr McLary by you was that the diocese was

1 opposing the claim and you were concerned about the
2 approach taken by Mr Harrison to the prosecution, if you
3 like, of the claims; is that correct?

4 A. That's correct.

5
6 Q. There is just thing I want to clear up. It says:

7
8 *42 complainants have come forward and all*
9 *except eight relate to disciplinary matters*
10 *rather than sexual abuse.*

11
12 Do you see that?

13 A. Yes.

14
15 Q. Do you accept, based on the schedule that you
16 prepared, that in fact the number of sexual abuse matters
17 was 20 of the 42, not 8 of the 42?

18 A. Yes, I think the eight actually refers to
19 cleric-related matters.

20
21 Q. Why were you making that distinction?

22 A. Because I wanted to get the clerics. I was very
23 conscious of all that.

24
25 Q. You didn't seem to include the other 12 matters as
26 being serious matters of sexual abuse, did you?

27 A. This is a relating of Mr McLary's conversation.
28 I would have thought I would have said eight of them
29 concern clergy, but I have noticed somewhere else I used
30 the term eight as well. But there were 20 in the schedule,
31 yes.

32
33 Q. By not telling him about --

34 A. Well, I'm not accepting that I didn't tell him.

35
36 Q. Sorry, let me ask the question, first. By not telling
37 him that there were in fact 20 matters of sexual abuse,
38 were you trying to downplay the seriousness of the claim?

39 A. No. I don't accept that that's all that I said.
40 I think I would have said half of them would have been
41 sexual abuse. I generally had three figures in my head:
42 half were disciplinary; half were involving sexual matters;
43 and eight involved clergy.

44
45 Q. But you accept that you did not tell him that 20 of
46 the 40 involved sexual abuse?

47 A. No, I don't. No, I don't accept that.

1
2 Q. Sorry, you don't accept that?
3 A. No. He's done a very good job of redacting the
4 conversation as far as I remember it, but I would have said
5 half - I think it is more likely that I expanded on the
6 eight and that hasn't been related in there.
7
8 Q. Mr Comben, following this particular conversation with
9 Mr McLary, were you aware that Bishop Slater and
10 Archbishop Aspinall spoke on or about 24 November?
11 A. Yes.
12
13 Q. What did he tell you about that conversation?
14 A. Who is "he"?
15
16 Q. Sorry, what did Bishop Slater tell you about the
17 conversation with Archbishop Aspinall?
18 A. He told me that - there were a number of conversations
19 from there on, so I'm going to have trouble remembering
20 that specific one, but it was that set of dot points, which
21 has been raised and adduced in evidence previously, that we
22 should be approaching this with Christian concern, why were
23 these matters of limitations being raised - that type of
24 thing.
25
26 Q. Let's go to SJH-28, Dr Aspinall's letter to
27 Bishop Slater of 8 December.
28 A. Yes.
29
30 Q. That's the letter I think you were referring to
31 a moment ago, where Dr Aspinall set out six principles that
32 he hoped --
33 A. Yes.
34
35 Q. -- Bishop Slater would adopt; is that correct?
36 A. Yes, and I think that was the purport of what
37 Bishop Slater had said to me about talking to him,
38 Dr Aspinall.
39
40 Q. Up until this stage, 8 December, there had been some
41 discussions within the diocese about settlement
42 negotiations, some form of conference or meeting with
43 Mr Harrison to discuss the claims, hadn't there?
44 A. That meeting was being prosecuted very strongly by
45 Mr Harrison, yes.
46
47 Q. But you were considering it and --

1 A. Yes.
2
3 Q. Were you favourably disposed to having such a meeting
4 or you didn't want to have such a meeting; what was your
5 position?
6 A. I was favourably disposed, as long as the two arms,
7 one of liability and one of quantum, could be dealt with.
8
9 Q. You had received a draft letter from Garth Blake SC,
10 which he had advised should be sent to the other side about
11 a way forward, hadn't you?
12 A. Yes.
13
14 Q. I can take you to the letter if you like, but do you
15 accept that in that letter he did not include liability as
16 one of the matters to be the subject of negotiation or
17 facilitation between the parties?
18 A. I think that point was missed on me because
19 Mr Blake SC had given advice that we were not liable.
20
21 Q. I will take you to the letter. It is in the tender
22 bundle 3-2, tab 50. He had provided a letter denying
23 liability - that's mentioned there on the page - and also
24 a without prejudice, inviting the alleged victims to
25 participate in the pastoral care and assistance scheme of
26 the Diocese of Grafton; do you see that?
27 A. Yes.
28
29 Q. If we go through to the next page, that's the letter
30 concerning denial of liability?
31 A. Yes.
32
33 Q. If we then move quickly on to the third page?
34 A. Yes.
35
36 Q. Do you see at (c) there that one of the purposes of
37 the process of facilitation was to make a recommendation to
38 the diocese as to counselling and apology and financial
39 assistance; do you see that?
40 A. Yes.
41
42 Q. There is no mention in there, is there, about the
43 facilitators actually taking into account the issue of
44 liability?
45 A. No. It's a without prejudice letter.
46
47 Q. Indeed. As a result of this, as I understand it, and

1 together with the primate's letter of 8 December, you gave
2 instructions to Mr Roland to write back to Mr Harrison;
3 that's correct, isn't it?
4 A. Yes.
5
6 Q. If we can bring up SJH-31. Have you read that now?
7 A. Yes.
8
9 Q. First of all, dealing with the principles, on page 1
10 over to page 2, there are five principles set out there.
11 Do I take it from their terms that they are an adoption, at
12 least in part, of what the primate had suggested be adopted
13 by the Diocese of Grafton?
14 A. Yes.
15
16 Q. I note that one of them with respect to access to
17 court processes has been amended?
18 A. Yes.
19
20 Q. Particularly paragraph 4. Do you see that?
21 A. Yes.
22
23 Q. That's in contrast to what Dr Aspinall said, where he
24 said one of the principles was an assurance that the
25 claimants have recourse to legal advice and court processes
26 at any time and that the diocese would do nothing to stand
27 in their way.
28 A. I don't see that as being inconsistent with that.
29
30 Q. Did you include those words so as not to stand in the
31 way of the diocese taking a position on the limitations
32 question?
33 A. I don't know why it was put in there. I think I was
34 certainly looking to protect Bishop-in-Council and the
35 diocese from the open-endedness which Archbishop
36 Dr Aspinall was referring to.
37
38 Q. So you were concerned that the principle that he had
39 espoused was too favourable to the claimants; is that what
40 you are saying?
41 A. It may have ratcheted the claimants up to another
42 level, yes.
43
44 Q. There is a file note there from Mr Roland, and you
45 probably heard his evidence; he said that he received
46 instructions from you to put clause 4 in those particular
47 words?

1 A. I think that's right.

2

3 Q. Then there are two options that are provided in that
4 letter. The first involves counselling, acknowledgment and
5 an appropriate pastoral response - although that is not set
6 out --

7 A. No.

8

9 Q. -- past medical expenses, reasonable legal costs and
10 modest ex gratia payment "for the clients' inconvenience in
11 those matters". Do you see that?

12 A. Yes.

13

14 Q. Those words "inconvenience in those matters" - what
15 was that a reference to?

16 A. I have no idea. I think it could have been modest
17 ex gratia payment for the clients, full stop.

18

19 Q. Was "inconvenience" in some way a reference to the
20 harm done by child sexual abuse to the claimants?

21 A. Not that I know of. No, not that I know of.

22

23 Q. Do you see that it might be taken as such, on reading
24 this letter?

25 A. It could be, yes.

26

27 Q. Did you consider the effect that such terminology
28 would have upon the claimants when you instructed Mr Roland
29 to write this letter to Mr Harrison?

30 A. I think I would have concentrated on the modest
31 ex gratia payment for the clients, trying to find a form of
32 words which did not put it up to a level which Mr Harrison
33 was talking about, but that would be reasonable. I don't
34 think I would have even noticed "inconvenience in these
35 matters" - I don't think I would have written that. It's
36 not a word I would normally use.

37

38 Q. Then in the second part, there is what appears to be
39 an adaptation of what Mr Blake had suggested to you; is
40 that right?

41 A. I think that's right, yes.

42

43 Q. And you will see at (d) that it includes:

44

45 *... the facilitators may consider the*
46 *prospects of the claim's success, the delay*
47 *in making the claim and any other factor*

1 *they consider appropriate in making the*
2 *recommendation.*

3
4 Do you see that?

5 A. Yes.

6
7 Q. You would agree that that was added in to the letter
8 that Garth Blake had suggested the diocese write?

9 A. Yes.

10
11 Q. Why was that?

12 A. To ensure that still in front of the claimants, and
13 particularly their solicitors, was the fact that we were
14 not going to just immediately go to a common law level of
15 claim, that the claim would be one at a lower base.

16
17 Q. So essentially by the time we get to 14 December, the
18 diocese is maintaining its position of questioning the
19 issue of liability; that's right?

20 A. By 14 December, the diocese was doing two things:
21 one, maintaining its legal position as to liability; and,
22 the second, talking about settlement.

23
24 Q. But in terms of settlement, the settlement wasn't on
25 the basis of putting the liability issues to one side; it
26 was including all of those matters as part of the
27 settlement negotiations?

28 A. That's what we believed to be a reasonable settlement.

29
30 Q. And you understand that that's quite a different
31 approach to --

32 A. Absolutely.

33
34 Q. -- facilitation or settlement of proceedings?

35 A. Yes.

36
37 Q. And it's one that creates additional pressure upon the
38 claimants because they have to clear that hurdle if they
39 are going to convince the Diocese of Grafton to provide
40 some form of financial settlement?

41 A. Yes.

42
43 Q. Then some five or so days after that letter, you went
44 into settlement negotiations at the diocesan centre; is
45 that correct?

46 A. That is how you could frame it, yes.

47

1 Q. Would you frame it in some other way?

2 A. We were bullied into having a meeting with
3 Simon Harrison, where we said we wanted to discuss the two
4 matters and he tried to put the one matter aside
5 immediately.

6
7 Q. Mr Comben, when you say you were bullied into those
8 matters, you said earlier today, I thought, that the
9 diocese was quite open to having some form of settlement
10 negotiations with Mr Harrison; is that not right?

11 A. Yes.

12
13 Q. And, in fact, you had indicated to Mr McLary that you
14 were open to having such?

15 A. Yes.

16
17 Q. So in fact you were open to having those matters and
18 weren't in fact bullied into having the settlement
19 negotiations?

20 A. Certainly a lot of pressure was put on us to have them
21 at that time and, secondly, to get rid of one arm of it.

22
23 Q. As I understand it, when the discussions commenced,
24 you were in the room where the negotiations were to take
25 place with your feet on a chair, were you not?

26 A. Yes.

27
28 Q. And were you also reading a book?

29 A. I had a book there to read, yes.

30
31 Q. You didn't want to be there; is that correct?

32 A. I had told Mr Roland that I did not want to be part of
33 the liability questions, but I wanted to be there
34 eventually for the quantum questions. The seating was in
35 a stepped system, so that I was actually seated probably at
36 that door away, but I could hear. My legs on a chair were
37 under the table. I had a book with me, and I was turned
38 away, so I could hear but not be part of it.

39
40 Q. Mr Comben, you would understand, would you not, that
41 any person entering into those sorts of settlement
42 negotiations with a party who was sitting in a corner, if
43 you like, or some way away from the settlement tables,
44 might be seen as dismissive, or contemptuous even, of those
45 negotiations?

46 A. Of the solicitor involved, yes, I had my private views
47 about what was going on, and I have kept those private

1 views to myself ever since, but they were very strong.
2
3 Q. Given the nature of the claims of Mr Harrison's
4 clients, did you not consider that such an approach to
5 those settlement negotiations might reflect poorly upon the
6 Diocese of Grafton?
7 A. I didn't think he would have taken any notice of me.
8 He was negotiating with two solicitors at the far end of
9 the table.
10
11 Q. He wouldn't take any notice of you?
12 A. Yes.
13
14 Q. Are you serious about that answer?
15 A. Well, I think at the time I was, yes.
16
17 Q. Mr Comben, you were the registrar of the Diocese of
18 Grafton, were you not?
19 A. Yes.
20
21 Q. You were providing instructions to Mr Roland about the
22 carriage of this particular matter?
23 A. Yes.
24
25 Q. That was known, at least as far as you knew, to
26 Mr Harrison, wasn't it?
27 A. Yes.
28
29 Q. How could he not consider your presence in that
30 meeting to be of substantial importance?
31 A. He was told that he was negotiating on the matter of
32 liability with Mr Fahey and Mr Roland and that I was down
33 the other end and I was just listening.
34
35 Q. Did you think that that sort of behaviour might have
36 made its way back to the claimants concerned?
37 A. It never occurred to me that it would, in the same way
38 as I wouldn't have thought his behaviour would have got
39 back to the claimants.
40
41 Q. Mr Comben, he was under an obligation, wasn't he, to
42 indicate not just what the settlement amounts were but also
43 the way in which the parties, including particularly the
44 Diocese of Grafton, was negotiating that matter?
45 A. And he was under an obligation to put his clients'
46 case, not the matter of the costs of his firm.
47

1 Q. Mr Comben, it sounds, from what you have just said,
2 that there was a considerable degree of antipathy between
3 you and Mr Harrison; is that not right?
4 A. There was indeed.
5
6 Q. Did you not consider that it was an appropriate
7 Christian response to attempt to at least rise above that
8 for the good of the claimants?
9 A. I had been trying that for six months.
10
11 Q. Well, this was the first time that you had actually
12 sat down with Mr Harrison, wasn't it?
13 A. Yes.
14
15 Q. So this was the best occasion at which you could
16 indicate to Mr Harrison that notwithstanding the sparring
17 that had occurred on the issue of liability, the diocese
18 was willing to come to a reasonable settlement which would
19 provide at least some reasonable financial recompense to
20 the claimants?
21 A. But our challenge was if some reasonable --
22
23 Q. Well, is that right or not?
24 A. Say it again, please?
25
26 Q. This was the best occasion at which you could indicate
27 to Mr Harrison that notwithstanding the sparring that had
28 occurred on the issue of liability, the diocese was willing
29 to come to a reasonable settlement which would provide at
30 least some reasonable financial recompense to the
31 claimants?
32 A. I could do that if the reasonable settlement and
33 reasonable recompense to the claimants was being honestly
34 looked at from the other side, yes.
35
36 THE CHAIR: Q. What do you mean by "honestly looked at
37 from the other side"? I understand the context of this:
38 there is a lawyer who starts off from the position of an
39 understanding of common law damages, which would have been
40 his position, I assume you understood?
41 A. Yes, very much so.
42
43 Q. It's not unreasonable for a lawyer to start from that
44 position, is it?
45 A. No.
46
47 Q. The church's obligation - assuming it was confident

1 that there was no capacity for a court to determine common
2 law liability, wasn't the church's responsibility to make
3 sure that it provided adequately for those who had been
4 damaged in these circumstances?

5 A. Yes. It was the interpretation of the word
6 "adequately".

7
8 Q. You knew by this stage, of course, that around
9 Australia, various processes had been devised by the
10 churches, including your own --

11 A. Yes.

12
13 Q. -- to provide levels of counselling, support and
14 monetary compensation, didn't you?

15 A. Yes.

16
17 Q. That might have been a good starting point, do you
18 think, for your discussion?

19 A. Well, had we been able to get to that discussion
20 without it being effectively the common law thrust that was
21 put upon us all the time. That's what we were trying to
22 get off the table.

23
24 Q. Here was your first chance to talk about the common
25 law position and for you to contribute to that discussion
26 by saying, reasonably, "We understand why you start there,
27 but the lawyers tell us there are these problems. But the
28 church is prepared, nevertheless, to address in
29 a responsible way what will be adequate to provide for
30 these people." That was your chance, wasn't it, to do
31 that?

32 A. Yes. I don't believe, the way that settlement
33 conference started, that that opportunity was going to be
34 given in any way.

35
36 Q. Well, I have been a lawyer for a long time.

37 A. Yes, sir.

38
39 Q. Many settlement conferences start with people a long
40 way apart, but if they are sensible, responsible and
41 approach the matter with a proper mind, they generally come
42 to a result which is satisfactory. Have you not had that
43 experience?

44 A. Yes, I have had that experience, and I fully agree
45 with you. Whether it was two bulls in a china shop, but
46 neither of us appeared to be likely to give way and nor was
47 there a middle course. I think, in truth, both Mr Harrison

1 and I embarrassed both his assistants and I embarrassed my
2 legal representatives, yes.

3

4 Q. I have the sense - tell me if I'm wrong - that you
5 approached this meeting on the basis that there was no hope
6 of achieving anything by way of a reasonable settlement; is
7 that right?

8 A. I think that's probably putting it a bit high, but
9 I was pretty dubious, and when Mr Harrison opened by
10 saying, "There's no question of liability. We have
11 provided all our stuff. Now let's go to quantum", at that
12 moment I realised there was no hope of reaching
13 a settlement.

14

15 Q. I just say to you again, I have seen many conferences
16 start that way that end up with a satisfactory resolution,
17 but I take it you were happy to operate on the basis that
18 there was no chance?

19 A. I was certainly not happy, because I had actually said
20 to a number of people that we had a chance of getting
21 a resolution. I was so upset by the first few moments that
22 I left the room, and I think it was a good job I left the
23 room.

24

25 Q. When did you leave the diocese? I know you have told
26 us. I have forgotten.

27 A. I think I resigned as registrar in late 2009, but
28 I was immediately asked to stay on as some sort of business
29 adviser. I'm not aware that what is in evidence from the
30 later registrar - that I left not on good terms - has any
31 substance to it at all. I know of nothing about that.

32

33 MR BECKETT: Q. At the end of the settlement conference,
34 Mr Comben, I think the parties were apart in the sense that
35 the diocese - I'm sorry, I should have asked you about the
36 comment that Mr Harrison made. You mentioned that there
37 was a considerable degree of antipathy between Mr Harrison
38 and yourself. Do I take it that you would agree with his
39 recollection of the conference where you used the words,
40 "Bring it on"?

41 A. I think later in the day, yes.

42

43 Q. That was an indication, was it, that you were willing
44 to defend any proceedings that the claimants wished to
45 bring?

46 A. It was the rebuttal of his statement, "Well, if you
47 are not going to settle here, we will just see you in

1 court." "All right, bring it on."

2

3 Q. At the end of the settlement conference, in any event,
4 you had increased the offer, I think, from \$5,000 to
5 \$10,000 per party, per claimant, and then eventually to
6 \$600,000?

7 A. Yes, I noticed that was adduced in evidence about
8 individual figures. I think they must have been done
9 afterwards, because I think we always had an in globo
10 figure. I don't remember it being - and I would have found
11 it very odd if we were dealing with the same amount of
12 money for everyone, so I think it was always an in globo
13 figure.

14

15 Q. So by the end of the second day, 20 December 2006, the
16 diocese had offered \$750,000 to settle all the claims; is
17 that correct?

18 A. Yes.

19

20 THE CHAIR: Q. How did you arrive at your in globo
21 figure?

22 A. It was the amount of money which we potentially had
23 available. It was as simple as that. I had to face some
24 fairly strong questioning at the next Bishop-in-Council as
25 to where I was going to find the money.

26

27 Q. Do you think, on reflection, that was the right way
28 for the church to approach the individual circumstances of
29 the particular claimants?

30 A. No. No.

31

32 MR BECKETT: Q. Why is that? Why do you say that?

33 A. Well, for all the - firstly, just from the legalistics
34 of the different amounts of harm, et cetera. But,
35 secondly, I think always in my mind was the belief that
36 certainly the clergy, which I had never in my own mind
37 denied any sort of liability for - the settlements for that
38 should have been considerably higher. And it should have
39 been done on the basis of the needs of the claimants rather
40 than the ability of the diocese to pay. And yet they were
41 my instructions.

42

43 Q. You didn't put that alternative way of assessing
44 matters to Mr Harrison, did you?

45 A. No. No.

46

47 Q. If, in fact, the process under the protocol had been

1 adopted, one of the things it could have done is take into
2 account those very things, that is to say, the individual
3 circumstances of a claimant?

4 A. I would hope that the good that will come out of these
5 proceedings is that that sort of process will now be able
6 to be adopted and bring closure, but we may - we got it
7 wrong at the time.

8

9 THE CHAIR: Q. Who gave you the instructions?

10 A. Bishop-in-Council. I don't think the instructions
11 changed from the time when it was a case of "Defend it".
12 There was still considerable concern about the level of
13 money. Even at the time, a month or two later, when it
14 closed, I was asked what would happen if there were further
15 claimants coming forward, and I think Mr Roland and
16 I looked at each other and said, "Well, deal with them", or
17 whatever, or we can just say the file is closed, and that's
18 actually what eventually happened. That was in the middle
19 of Bishop-in-Council. There was no questioning of that.

20

21 Q. You were a member of Bishop-in-Council?

22 A. Yes.

23

24 Q. Did you argue, in the meetings of the
25 Bishop-in-Council, that this was the wrong way to go?

26 A. No, I didn't, nor did anyone else. And I think, in
27 hindsight, your Honour is totally right: I think had I -
28 I'll put two propositions. One, had I just gone with even
29 the Sydney scheme, which I suspect Mr Harrison would not
30 have accepted, then the amount of money involved in that
31 would have been huge and wouldn't have been acceptable to
32 Bishop-in-Council. Secondly, I just think - well, yes,
33 I think that's what I would leave it at. It was always the
34 amount of money that was involved that was the problem.

35

36 Q. Was it ever discussed with you, either in
37 Bishop-in-Council or with the bishop or anyone else, that
38 you might ask the national church to assist in resolving
39 the financial issue that lay behind the thinking of
40 Bishop-in-Council?

41 A. I think that question is properly put to the bishop,
42 because most dealings with the national church were by him.
43 But we had, during this period, a registrars conference in
44 Grafton, which I and the office hosted for a couple of
45 days. People were aware of that. I don't suppose at any
46 point I asked anyone, but there was just this acceptance of
47 there being the Great Walls of China around the dioceses:

1 you kept other people out interfering; therefore, it was
2 pretty hard to get them in when you wanted help. I don't
3 think there was much discussion about it. And where would
4 the money have come from? Some of the bigger dioceses that
5 have since bailed out Grafton would have had some money,
6 but there was no national church pool, as such.

7
8 MR BECKETT: Q. Mr Comben, I want to ask you some
9 questions, restricting this to the issue of contact with
10 police and disciplinary processes. If I start with
11 Mr Campion, he had written to you on 29 August 2005?

12 A. Yes.

13
14 Q. Those portions of his letter that you said you
15 underlined a moment ago indicated that he was making
16 allegations against both Reverend Morgan and with respect
17 to child sexual abuse against Reverend Campbell Brown?

18 A. Yes.

19
20 Q. I take it you understood that in August 2005?

21 A. Why in August?

22
23 Q. That's when the letter was received, as I understand
24 it.

25 A. In 2005?

26
27 Q. Correct?

28 A. I said in evidence on Friday that I read that letter
29 once and I was so hurt by it, I didn't read it again.
30 I think I missed that Campbell Brown was there and that's
31 why later - I noticed Reverend Morgan.

32
33 Q. With respect, I'm not sure that's correct. If PG-18
34 could be brought up, please.

35 A. "Of the clergy you mentioned", all right, I probably
36 did, but I don't remember two.

37
38 Q. Do you see the last line in the fourth paragraph
39 there?

40 A. Yes, "the clergy you mentioned", yes. That's plural,
41 yes.

42
43 Q. "One of the clergy you mentioned"?

44 A. Yes.

45
46 Q. What was the distinction between the two clergy?

47 A. In height or - I don't understand the question.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Q. You agreed with me a moment ago that the allegations were physical abuse and psychological abuse, I think, with respect to Reverend Morgan and then sexual abuse with respect to Reverend Campbell Brown?

A. Yes.

Q. You say:

This will let me progress matters towards at least internal discipline towards one of the clergy you mentioned.

Were you making a distinction there between sexual as opposed to physical and psychological abuse?

A. I have no recollection of that.

Q. Can you recall why you were making a distinction between the two clergy?

A. I can only assume that one of them - if I picked up the fact that one of them was sexual, I would have been looking for internal discipline towards that person.

Q. But in terms of physical abuse, you were not concerned about there being any appropriate disciplinary matters that should take place as a result of that abuse?

A. I would have been very concerned.

Q. Well, you seem to have --

A. I have made a distinction, yes. I don't know why I made the distinction, but I would have been after the guy that did the sexual matters.

Q. This letter is dated 2 October 2005. What steps, if any, did you take to refer these allegations against Reverend Brown to the police?

A. I did two things. I spoke to a local senior officer, in Grafton who I met at a social occasion, and said, "What should I do with these" or "this", and his advice was to talk to a sexual complaints unit, which I did the next day.

Q. Who was that, or where was that unit?

A. I think it was in Newcastle. And --

Q. Who was the officer you spoke to?

A. Don't know.

1 Q. Did you take a note?
2 A. No.
3
4 Q. Why not?
5 A. Well, I say "no". It hasn't been adduced in evidence,
6 but there could have been a note on the file.
7
8 Q. Mr Comben, we have searched high and low for these
9 sorts of matters, and there seems to be no note, certainly
10 in the Diocese of Grafton. Do you recall writing one?
11 A. No, no.
12
13 Q. Let me put it this way: is there any reason why you
14 would not have formally referred such a matter to the
15 police, irrespective of where they were?
16 A. Yes, because of the advice I received from Newcastle.
17
18 Q. Was not to put it in writing?
19 A. At that moment, I told them what was happening and
20 said, "We're expecting a number of things." He said,
21 "Well, when that occurs, get it down to us then. Have you
22 got any statements?" "No, I haven't got any statements.
23 I've got one matter from one of the complainants, the
24 victims." He said, "Well, wait until you get your stuff
25 together and get it down to us."
26
27 Q. Do you recall a specific conversation or is that your
28 recollection?
29 A. That's my recollection.
30
31 Q. So you are saying the police were leaving it up to you
32 to provide additional material to them once you had
33 gathered it; is that correct?
34 A. And I think I was at that stage saying, "It's supposed
35 to have been coming since March, so it's not going to be
36 far", and he said, "That's good stuff, get it." I have
37 always had the view that it was actually that officer that
38 responded to me from Mr Gerber's stuff.
39
40 Q. Mr Comben, there are a couple of things that I want to
41 raise with you about that. First of all, you are aware
42 that the police, in terms of serious matters, serious
43 criminal matters, invariably ask those who are in
44 possession of the information who might want to go through
45 disciplinary processes or conduct their own investigation -
46 ask those parties, that is, the discipliners, if you like,
47 to cease investigation so that the police can carry out

1 their work in an unfettered way?
2 A. Yes.
3
4 Q. You are saying the reverse happened in this case and
5 that the police deferred to you and said, "Provide us with
6 any more additional information you get, and then we will
7 look at whether we will actually commence an investigation
8 or not"; is that what you are saying?
9 A. I don't think that's a reversal. That's consistent.
10 We were having a reasonably informal discussion as to what
11 we should be doing, and I think I put it to the officer,
12 "Look, we're waiting for these statements. Do I have to
13 then get this stuff down to you, because they've got
14 solicitors acting for them?" "When are you going to get
15 it?" "We're waiting for it shortly." "All right, get it
16 down to us."
17
18 Q. If we move then to September 2006, you had the
19 450-page dossier. You had set that out in a detailed
20 schedule, hadn't you?
21 A. Yes.
22
23 Q. Tender bundle 39.
24 A. Yes, I think that wasn't in September. I think it
25 would have been a bit later. It took me a while to read
26 them.
27
28 Q. Mr Comben, you agreed with my question earlier that
29 you had conveyed this schedule to Mr Roland on 26 September
30 2006?
31 A. Oh, did I? Right, yes, sorry.
32
33 Q. In September 2006, you knew from that schedule -
34 perhaps if that could be brought up, please, tender
35 bundle 39. Mr Comben, I have an unredacted version of this
36 particular document, if that would assist you.
37 A. No.
38
39 Q. In any event, you can see that in the sixth column
40 from the left, the alleged perpetrators are set out there,
41 against the type of abuse; do you see that?
42 A. Yes.
43
44 Q. What steps did you take in September to refer these
45 allegations of child sexual abuse to the police?
46 A. I waited until the professional standards committee
47 meeting in November.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Q. Let's go to that meeting, then. I wonder if --

A. Could I ask a question about the document in front of me? There is a [CN] there. It is not on the list of pseudonyms that I have. Would someone be able to pass me a name?

Q. Yes. I will just check the orders perhaps during the break. In any event, Mr Comben, you had in this table a number of allegations of child sexual abuse. In fact, I think you had 20 individuals who had been sexually abused, some of them multiple times. What did you do in September to refer them to the police?

A. I made a phone call to a police officer - oh, no, in September? No, I waited until the PSC.

Q. We have a copy of that PSC. Could PG-35 be brought up, please. We should start, actually, at the top of the page, because, as I understand it, this was a meeting which you did not attend; is that correct?

A. I think that's right, yes.

Q. Your apologies are marked there. Then if we go down the page, do you see there is a reference there to Reverend Winston Morgan and also Reverend Campbell Brown?

A. Yes.

Q. Then "Peter", who I presume is Peter Catt, one of the members of the professional standards committee:

... to check if Reverend Brown has applied for a licence.

A. Yes.

Q. Then if we go further down, there is a reference to the Sex Crimes Squad in Sydney, with "Pat", who I presume is you:

... to write to police using standard letter provided by Philip.

A. Yes.

Q. In any event, as I understand it, you didn't write letters to the police, but in fact Mr Gerber wrote to the police about those matters?

1 A. That's correct.
2
3 Q. Over the page:
4
5 *Pat to inform the bishop?*
6
7 Did you inform the bishop?
8 A. Yes.
9
10 Q. And what did you say to him?
11 A. I can't remember exactly, but I would have said that
12 there were - I think the reality of the situation would
13 have been that I would have already told him of these
14 allegations and what was going on, and so the question
15 mark - where there would have been a consciousness of
16 separating the powers within the diocese on sexual matters,
17 that's why the question mark was there. I don't remember
18 whether or not I actually went, after that meeting was told
19 that that was there, or whether I would have just said to
20 the bishop at some stage the committee has considered those
21 matters.
22
23 Q. And I see:
24
25 *Philip is also the Director of the PSC in*
26 *Newcastle and is informed of the matter.*
27
28 A. Yes.
29
30 Q. That's because, on the previous page, it is noted that
31 Reverend Brown has moved to the Newcastle Diocese?
32 A. That's right.
33
34 Q. If we go then to PG-36, there were a number of letters
35 that were sent on 19 December by Philip Gerber?
36 A. Yes.
37
38 Q. To the Sex State Crimes Squad?
39 A. Yes.
40
41 Q. You were aware of that occurring?
42 A. Yes.
43
44 Q. In fact, Mr Gerber had taken over that step from you?
45 A. Yes, I think I have said, "Look, I'm not sure what I'm
46 supposed to say." Philip was using terms like
47 "intelligence" to the police, and I was still questioning

1 what it was that we were giving them, when they had
2 solicitors acting for them. I couldn't actually understand
3 what was going on there.

4
5 Q. Mr Comben, you had, from that schedule, PG-39 - we
6 don't need to go to it yet - approximately 40 matters, or
7 perhaps 41 --

8 A. Yes.

9
10 Q. -- of which 20 were sexual. You seem to have
11 referred, or at least you have caused Philip Gerber to
12 refer, three matters, that is three people, to the police.
13 Why did you not refer all of the other matters to the
14 police at the same time?

15 A. I'm not sure that I got Philip to refer them. I might
16 have asked him to write the letters. It was a meeting,
17 which you said I wasn't at, of the professional standards
18 committee. There is no doubt that I would have been
19 pushing the agenda of wanting to pursue these priests.

20
21 Q. If we go back to tender bundle 39, I will show you an
22 unredacted version of this that has been marked up by an
23 officer of the Royal Commission.

24 A. Yes.

25
26 MR BECKETT: I will hand up three copies for the Royal
27 Commission and one for the witness. I will ask for
28 a non-publication order with respect to this particular
29 document, as it is unredacted.

30
31 THE CHAIR: Very well. I will make that order. Yes,
32 I have made that order.

33
34 MR BECKETT: Q. Mr Comben, if we just go through it,
35 let's start on page 1. You will see next to the number 3,
36 that was [CN], who you were asking about before. If you
37 scroll across, you will see three named individuals there
38 next to the word "Sexually"?

39 A. Yes.

40
41 Q. I take it from those three names that while the first
42 of those people was referred to the police, the second two
43 were not referred to the police; do you see that?

44 A. Yes.

45
46 Q. Why was it the case, given that you had allegations of
47 child sexual abuse against [CN], that those matters were

1 not referred to the police by December 2006?
2 A. I have no idea.
3
4 Q. Mr Comben, did it not occur to you that you had very
5 serious allegations of sexual abuse, although they may have
6 been quite old, nonetheless they were of criminal conduct,
7 which were properly matters that the police should
8 investigate?
9 A. It occurred to me, but I still could not understand
10 why these matters were not being referred by solicitors
11 acting for individuals that had more information than
12 I had.
13
14 Q. There are a number of reasons why that might be the
15 case, Mr Comben, but I just want to ask you: you were in
16 possession of serious allegations of child sexual abuse
17 made against a number of people, some named, some unnamed,
18 and you did not provide that information to the police.
19 Why was that?
20 A. I have no idea.
21
22 Q. We will just go through it. You will see at 10, there
23 was a further example of an older unnamed male resident,
24 plus others unnamed, with respect to number 10? Do you see
25 that?
26 A. Yes. Again, I think I would have looked at that and
27 thought, "What am I referring to the police?"
28
29 Q. I presume that means that because the perpetrator is
30 unnamed, you are concerned that the police would not know
31 who the perpetrator was and therefore it would be difficult
32 for them to investigate; is that what you are saying?
33 A. I think difficult to investigate is what I'm saying,
34 and we had no addresses for these individuals.
35
36 Q. But, Mr Comben, this is putting you in the position of
37 the police, is it not?
38 A. You keep on saying me. This was in front of the
39 professional standards committee and we took decisions - or
40 they, at a meeting which I wasn't at, took decisions about
41 these things. I can't say what was in their mind, sir.
42
43 Q. Mr Comben, there is no evidence that this particular
44 schedule and all the allegations in it were before the
45 professional standards committee?
46 A. I see what you are saying. Right, yes. So I had this
47 in my possession, but I only referred to three clerical

1 matters?

2

3 Q. That's correct, that's what the evidence appears to
4 be. Do you accept that that is the state of the evidence?

5 A. I agree with you that that's what the evidence appears
6 to say. I still have trouble believing that I would have
7 in any way kept this to my chest. It would have been in
8 front of the professional standards committee.

9

10 Q. Mr Comben, we have no evidence that it was ever
11 communicated to the police until in fact Mr Michael
12 Elliott, the professional standards director, took acts to
13 do so in 2013.

14 A. Yes.

15

16 Q. Are you aware of that?

17 A. No, no, I wasn't.

18

19 Q. If we go on to 16, for example, with respect to
20 Mr [CL], there are allegations against Reverend Morgan and
21 Reverend Brown again, and a third person there, who was
22 also not referred. Do you see that?

23 A. Yes.

24

25 Q. The next one, number 17, there is an allegation
26 against Canon Robinson. Do you see that?

27 A. Yes.

28

29 Q. Canon Robinson was, I presume, deceased by the time
30 you were compiling this collection; is that right?

31 A. Yes.

32

33 Q. But, again, we don't know who the two others are, do
34 we?

35 A. No.

36

37 Q. Something that could be left with the police to follow
38 up with the victim who was named at 17?

39 A. Yes.

40

41 Q. So it's reasonable to accept that, "Well, if I give
42 this material to the police, then it is really essentially
43 a matter for them to follow up, and I have discharged my
44 duty", if you like, "by informing them that we have - that
45 is to say, the Diocese of Grafton has - that evidence"?

46 A. Yes, even though I believed the solicitors would have
47 done it or should have done it. I raised that with

1 Mr Harrison at that meeting.

2

3 Q. Mr Harrison was concerned at one stage, when those
4 three letters, PG-36, PG-37 and PG-38, were referred to the
5 police and contained statutory declarations that had been
6 provided to the diocese, wasn't he?

7 A. Yes.

8

9 Q. And he was concerned that there had been no
10 communication with him or his clients about informing them
11 that that is what the diocese was going to do?

12 A. There was communication, because at the conference
13 I raised with him both the conflict of interest of acting
14 for some people who were named in here as alleged rapists,
15 at the same time as he was representing the victim, and the
16 matter of these things being referred to the police.

17

18 Q. But, Mr Comben, the decision had been made well before
19 the meeting on 19 December. You had made that decision, or
20 at least the PSC had made that decision, in November when
21 it met to consider writing to the police about at least two
22 clerics and one other person?

23 A. Yes.

24

25 Q. It wasn't a question of it just arising on
26 19 December; in fact, as far as we can see, the letters had
27 already been drafted and were winging their way to the
28 police on 19 December?

29 A. They were sent on the 19th, yes.

30

31 MR BECKETT: Is that a suitable time, your Honour?

32

33 THE CHAIR: Yes. Do you want this document --

34

35 MR BECKETT: Yes, I will tender it.

36

37 THE CHAIR: We will make it exhibit 3-11. I think the
38 record should include a redacted copy.

39

40 MR BECKETT: I think we are up to 3-12.

41

42 THE CHAIR: Not in my book.

43

44 MR BECKETT: We will sort that out over the break.

45

46 THE CHAIR: I am sorry, you are right, it is 3-12. So
47 that there is no risk of this going in the wrong direction,

1 we should have a redacted copy as the exhibit in due
2 course.

3
4 **EXHIBIT #3-12 REDACTED COPY OF MARKED-UP VERSION OF TAB 39**
5 **OF TENDER BUNDLE**

6
7 MR BECKETT: Yes. Thank you, your Honour.

8
9 THE CHAIR: We will take the morning adjournment.

10
11 **SHORT ADJOURNMENT**

12
13 MR BECKETT: Q. Mr Comben, just before the break, we
14 were going through some parts of exhibit 3-12, the schedule
15 in front of you.

16 A. Yes, sir.

17
18 Q. If you could go to page number 607 in Ringtail,
19 claimant number 32. Do you see that?

20 A. Yes.

21
22 Q. If you go across to the sixth column, next to the word
23 "Sexual", which refers to abuse --

24 A. Yes.

25
26 Q. -- the third of those people is somebody, or at least
27 somebody from the family of people, who had been defending
28 the home in the media; is that correct?

29 A. It's certainly the same surname. I don't know any
30 more than that.

31
32 Q. Did you consider what effect defending those people,
33 such as the man, somebody of the same name at least, who
34 had been in the local media, might have on victim number 32
35 there?

36 A. I don't believe at any time that I was defending that
37 person. I was defending staff and trying to put the other
38 side of the argument. But that person with that surname
39 was out in the media by himself on a frolic of his own.

40
41 Q. As at 19 December, we know that at least two clergy
42 have been referred to the police by Mr Gerber?

43 A. Yes.

44
45 Q. Reverend Morgan and Reverend Campbell Brown?

46 A. Yes.

47

1 Q. What steps did you take after that to commence any
2 disciplinary process with respect to either of those men?
3 A. I had to wait for the letter to come back, and the
4 request there was that the diocese not take further action
5 to investigate if it could interfere with any potential
6 police investigation.
7
8 Q. Just so that we are on the same page, if PG-39 could
9 be brought up.
10 A. Yes, sir.
11
12 Q. Is this the email of 16 January 2007 that you're
13 referring to?
14 A. Which was sent in response to my telephone call to
15 say, "Can I get on with chasing these clergy."
16
17 Q. If we just scroll up a little bit, it was sent
18 directly to you; is that right?
19 A. I think so, and I'm not quite sure why - oh, copied to
20 Mr Gerber, yes.
21
22 Q. Maybe it is the address. In any event, was
23 patrickc@nor.com.au an email address that you were using in
24 2007?
25 A. Do it again, .NOR?
26
27 Q. Yes, patrickc@nor.com.au.
28 A. I'll say yes, but I don't know exactly. That sounds
29 familiar.
30
31 Q. Your name is Patrick?
32 A. Yes, it is, sir.
33
34 Q. Do I take it that at that stage - that is to say, in
35 December 2006 and January 2007 - you were concerned that
36 both of those members of clergy may have warranted
37 disciplinary action by the Diocese of Grafton; is that
38 correct?
39 A. I didn't think they "may" have done; they certainly
40 should have had some disciplinary action so that they could
41 be heard.
42
43 Q. You received this email from the police, and I presume
44 that means at that stage, at least, you suspended your
45 investigation of those matters; is that correct?
46 A. Yes. I also had contact at about that time from
47 Reverend Brown.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Q. What was the nature of that contact?

A. He phoned - I had seen him once before. He wasn't a man that I knew. He was doing a chaplain's job when I first arrived in the diocese - a voluntary job, I think. He came to see the bishop one day and then came in to see me and was asking in general terms what was happening with the North Coast Children's Home. I told him that we were waiting for material to come in, et cetera, but not more. He said, "You haven't got any details of it?" I said, "Well, two issues: firstly, no; and, secondly, I'm not sure that I could be sharing them with you, anyway."

That was that contact. Then, about this time, he phoned me and asked me specifically about one of the victims, and I said, "Look, I can't talk to you about this." He said, "Oh, I just wanted to know whether this happened or whether he said something about this." And I said, "I can't give you any comment on that."

But, in my mind, he had made a very guilty statement because it was precisely - it was close to what I had understood at that time to have happened with one of these people, someone I had never raised with him, no incident had been raised, but he said, "Has he said anything about this?"

Q. Just looking down that list of pseudonyms, was it with respect to one of those people?

A. Yes, I think it's [CL]. But - yes, it was - yes.

Q. Did you convey that statement - that is, what Reverend Brown had said to you - to the police?

A. No.

Q. Why not?

A. Well, I said no - it was in response to that that I phoned this guy to find out what I could do. I'm not sure I can say to you that I did not convey it. Did I formally convey it with a note in the file and a letter? No. But I think that's what made me phone this guy, to say, "All right, you have got those. Can we get on with this and what should I do next?"

Q. So you are saying that the conversation with Reverend Brown occurred prior to this email of 16 January?

A. Or on that day. Fairly close to that, yes.

1
2 Q. So what steps did you take after this information was
3 conveyed to Inspector Armstrong of the NSW Police to follow
4 it up?
5 A. None. I sat and fumed for two years.
6
7 Q. Did you speak with Inspector Armstrong and ask him
8 what the status of the investigation was?
9 A. No. For good reason.
10
11 Q. What was the good reason?
12 A. That it was a matter of some notoriety that the
13 Catholic Church in Newcastle was being investigated, and,
14 secondly, the material - the evidence adduced from
15 Mr Gerber on Friday talked about the belief of himself
16 about low-level scuttlebutt concerning priests of the
17 cathedral.
18
19 Q. Mr Comben, let's just focus, if we could, on
20 Reverend Brown for the moment.
21 A. Yes.
22
23 Q. Do I take it from what you have said that for two
24 years, so leading up until, what, the end of your time as
25 registrar --
26 A. Yes.
27
28 Q. -- you made no further contact with the police as to
29 the status of the investigation of Reverend Brown?
30 A. That is correct.
31
32 Q. And is the same the situation with respect to
33 Reverend Morgan?
34 A. I probably didn't think more about Reverend Morgan at
35 all, because my understanding was that he was actually, by
36 that time, a very sick man that would have had some
37 difficulty being pursued. I think I was told he had
38 Alzheimer's.
39
40 Q. On that basis, you thought that no further
41 disciplinary matters should take place, because of his
42 health concern?
43 A. I don't know that I went that far, but it was
44 Reverend Brown that I was wanting to pursue in the same way
45 as we had Reverend Lawton.
46
47 Q. Mr Comben, you were concerned about the serious

1 matters that had been alleged against him; you were
2 concerned that he have his day in court, as well as
3 Mr Campion, who had made those allegations. Why would you
4 not pursue the police to see what the status of the
5 investigation was so that you could get the disciplinary
6 matters, which had been suspended, back on track?

7 A. Because the contacts in the Diocese of Grafton had
8 been senior priests in Newcastle, and returning to
9 Mr Gerber's evidence of some concerns about what was going
10 on in the cathedral, we were very conscious that police
11 were investigating at least one of the priests and his
12 partner, and I made the assumption for about two years that
13 those matters were ongoing and were part of Mr Brown as
14 well.

15
16 Q. But during that time, you had no conversations with
17 police specifically about this investigation; is that
18 correct?

19 A. I have said that twice, yes.

20
21 Q. So, effectively, no disciplinary proceedings were
22 commenced during those two years against Reverend Brown?

23 A. No.

24
25 Q. And are you aware that no disciplinary proceedings
26 have been commenced against him subsequent to your
27 departure?

28 A. I'm not aware of that.

29
30 Q. Were you aware that the Diocese of Grafton was able,
31 in the sense that it had power under the Professional
32 Standards Ordinance, to commence disciplinary proceedings
33 against him?

34 A. Oh, yes, that's what I was trying to do. We had also
35 had one other matter in another diocese where I was very
36 disappointed with the response, so we would have been
37 trying to get it back to Grafton to be heard.

38
39 Q. Do you think you failed in your duty as registrar to
40 pursue in perhaps a more vigorous way the disciplining of
41 Reverend Brown?

42 A. No.

43
44 Q. Considering that you didn't speak to the police for
45 a period of two years about his particular matter, don't
46 you consider that as being a specific failing in your
47 duties to pursue these sorts of disciplinary matters?

1 A. With all the gifts of hindsight, yes. At the time,
2 the knowledge that we had and the belief that we had that
3 a major police investigation was ongoing, one of the
4 priests being investigated being a personal friend of
5 someone in the diocese, we were very conscious of the
6 police investigation. We made the assumption that that
7 would include Reverend Brown that had been referred to
8 them.

9

10 Q. Mr Comben, it all seems very casual?

11 A. Well, it's not.

12

13 Q. There doesn't seem to have been any formal step, even
14 to the extent of writing a letter to the police to ask them
15 where their particular investigation was up to?

16 A. But I telephoned them.

17

18 Q. I thought you said you didn't telephone them after
19 January 2007?

20 A. I did. That's why I got the email back. I telephoned
21 them to get that email back, which said, "Don't take any
22 further investigation."

23

24 Q. After January 2007, you didn't take any further steps,
25 by phone, by email or in writing, to actually ascertain
26 what the status of the investigation was?

27 A. I have an email on my file, which says, "We will
28 inform you in due course what action NSW Police propose to
29 take in response to these allegations."

30

31 Q. So that's it? You just rest on that and you don't
32 pursue disciplinary proceedings because the police have, in
33 January, asked you not to investigate until they contact
34 you further?

35 A. We had week-to-week commentary about the police
36 investigations in Newcastle. I'm not taking it easily.
37 I wanted that guy. We were the second diocese in the
38 Commonwealth to actually defrock someone, and I wanted that
39 guy because of the admission he had made to me. To say
40 that I sat on my hands is a bit rough.

41

42 Q. Well, you hadn't set out in writing that particular
43 admission, had you?

44 A. No, but, again, I was never expecting a forensic
45 examination, and the job in the diocese --

46

47 Q. Isn't that exactly what occurs in the disciplinary

1 process in the Anglican Church, that there is a forensic
2 analysis of those particular matters if they are challenged
3 by the member of clergy?

4 A. Yes.

5
6 Q. In other words, that piece of evidence, that admission
7 in your terms, would have been something that was highly
8 relevant to consideration of any disciplinary matter of
9 Reverend Brown after January 2007?

10 A. The primary evidence would have been the statutory
11 declarations, and I would have been giving some
12 corroboration, yes.

13
14 Q. Indeed. But you didn't put it in writing, did you?

15 A. No.

16
17 Q. Did you tell your successor about it?

18 A. I think I've only ever spoken six words to my
19 successor. I certainly told my true successor, which was
20 my later wife. She was certainly well aware of it, so --

21
22 Q. I will ask you, while dealing with those matters of
23 discipline, about Reverend Kitchingman. Were you aware
24 that he had been convicted in 2002 of a number of counts of
25 sexual abuse, sexual assault, on a minor?

26 A. At what time?

27
28 Q. 2002 was the conviction with respect to acts that had
29 occurred in or about the North Coast Children's Home in
30 1975.

31 A. In 2002 I was in Brisbane. I don't believe it would
32 have got any coverage up there at all. No, I did not know.

33
34 Q. When you came to assume the position of registrar at
35 Grafton, did you become aware of Reverend Kitchingman and
36 the convictions for indecent assault against him?

37 A. This was covered in my evidence on Friday, when I said
38 initially that I didn't think I became aware of it until
39 late in the year, and you were able to show that there had
40 been documents put in front of me which should have
41 disclosed to me earlier in the year.

42
43 Q. All right. So by the end of 2004, you knew about
44 Reverend Kitchingman. One of your obligations, was it not,
45 was to ensure that the ordinance, in terms of discipline,
46 was maintained and followed; is that not correct?

47 A. Yes.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Q. What steps did you take, having known about Reverend Kitchingman, to pursue any form of disciplinary charges against him after you became aware of that in 2004?

A. I did nothing at all.

Q. Is that nothing at all between 2004, when you first became aware of him, and 2009, when you ceased to be registrar?

A. That is correct.

Q. Did you ever raise the issue with Bishop Slater?

A. Yes, because late in the piece, for all that you put the documents in front of me and I should have been aware of it, I don't know that it really clicked with me that that was the problem. Late in the piece, when I was beginning to try to chase Reverend Campbell Brown, I became aware that Reverend Kitchingman, as he was, was still in the stud book.

I think I was looking for an address for Campbell Brown, had some of this material in front of me and just flicked over to make sure - I don't know what I was looking for, but I looked up Kitchingman. I got a shock to find he was there. I can remember getting up from my desk, walking into the bishop and saying, "Kitchingman's still in the stud book."

Q. When you say the "stud book", you mean the Anglican directory; is that correct?

A. I gather that is the correct name, Mr Beckett, yes. It's a totally inappropriate name in these proceedings, I apologise. I think the bishop said to me something to the effect of, "Well, you had better tell Newcastle." So I phoned Newcastle. I think I also phoned Mr Gerber, who then, I think, wrote to Newcastle more formally. I don't think, until then, I had realised that Mr Kitchingman was even anywhere on the scene.

Q. Did you consider that the Diocese of Grafton, because the acts had in fact taken place within the diocese, had primary jurisdiction to prosecute any disciplinary matter with respect to Mr Kitchingman?

A. Perhaps I did. I think I was still looking for Mr Brown, and we were, at that stage, trying to finalise the matter in another diocese, which ended in a very unsatisfactory decision. But I think we were just too busy

1 to take him on and left him to Newcastle to a high extent.

2

3 Q. Too busy to take him on? Mr Comben, this was
4 a serious conviction, a conviction for some serious sexual
5 abuse upon a child that dated back to 1975. It's highly
6 inappropriate, is it not, that such a member of clergy
7 should still be able to hold himself out as a member of
8 clergy?

9 A. Absolutely.

10

11 Q. But, Mr Comben, you said a moment ago that you just
12 didn't have time to pursue that particular issue. It's
13 something that you could have referred to Mr Gerber to
14 prosecute on behalf of the Diocese of Grafton, couldn't
15 you?

16 A. I don't think, by the time that we were aware that
17 Mr Kitchingman was somewhere on the scene where we could
18 potentially take action, that Mr Gerber was still actually
19 the director of professional standards.

20

21 Q. Mr Comben, "on the scene", he doesn't need to be
22 resident in the diocese for you to commence action against
23 him, does he?

24 A. No, on the scene in terms of anywhere. I had no idea
25 that he was anywhere other than he had - as I said on
26 Friday, someone eventually told me there would be a file
27 somewhere. I found it in a bottom drawer, literally, the
28 old dusty thing. And it was only when I was looking for
29 information on Mr Brown that Mr Kitchingman's name came
30 forward. I walked straight in to the bishop, went back to
31 my office, phoned Newcastle, phoned the director. But it
32 was still not a matter which we put clearly - I was not the
33 professional standards director, and that's probably the
34 difference and one of the short-failings - shortcomings of
35 the time, because I was trying to do a registrar's job,
36 trying to juggle some financial balls, and we had these
37 matters occurring.

38

39 Q. Can you understand, Mr Comben, that members of the
40 public might be --

41 A. Yes, I can.

42

43 Q. -- disappointed, if you like, might be critical of you
44 for not pursuing somebody, where they had a criminal
45 conviction, and yet the church, irrespective of which
46 diocese, does not appear to have taken any disciplinary
47 proceedings against him?

1 A. I can fully understand that, for a matter that was at
2 least two years before my time in the diocese and where he
3 was resident in another diocese and holding himself out to
4 be in that diocese, but I --

5
6 Q. Are you attempting to lay the blame on your
7 predecessor by saying that nothing had happened for two
8 years?

9 A. I take full responsibility in my time that had we had
10 the time and had been focused and we weren't dealing with
11 financial matters, et cetera, that I should have pursued
12 him in the same way as I was trying to pursue
13 Reverend Brown and in the same way as I had pursued another
14 priest to have him defrocked, yes, I take full
15 responsibility of my time. I put the onus, all the
16 responsibility, on no-one else except me in my time, yes.

17
18 Q. If I could now return to the end of the negotiations.
19 As I think we left the evidence earlier today, the diocese
20 offered \$750,000 and the claimants had offered \$1.2 million
21 inclusive to settle the particular matter. Could TB-66 of
22 exhibit 3-2 come up, please. Tab 66. Mr Comben, we have
23 minutes from Bishop-in-Council which indicate that it
24 approved a settlement of the sum up to \$950,000. We will
25 just scroll through to the next page.

26 A. Yes.

27
28 Q. So do I take it by that that Bishop-in-Council had
29 approved an amount up to \$950,000?

30 A. The motion is that - to a maximum figure of \$950,000,
31 yes.

32
33 Q. So the negotiations which continued at that stage
34 could have been settled for any amount up to \$950,000;
35 that's your understanding, isn't it?

36 A. When you say "settled up to", are you saying just for
37 the claimants?

38
39 Q. Yes.

40 A. No, that's not my understanding. I accept in there
41 the costs - I had in my mind legal costs of the advocate of
42 about \$20,000 and a similar amount for counsel, so I was
43 discounting that straightaway to \$900,000 in my own head.

44
45 Q. All right. In any event, if it was \$900,000, then you
46 could settle for any amount up to \$900,000?

47 A. Yes.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Q. We know - and I think you may have heard Mr Roland give this evidence - that four days later, he, on instructions from you, withdrew all offers, including the one that was then on the table from the diocese of \$800,000; do you remember that evidence?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you agree that that is what occurred?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you agree that that was a commercial tactic adopted by you and Mr Roland?

A. A commercial tactic instructed Mr Roland by me - I don't know that it was Mr Roland. I would hate to put him in there. I think it was my decision.

Q. The idea was to remove that offer so as to increase the pressure upon the claimants to settle; is that right?

A. That is correct.

Q. In fact, a week or so later, Mr Roland, on your instructions, reinstated the offer of \$800,000; is that correct?

A. That's correct.

Q. While we come to an agreed sum of \$825,000, there were a number of offers, were there not, between \$800,000 and \$900,000 that were rejected by the diocese; is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. Given that you had had approval up to, as you say, \$900,000, even if you include legal fees, you could have accepted those amounts and they would have been well within the approval that had been provided by Bishop-in-Council; is that correct?

A. On the black letters of that motion and that, yes. But what you haven't got there is the discussion about where the heck would this money have come from and what do you think you can settle it at?

Q. Mr Comben, why didn't you just simply accept one of the offers - I think one of them, for example, was \$870,000 - and provide that to the claimants to settle the claim?

A. Because there had been great concern about how much we

1 were spending. A number of people at Bishop-in-Council
2 said, "But if we're not liable, why are we spending
3 anything and why are we paying this money?", and, as it
4 says there, "Where's the money going to come from?", which,
5 by that stage, was beginning to bite, even though it wasn't
6 fully aware. So we were still trying, in line with the
7 instructions I had, to minimise the payments.

8
9 Q. At this stage we have a number of file notes about
10 three-way teleconferences and communications between you,
11 Mr Roland and Bishop Slater; do you recall those?

12 A. Yes.

13
14 Q. Is it fair to say that he was intimately involved in
15 the setting of the amount of the offers provided to the
16 claimants at that time?

17 A. I again don't know who "he" is.

18
19 Q. Sorry, Bishop Slater.

20 A. Sorry, thank you. Oh, intimately involved with
21 settling the amounts? Yes, that would be true, but I think
22 he was being guided by Mr Roland and by myself, yes.

23
24 THE CHAIR: Q. Mr Comben, earlier today we talked about
25 this process of negotiation and the lump sum, the origin of
26 the lump sum; do you remember that discussion?

27 A. Yes, I do.

28
29 Q. And you said that you:

30
31 *... would hope that the good that will come*
32 *out of these proceedings is that that sort*
33 *of process will now be able to be adopted*
34 *and bring closure, but we may - we got it*
35 *wrong at the time.*

36
37 Did you have in mind that there should be another look at
38 the claims that had been settled?

39 A. Oh, I think, yes, I did - I do. But I'm no longer
40 involved with the church.

41
42 THE CHAIR: I understand that.

43
44 MR BECKETT: Q. We have a file note from Mr Roland where
45 he says that you instructed him to put the offer of
46 \$825,000, but not a penny more. Do you remember that?

47 A. Yes. We had been talking about Jeffrey Archer's book

1 about Not a Penny More. We had both read the book, and it
2 was a few days beforehand.
3
4 Q. In any event, the instruction was not to put anything
5 higher than \$825,000?
6 A. Yes.
7
8 Q. And that was the agreed amount for I think the 41 or
9 42-odd claimants; is that correct?
10 A. Yes.
11
12 Q. Part of the agreement was also that the claimants
13 would enter into a deed of release?
14 A. Yes.
15
16 Q. And that there would be an apology given by I think
17 the bishop to each of the claimants; is that correct?
18 A. I don't think it was to each of the claimants. It was
19 finessed a bit more than that.
20
21 Q. I will take you to the relevant letter.
22 A. Well, I accept it if you are saying that. I thought
23 it was only to those who wanted it, or something to that
24 effect.
25
26 Q. Yes, we have the evidence that has been adduced.
27 Shortly stated, it is that Mr Harrison wrote to you with
28 a list of I think about 28 or 29 claimants --
29 A. Yes, that's what I recall, yes.
30
31 Q. -- who sought an apology, some who wanted a written
32 apology; some - I think there were three - who wanted
33 a personal apology?
34 A. Yes.
35
36 Q. Or a public apology?
37 A. Yes.
38
39 Q. And then the remainder did not want an apology. Do
40 you remember that?
41 A. Yes, yes, that's right.
42
43 Q. You drafted an apology to be given to the claimants?
44 A. For myself or for the bishop?
45
46 Q. For the bishop. I will show you tender bundle tab 81.
47 A. Yes, I think I did, yes. He again finessed it,

1 I think.

2

3 Q. Could exhibit 3-2, tab 81, be brought up, please.

4 A. Yes.

5

6 Q. Over the page we have what appears to be a draft
7 apology.

8 A. I'm not sure I can say to you that that's actually my
9 total draft. I would expect the bishop to have put his own
10 input into it. I would have done the thrust of the
11 apology.

12

13 Q. Just in terms of the passage of this particular
14 apology, we haven't been able to locate any signed
15 apologies provided to any of the people who asked for
16 a written apology. Do you recall there being written
17 apologies sent to those claimants who had asked for
18 a written apology?

19 A. No, I don't.

20

21 Q. Is it possible - in fact, is it likely - that those
22 apologies were not sent to individuals?

23 A. I think that what is likely is that the offer was
24 made, but there was a moment when Nicol Robinson Halletts
25 came back and said, "Well, look, the care and compassion
26 will really be taken care of by the money." And I don't
27 think they then chased anything else.

28

29 Q. Mr Comben, you are aware, in your extensive dealings
30 with Mr Campion, for example, that this apology was not an
31 acceptable one to him; you are aware of that?

32 A. Yes, very much so, yes.

33

34 Q. There are a couple of things in that apology I would
35 like to take you to. In the first paragraph, the draft
36 says:

37

38 *I am sorry to hear that this was your*
39 *experience in this community based*
40 *facility ...*

41

42 A. Yes.

43

44 Q. When you drafted, together with Bishop Slater, on
45 14 June 2007 --

46 A. I don't think I drafted it with the bishop. I think
47 that was my wording, and the bishop later would have made

1 some editorial comment on it.

2

3 Q. All right. But the term "community based facility" -
4 was that your phrase?

5 A. Yes, it was.

6

7 Q. Did you not think that that would be a red rag to
8 a bull, given the dispute, if you like, between the
9 claimants and the diocese about the particular home?

10 A. I wouldn't have seen it as that. I probably would
11 have been aware that we were saying, "We're still not
12 accepting it as the Church of England home."

13

14 THE CHAIR: Q. Mr Comben, did it occur to you that if
15 you took that position, those to whom this was directed
16 wouldn't see it as a genuine apology? You are disowning it
17 and purporting to apologise at the same time?

18 A. Yes, well, there was the considerable angst within the
19 diocese about what we were actually saying and doing, and
20 so I think at that stage I was trying to straddle the two
21 things and I certainly was further on the side of my
22 employer than I would have been on the side of the
23 claimants, so that's why it was put in there. But, yes,
24 I agree it would have been difficult for some of the
25 claimants.

26

27 Q. You might have been better off not even to try to
28 apologise. You would just make matters worse, wouldn't
29 you?

30 A. I think that's probably right, and in view of the fact
31 that no-one came back to actually physically ask for the
32 apology, I wonder why it got in there at all, yes.

33

34 Mr Beckett, can I refer to a letter from Nicol
35 Robinson Halletts of 9 January, which says:

36

37 *We believe that this represents the best*
38 *opportunity to settle the overwhelming*
39 *majority of the claims and may ensure that*
40 *these clients could then accept that*
41 *pastoral care has been given.*

42

43 I think that was their view. They were not interested in
44 seeing the finer details. They had the money and the
45 settlement.

46

47 MR BECKETT: Q. Mr Comben, I wanted to ask you about the

1 financial position of the diocese in about the years 2006
2 and 2007. I'll hand you a folder.

3 A. Yes.

4
5 MR BECKETT: I have a number of folders for the Bench as
6 well. This is not in evidence as yet. I hand up a folder
7 entitled "North Coast Children's Home, Anglican Diocese of
8 Grafton Financial Records".

9
10 THE CHAIR: Do you want to tender this?

11
12 MR BECKETT: Yes, I tender it.

13
14 **EXHIBIT #3-13 FOLDER ENTITLED "NORTH COAST CHILDREN'S HOME,**
15 **ANGLICAN DIOCESE OF GRAFTON FINANCIAL RECORDS"**

16
17 MR BECKETT: Q. Mr Comben, I wonder if you could go to
18 tab 3, please, which is the 2005 annual report of the
19 Diocese of Grafton?

20 A. Yes.

21
22 Q. If you turn over to the balance sheet, which is at
23 page 2, Ringtail ANG.0030.001.0041. Do you see that on the
24 page that sets out the balance sheet, net assets have
25 fallen substantially between 2004 and 2005?

26 A. Yes.

27
28 Q. So that the net assets of the diocese are
29 \$2.83 million; do you see that?

30 A. Yes.

31
32 Q. I understand, if we turn through to page 8, that there
33 was a substantial asset revaluation undertaken?

34 A. Yes.

35
36 Q. On page 8 you will see accumulated funds were reduced
37 to reflect an incorrect prior treatment of assets belonging
38 to the diocese because they belonged to the corporate
39 trustees and transferred a valuation; do you see that?

40 A. Yes.

41
42 Q. Do I take it, then, if we go back to page 2, that that
43 substantial variation in the net assets of the diocese was
44 due to a transfer, effectively, of that amount of money
45 over on to the balance sheet of the corporate trustees?

46 A. That's correct.

47

1 Q. Then we have the corporate trustees at tab 4 --

2

3 THE CHAIR: Q. Just before you leave that, page 17 is
4 a profit and loss for the year ended 31 December. There is
5 an extraordinary item there, \$496,000, do you see that, for
6 the year 2005, not there in 2004.

7 A. I can't find the item, your Honour. Oh, yes,
8 extraordinary item, yes.

9

10 Q. Extraordinary item, 2005, \$496,962, with a net
11 position of a deficit of \$85,000 what was the extraordinary
12 item?

13 A. I don't know, but it looks to me as if it might have
14 been the value of the Bishopsholme, the bishops residence.

15

16 Q. This is your profit and loss account.

17 A. Well, it - I don't know without looking further into
18 it.

19

20 Q. At first glance, that suggests that the net loss made
21 in that year was, firstly, entirely due to that item, but
22 without that item, you would have had a significant
23 surplus?

24 A. Yes, it certainly - and I can't find a note to it,
25 either.

26

27 Q. It doesn't bespeak, but for the extraordinary item,
28 that you were doing other than running at a plus?

29 A. Yes, except that extraordinary item may have been
30 trading from the land development schemes. There were
31 certainly some losses of that order. But I wouldn't have
32 expected that to appear in profit and loss. I would have
33 thought that was - although it would have had to have done.

34

35 Q. Well, where was that trading done from, which fund?

36 A. Generally from the corporate trustees, but the funds
37 were all over the place. There were some borrowings from
38 the GDIF. They used some of their own assets, and they
39 used some of the diocesan assets as well. That was why it
40 was difficult, in these years, to try to put together a set
41 of books.

42

43 MR BECKETT: Your Honour, at page 9, there is note 5A,
44 "Other financial assets", which included the extraordinary
45 item of \$496,000, which is the same value in the income
46 statement.

47

1 THE CHAIR: Sorry, page 9?
2
3 MR BECKETT: Yes, page 9 of that document.
4
5 THE WITNESS: They were double-accounted is what that is
6 saying.
7
8 MR BECKETT: It states:
9
10 *... fundamentally incorrectly treated in*
11 *prior years as belonging to the Diocese,*
12 *however these were also included in the*
13 *books of the Corporate Trustees.*
14
15 Does your Honour have that?
16
17 THE CHAIR: Yes. I'm not sure I still understand it, but
18 anyway.
19
20 MR BECKETT: Q. Mr Comben, is it essentially a case that
21 it was transferred from the balance sheet of the corporate
22 trustees over on to the Diocese of Grafton?
23 A. The other way, I believe.
24
25 THE CHAIR: That's what that looks like.
26
27 THE WITNESS: Yes, I think it was taken off the diocese
28 and given to the corporate trustees. That was just one of
29 the many examples in that first couple of years when we
30 were trying to work out where the accounts were. And even
31 when I thought we had got them into a reasonable state, we
32 changed the auditors and they pointed out a lot of
33 anomalies and wrong entries, et cetera.
34
35 MR BECKETT: Q. Mr Comben, back on the balance sheet,
36 you will see under "Non-current liabilities", "Provisions"
37 note 10, an amount of \$8,768; do you see that?
38 A. Are we dealing with 2005?
39
40 Q. Yes.
41 A. The non-current assets, yes.
42
43 Q. Then if we go through to page 10, the note that
44 applies to provisions, there is only provision made for
45 annual leave; do you see that?
46 A. Yes.
47

1 Q. Then, on page 16, under the profit and loss, we have
2 "Professional standards - regis" of \$35,343 for 2005; do
3 you see that?
4 A. Yes. That would have been one payment which we would
5 have made in 2005. We made a number of payments around
6 about that time. I think most of them were actually paid
7 in early 2006.
8
9 Q. So then if we go across to tab 4, the corporate
10 trustees balance sheet.
11 A. Yes, sir.
12
13 Q. This is the document beginning ANG.0030.001.0063.
14 This is on page 65. You will see that the total equity for
15 the corporate trustees was \$11.6 million; do you see that?
16 A. Yes.
17
18 Q. If we then go forward to 2006, so tab 6, I will just
19 start with the diocese, the total equity has fallen by
20 about \$400,000 to \$2.4 million?
21 A. Yes.
22
23 Q. If we pick up the provisions, note 11, which is on
24 page 11, we have "Professional standards" of \$840,000 as at
25 31 December 2006; is that correct?
26 A. I have page 11. I can't see "Professional standards".
27
28 Q. Under "Note 11 Provisions", "Number of Registry
29 employees" "Current", "Employee" --
30 A. Yes, I have it, thank you.
31
32 Q. Is that the payment to the group claimants?
33 A. Yes.
34
35 Q. If we then go across to the corporate trustees audited
36 financial papers, which are in fact at tab 5, and again go
37 to the balance sheet - I will just grab the Ringtail
38 number.
39 A. Yes.
40
41 Q. It is ANG.0030.001.0090. If we scroll down, please,
42 you will see there, sir, that under "Total equity" for the
43 corporate trustees of the Diocese of Grafton, the total
44 equity has jumped from \$11.5 million to \$181.7 million?
45 A. Yes.
46
47 Q. Is that correct?

1 A. Yes.
2
3 Q. What happened to cause that very substantial increase?
4 A. We were told by the auditors that best practice was to
5 have all assets on the balance sheet, even though these are
6 not public accounts and you can effectively do what you
7 like, within certain private rules of auditors and
8 accountants, and that we should have a property book and
9 a valuation next to it, so that we could then start working
10 out how much money we have to put to one side for upkeep,
11 et cetera. So the increase was to put every church, the
12 cathedral, every rectory, every piece of land - there were
13 a few - every cemetery, although some of those we thought
14 might have been negatives, on the balance sheet. So that
15 was done for the end of 2006.
16
17 Q. If we go across to page 8 of the corporate trustees
18 financial statement.
19 A. Yes.
20
21 Q. You will see under "Note 6 Property, Plant and
22 Equipment", if you come down, land at valuation has
23 increased from \$0.7 million to \$40.9 million. Is that in
24 keeping with the new approach to valuation and listing of
25 assets?
26 A. Sorry, are you under "Plant and equipment"? I have
27 lost where you are, sir.
28
29 Q. Sorry, perhaps I went too quickly. "Note 6 Property,
30 Plant and Equipment" - do you have that?
31 A. Yes, land at valuation, yes.
32
33 Q. Land at valuation of \$40.9 million; is that right?
34 A. Yes. That is the land of all the buildings. It's not
35 a valuation of the land and improvements. I think that was
36 actually - that valuation was taken from the state
37 government's Valuer General's department.
38
39 Q. Then we have "Buildings at valuation", which has
40 increased from \$1.3 million approximately to
41 \$141.69 million?
42 A. Yes.
43
44 Q. Giving total assets, at least in terms of property and
45 equipment, of \$190 million?
46 A. Yes.
47

1 Q. Do I take it from that that if one includes the value
2 of the assets, both buildings and land, even at
3 Valuer General's valuations, on 31 December 2006, the
4 Diocese of Grafton was in a pretty healthy financial
5 position?

6 A. I think you could only say it's asset rich and cash
7 poor. It certainly has very substantial assets; I would
8 concede that. But I don't know I could concede it was in
9 a healthy financial position.

10
11 THE CHAIR: Q. Can I just ask you this - you may not be
12 able to help us. If you compare 2005 with 2006, which
13 I have just been trying to do very quickly, in relation to,
14 say, the detailed income statement in the 2006 report, you
15 start to see some extraordinary things happening.

16 A. Yes.

17
18 Q. The total income for 2005 is said to be \$2,245,000; do
19 you see that? Page 16 behind tab 6. For 2006, it's about
20 \$2.5 million more.

21 A. Yes.

22
23 Q. Do you see that?

24 A. Yes.

25
26 Q. When you come to the expenses, over the page, at first
27 glance they have become \$5.5 million as opposed to
28 \$1.9 million.

29 A. If we could go to the first piece you raised,
30 your Honour, the \$2,300,000 that you raised in difference,
31 the Grafton Diocesan Investment Fund had a fairly large
32 loss the year before, in the share market, so it's actually
33 jumped up by about \$900,000 there. Corporate trustees have
34 handed over more money than was expected - again, I think
35 that was through share markets - so there is a difference
36 there of \$100,000. Parish contributions were - well, the
37 parish contributions difference is \$2.3 million. I don't
38 know why that would be so. Oh, I do know why that is so.
39 Again, that was because of the way it was done previously.
40 A lot of the parish contributions, especially insurance -
41 that was the big parish contribution generally - were off
42 the books. It would come in at one end of the diocese, go
43 through and go out as contribution to the diocese, or
44 substantially to insurance, et cetera, and was never
45 recorded. So that when we managed to get everything that
46 was coming in to go through the books, that was the
47 increase.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Q. Well, the insurance is actually shown lower down, as \$487,000, as against the previous year, \$396,000. That's not telling you very much. It's \$90,000 difference.

A. No, but the 2.2 - the big one was clergy costs. That now includes all the clergy costs. Previously it was done in parishes by themselves. Now we are saying, well, they may be employed by God but there is a view that they could be covered by workers compensation, et cetera, and so the costs should be going through the books. It was those sorts --

Q. Would that explain the employment costs jump over the page, then?

A. Employment costs?

Q. \$2.5 million - do you see the change?

A. It didn't change. Well, it did change. Salaries and wages --

Q. No, total employment costs - just look at the total. There is a \$2.5 million difference.

A. Yes. Well, I think that is it. Yes. The income has gone up, but so has the expense, by about the same amount, because all the employees are now put through the books, whereas previously, they weren't.

Q. All right. Well, the money must have come from somewhere in the past?

A. Yes, the substantial money in the diocese was in parishes where every week the wages had to be paid, the rents had to be paid, et cetera. But that wasn't being reflected in the books of account for the diocese. In this year, it was.

MR BECKETT: Q. Mr Comben, just a couple more, and then I will conclude there. The balance sheet for the Diocese of Grafton for 2007 - it is tab 8. It is Ringtail ANG.0030.001.0210. You will see at the bottom that total equity has grown from \$2.4 million to \$2.675 million; do you see that?

A. Yes.

Q. If we look at the provisioning on page 11, you will see that no provisions appear to have been made for 2007 for professional standards at all - do you see that - compared to the \$840,000 in the previous financial year?

1 A. Yes.

2

3 Q. Given that a number of people had made claims, who had
4 been at the North Coast Children's Home, why was provision
5 not being made in these financial statements for future
6 potential claimants coming forward to make claims?

7 A. I think that it was only when the very large amount
8 was there that it was ever provided for or provisioned. If
9 people had been coming forward for the amounts that we had
10 been settling claims before the group claim came - it
11 probably should have been in the provisions. I think I was
12 actually asked whether or not I knew at that time - it was
13 always the knowledge on that date - whether I knew of any
14 that were needing to be having provisions, and I said no.

15

16 Q. If you go to tab 7, we will just pull up the balance
17 sheet for the corporate trustees. ANG.0030.001.0183.
18 Again, if we go down to the bottom there, you will see that
19 the total equity for corporate trustees has grown from
20 \$181 million to almost \$209 million; do you see that?

21 A. Yes.

22

23 Q. Do you understand, Mr Comben, why, given that
24 financial basis, some might consider that the diocese was
25 being unduly parsimonious in its approach to settling the
26 claims of those who had been abused at the North Coast
27 Children's Home?

28 A. I can understand that. No-one's raised any questions
29 of trusts and such, but, yes, I could fully understand
30 that.

31

32 Q. In any event, many of the assets, as a general
33 proposition, of the Diocese of Grafton are held under
34 trusts?

35 A. Almost all of them.

36

37 Q. Some are able to be liquidated and some are not; is
38 that correct?

39 A. Yes, and of course the church Trust Property Act gives
40 provision for the Bishop-in-Council and synod to change the
41 trusts if they are genuinely no longer required.

42

43 Q. Is it simply the case that proper provisioning was not
44 made for dealing with claims from the North Coast
45 Children's Home during the period 2005 to 2007?

46 A. It's a very broad question, and to some extent
47 a technical question. It was provisioned, of course, in

1 2006. But in 2005, we didn't know the size of the
2 potential claims, so it's not properly provisioned there,
3 or whether we had liability. 2007 - should there have been
4 something for some other claims coming in? It's arguable,
5 but I would have been asked if I was aware of any claims
6 that were going to be settled in 2007, and at that stage,
7 I would have said no.

8

9 Q. Mr Comben, we come to 2008. If we could go to tab 10,
10 the balance sheet has a very substantial write-down this
11 time?

12 A. Yes.

13

14 Q. That is Ringtail ANG.0030.001.0286. You will see
15 there is a very substantial write-down from \$210 million to
16 \$178 million; do you see that?

17 A. On page 10?

18

19 Q. On page 3. Sorry, tab 10, page 3.

20 A. Yes.

21

22 Q. Then if we go over to page 11 under "Property, Plant
23 and Equipment", you will see that there is a decrease of
24 just over \$40 million for buildings at valuation?

25 A. Yes.

26

27 Q. And the same for something called "Ken Dick Real
28 Estate Property at valuation"?

29 A. Yes. That seems to account for a substantial amount
30 of the write down. Can you please explain what that is
31 about.

32

33 THE CHAIR: I think I can.

34

35 Q. It is the GFC, isn't it? That's what's impacted upon
36 real estate values in that period, I would have thought?

37 A. Some of it would have been. The Ken Dick estate was
38 a very large bequest from Mr Ken Dick of Port Macquarie,
39 written - with a handwritten will, unwitnessed, et cetera,
40 to the Port Macquarie parish for \$7 million or \$8 million.
41 I think at the time when he died it might have even been
42 a value of \$12 million or \$14 million. Then the GFC came
43 along, and I suspect we just had a wrong quantum, because
44 we didn't get it until some time after the actual death,
45 because the executors handled it. I think it is as simple
46 as that. We had a figure in our mind, but when it actually
47 came over - but there had also been some cash coming over.

1 I notice this is "Property, Plant and Equipment". I think
2 you would find elsewhere there is some cash somewhere.

3
4 MR BECKETT: Q. Isn't it the case that in 2006/2007,
5 when you were indicating to Mr Harrison that the Diocese of
6 Grafton had limited resources, the diocese was cash poor
7 rather than asset poor?

8 A. That's what I said earlier in my evidence, yes.
9 That's very much so. And things like the Ken Dick estate
10 were not going to be easily available to us for any
11 settlements.

12
13 Q. Mr Comben, at the end of the negotiations, you wrote
14 a letter, and if exhibit 3-5 could come up, please.

15 A. Yes, sir.

16
17 Q. We will just scroll down a bit. Are you aware of this
18 letter?

19 A. Yes.

20
21 Q. You say that your instructions to Mr Roland are not to
22 admit liability, and you considered the generous settlement
23 offer to be treated as a "one-off ex gratia payment"; do
24 you see that?

25 A. Yes.

26
27 Q. Strictly speaking, it wasn't ex gratia, was it, in the
28 sense that you received releases from each of the claimants
29 who accepted the settlement?

30 A. If receiving the release doesn't make it ex gratia,
31 yes. I wasn't aware of that.

32
33 Q. Just go over the page, please. By this stage, you
34 were aware that Mr Campion and [CA], and I think in fact
35 one other of the claimants, were reluctant to accept the
36 settlement that had been offered by the church?

37 A. Yes. We never did quite work out why the third one
38 wasn't there, but yes.

39
40 Q. In any event, you instructed Mr Roland that with
41 respect to those other claimants - namely, Mr Campion and
42 [CA] - that you would ask Mr Roland to close his file?

43 A. Yes.

44
45 Q. And wait for legal proceedings to be commenced?

46 A. Yes.

47

1 Q. So effectively, as far as you were concerned, that was
2 the end of settlement negotiations with Mr Campion and
3 [CA]?
4 A. I don't believe I ever believed that.
5
6 Q. But that was your instruction to Mr Roland, wasn't it?
7 A. Yes.
8
9 Q. The second sentence in that paragraph there is:
10
11 *... all inquiries be passed to the Diocese*
12 *and we -*
13
14 that is, the diocese -
15
16 *will respond pastorally, but not with*
17 *further settlement negotiations.*
18
19 Do you see that?
20 A. Yes.
21
22 Q. Do I take it from that that any further claims from
23 other persons who had been resident at the North Coast
24 Children's Home, and who had asserted that they had
25 suffered child sexual abuse as well - they were to be dealt
26 with pastorally; is that correct?
27 A. They were my instructions from Bishop-in-Council, yes.
28
29 Q. There would be no financial settlement to be paid to
30 those persons; is that correct?
31 A. That was my instructions from Bishop-in-Council.
32
33 Q. Do you recall a specific Bishop-in-Council meeting
34 where that in fact occurred?
35 A. No, but I've seen it in the evidence. Oh, actually,
36 it was - at the time when we said that we had settlement,
37 the question was asked by Mr Terry Shorten, "What happens
38 if someone else comes forward?" And Mr Roland and I looked
39 at it other, shrugged shoulders and said, "Well we, we can
40 just tell them, we can either just pay up or we can tell
41 them to go away". I think it was in the context of whether
42 or not Mr Harrison was going to bring forward other people.
43
44 Q. All right. So in essence, then, you say that you
45 raised it at Bishop-in-Council level --
46 A. No, Mr Shorten raised it with me.
47

1 Q. There does not appear to have been a resolution to
2 that effect. Would you agree with that?

3 A. Yes.
4

5 Q. You took that as instructions with how to handle
6 matters after that?

7 A. Yes. There was no resolution, but I think the
8 conversation is in some way referred to in
9 Bishop-in-Council minutes.
10

11 MR BECKETT: We will have a search over the luncheon
12 adjournment for that.
13

14 THE CHAIR: Very well. We will adjourn for lunch.
15

16 **LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT**
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

1 **UPON RESUMPTION**

2
3 MR BECKETT: Q. Mr Comben, shortly before the lunch
4 break, you were referring to a conversation you had with -
5 I can't recall the name of the gentleman on
6 Bishop-in-Council, but you said you had a conversation with
7 somebody from Bishop-in-Council with respect to how future
8 claims were going to be dealt with?

9 A. It wasn't a conversation. It was the answer to
10 a question, and that led to some discussion around the
11 table, yes.

12
13 Q. We'll just have a look briefly at the
14 Bishop-in-Council meetings around that time. I wonder if
15 exhibit 3-2, tab 66 could be brought on to the screen,
16 please. If we could scroll down to the second page,
17 please. This is a Bishop-in-Council meeting where you were
18 present?

19 A. Yes.

20
21 Q. You will see that this is prior to, obviously, the
22 matter being settled about a month later, with Mr Roland
23 bringing the members of Bishop-in-Council up to date with
24 events and discussion, and that there were four potential
25 options. Do you see that?

26 A. Yes.

27
28 Q. You were asked about where the settlement was going to
29 come from?

30 A. Yes.

31
32 Q. And you suggested diocesan reserves and partly
33 a commercial loan. Do you see that?

34 A. Yes.

35
36 Q. So there was no discussion at that stage about future
37 claims, was there?

38 A. The minutes don't reflect any discussion, but there
39 was a large discussion about the entire - the entirety of
40 the matters.

41
42 Q. Let me just take you to some of the later ones that
43 might assist with your recollection. Just so we're clear
44 on that, you don't remember specifically having that
45 question and answer session on 22 February 2007, do you?

46 A. I would have said it was either then or the next
47 Bishop-in-Council, because it was directly relevant to,

1 all right, if we settle this, then Terry Shorten looked
2 straight at me across the table and said, "Well, what
3 happens if anyone else comes forward?" So it was either
4 this one or the next one.

5
6 Q. Let's look at the next one. The next one is tab 76 in
7 the same volume, a Bishop-in-Council meeting of 19 April
8 2007, and page 3. It's Ringtail ANG.0012.002.0002, just
9 down the bottom of that page. You will see item 5, "North
10 Coast Children's Home", where apparently a vote of thanks
11 was given to you and to Mr Roland for all the work you have
12 done in bringing the negotiations to conclusion. Do you
13 see that?

14 A. I do remember that I was given thanks for the work
15 I had done. It seems a long time ago.

16
17 Q. You will see that there is no mention there about how
18 to deal with future claims?

19 A. That's correct.

20
21 Q. If we could bring up - this is a document that is not
22 in evidence yet - the Bishop-in-Council meetings for
23 28 June 2007, particularly if we could bring up Ringtail
24 ANG.9320.1804.1455 the first page is 1452. These are the
25 Bishop-in-Council minutes for 28 June 2007, page 4. That
26 is the only apparent entry about North Coast Children's
27 Home. You will see there that there is a reference to:

28
29 *The leader in this matter -*

30
31 which I presume is Mr Campion -

32
33 *has still not settled and there is*
34 *a suggestion that there are other people*
35 *emerging in relation to the Home.*
36 *Bishop Slater informed members that he*
37 *begins to meet with some who require*
38 *a face-to-face apology and others with whom*
39 *we are still dealing.*

40
41 Do you see that?

42 A. Yes.

43
44 Q. Isn't it more likely that that was the occasion on
45 which there was discussion about how to deal with further
46 people coming forward, because you had concrete evidence of
47 that occurring?

1 A. I can see where you're coming from in that, but the
2 direct question to me from Terry Shorten was, "What happens
3 if there are more people coming forward?" I think that's
4 more consistent with the previous meeting, but I am not
5 going to say that it was either one or the other of the
6 three.

7

8 Q. So you think it's more likely than not that it was the
9 second one; is that what you're saying?

10 A. Yes, I do.

11

12 Q. You're aware that exhibit 3-5, which is a letter of
13 28 March to Mr Roland, pre-dates that second meeting?

14 A. Well, then - no, I'm not, but in the flexibility I'm
15 in at present, it could have been that first meeting, yes.

16

17 Q. In any event, what I'm suggesting to you is that it
18 was your idea to close off future claims, rather than
19 Bishop-in-Council?

20 A. No. Bishop-in-Council said, "What happens?", and we
21 responded.

22

23 Q. What I'm suggesting is that you put it to Mr Roland,
24 to begin with, and that later it was accepted by
25 Bishop-in-Council in the way that you have indicated?

26 A. No.

27

28 MR BECKETT: I tender those minutes of Bishop-in-Council
29 of 28 June 2007.

30

31 THE CHAIR: Is there a copy somewhere?

32

33 MR BECKETT: Yes.

34

35 THE CHAIR: As long as you have one, we'll mark it
36 exhibit 3-14.

37

38 **EXHIBIT #3-14 MINUTES OF BISHOP-IN-COUNCIL OF 28/06/2007**

39

40 MR BECKETT: Q. Now, Mr Comben, you're aware that in
41 2007 Mr Campion and [CA] continued to communicate with the
42 bishop about the settlement of their claims, aren't you?

43 A. Yes.

44

45 Q. And there was an issue, I think, by 3 July 2007 that
46 Mr Campion was very keen for you not to be involved with
47 the settlement of his claim?

1 A. That's correct.
2
3 Q. So do I take it that in the remainder of 2007 you had
4 relatively little to do with his claim and [CA]'s claim?
5 A. It was certainly very diminished, and at times I'd be
6 asked some vague question by the bishop, which I would know
7 would be referring to those claims, and occasionally when
8 it was dollars and cents I'd be asked specifically, but
9 yes.
10
11 Q. I'll proceed chronologically. SJH-74, if that could
12 be brought up, please. On 2 October 2008, Mr Harrison
13 wrote to Mr Roland at Foott Law & Co concerning --
14 A. What date? Sorry.
15
16 Q. 2 October 2008. The letter is just coming up now.
17 A. Right, sorry.
18
19 Q. On 2 October 2008, Mr Harrison wrote to Mr Roland
20 concerning three former residents of the North Coast
21 Children's Home who had suffered from physical and
22 psychological abuse.
23 A. Yes.
24
25 Q. That was referred to you, as I understand it, for
26 instructions?
27 A. Yes.
28
29 Q. And if tab 124 of exhibit 3-2 could be brought up,
30 please, you'll see that is a letter from you to Mr Roland
31 dated 29 January 2009?
32 A. Yes.
33
34 Q. The position that you took in that letter was to rely
35 upon the legal advice that you had received previously and
36 in fact to say that that case, the case of *Ellis* in the New
37 South Wales Court of Appeal, supported the position taken
38 by the diocese with respect to the group claims in 2007; is
39 that correct?
40 A. Yes, I believe.
41
42 Q. Then you were suggesting that Mr Roland contact
43 Mr Harrison and ask him to state the basis on which the
44 claims were being made?
45 A. Yes. I'm a bit nonplussed. I thought this was going
46 on for longer than the documents you have put in front of
47 me. And I notice that first one you put up said, "I refer

1 to your email". I think this was earlier than you're
2 suggesting here, that there had been contact at least.

3

4 Q. If you're referring to prior to 2 October 2008 - is
5 that what you're suggesting?

6 A. Yes. A personal event happened in my life that was
7 very close to one of these, and that first letter refers
8 to, "I refer to your email, Mr Roland", so there must have
9 been something before that.

10

11 Q. There may well have been. In any event, what I want
12 to ask you about is that in that final paragraph of the
13 letter of 29 January 2009:

14

Only when your client has before it -

16

17 that is, when the diocese has before it -

18

*from the solicitors for the proposed
19 claimants, the proper basis of their claim
20 will it be a situation to make a proper
21 decision as to how it will proceed.*

22

23 Do you see that?

24

25 A. Yes.

26

27 Q. The position by then - that is, by early 2009 - was
28 essentially the one put in your letter of the end of March
29 2007, namely, that these new claims would be dealt with by
30 way of a pastoral approach; is that correct?

31

32 A. Yes.

33

34 Q. And that by 2009, the diocese was not entertaining the
35 possibility of financial settlements?

36

37 A. That is correct.

38

39 Q. I haven't taken you to all the correspondence, but if
40 you'll accept from me that the letter of 2 October 2008,
41 and in fact your letter to Mr Roland of 29 January,
42 concerned three claimants that the Royal Commission is
43 referring to as [CE], [CF] and [CG]?

44

45 A. Yes.

46

47 Q. So it was the case, wasn't it, that those three people
were to be dealt with in accordance with the new policy; is
that correct?

48

49 A. Yes, yes.

1
2 Q. Save for some matters to do with Mr Campion that I'll
3 ask you about in a moment, essentially your time as
4 registrar finished at the end of 2009, and in that time no
5 other claimants had come forward?
6 A. I think that's correct, yes.
7
8 Q. If we could bring up tender bundle 126, that's
9 exhibit 3-2. If you could take it from me that by 14 June
10 2010 Mr Campion had agreed that he would take a financial
11 settlement with respect to his claim, and this is an
12 indication of that. Do you see that?
13 A. Yes.
14
15 Q. And that some three days later, if RC-90 could be
16 brought up, please, he offer that was provided by Mr Roland
17 to Mr Campion set out the terms of that settlement?
18 A. Yes.
19
20 Q. In those terms?
21 A. Yes.
22
23 Q. Were you aware of that in June 2010?
24 A. Yes, I think I actually did the sums for it, yes.
25
26 Q. And you provided instructions to Mr Roland to draft
27 this particular letter?
28 A. I would expect so. I think it would have been joint
29 instructions; Mr Roland would have been talking to the
30 bishop. I would have been standing behind him with the
31 numbers, yes.
32
33 Q. If one takes a comparison of those who were in the top
34 band of the group claims --
35 A. Yes.
36
37 Q. -- Mr Campion was offered that amount, called
38 "settlement amount" there, which was from the group claim,
39 wasn't it?
40 A. Yes.
41
42 Q. Together with interest from May 2007 to the date of
43 the letter?
44 A. Yes.
45
46 Q. And a lump sum for future counselling?
47 A. Yes.

1
2 Q. And a payment of \$7,730 to Medicare as well?
3 A. Yes.
4
5 Q. Then there was an inclusion of an apology, wasn't
6 there?
7 A. Yes.
8
9 Q. If we could go to RC-91, please, this is a copy of
10 Bishop Slater's letter to Mr Campion?
11 A. Yes.
12
13 Q. Which is said to be his apology. Were you involved in
14 the drafting of that document?
15 A. I think so, but not as substantially as the previous
16 apology.
17
18 Q. What do you recall - what discussions did you have
19 with Bishop Slater about his apology and your apology?
20 A. I don't recall any.
21
22 Q. Well, how did it come to be that you started to draft
23 your own apology?
24 A. Mr Campion asked me.
25
26 Q. And were you aware - perhaps you've answered this -
27 that the bishop was also drafting an apology?
28 A. Yes. Oh, yes.
29
30 Q. To your understanding, why was Mr Campion asking you
31 for a direct apology?
32 A. I think he was asking for an apology for the way
33 I had, in his view, treated him over the past four years.
34
35 Q. If RC-93 could come up, please. Is this the apology
36 you wrote to Mr Campion on 24 August 2010?
37 A. Yes.
38
39 Q. Just before I ask you about it, I wonder if you could
40 please indicate what contact you had with Mr Campion over
41 the period, really from the start of the group claims in
42 2006 through to 2010?
43 A. I think the contacts have been adduced in the evidence
44 that you've presented.
45
46 Q. Was it essentially in writing; is that what you're
47 saying?

1 A. I don't think there was any verbal communication or
2 any other sort of communication.
3
4 Q. Did you have any meetings with Mr Campion during that
5 period of time?
6 A. No.
7
8 Q. Did you ever consider that there would be some utility
9 to having a meeting with Mr Campion?
10 A. I would have met him if he'd asked.
11
12 Q. Did you offer a meeting with him?
13 A. No.
14
15 Q. Just coming to the letter, you say you:
16
17 *... apologise sincerely for treating*
18 *Richard "Tommy" Campion and [CA] with*
19 *contempt in respect to the aftermath of the*
20 *abuse they suffered as children while*
21 *living in an Anglican place ...*
22
23 A. Yes.
24
25 Q. Was that a truthful apology?
26 A. If that was the view which Mr Campion took, and I took
27 that term and the one in the last paragraph from his
28 letters, then I was apologising for it. Did I have that
29 view? No, I didn't. But if it would have helped
30 Mr Campion, I would have written it.
31
32 Q. You say at the last paragraph:
33
34 *As I am a member of the Anglican Clergy and*
35 *you a victim of abuse I should not have*
36 *made the many accusations of deceit that*
37 *I did.*
38
39 Do you see that?
40 A. Yes, I said that before.
41
42 Q. Did you make any accusations of deceit towards
43 Mr Campion?
44 A. Not that I'm aware of.
45
46 Q. So that paragraph was false, was it?
47 A. No. They are the words which Mr Campion wrote to me

1 and said he wanted apologies about. There are always, in
2 human communications, the words I say, the words you hear
3 and the words I meant to say. If that's how he took it,
4 then truthfully I say to him if that's your view, then
5 I apologise for it. But does it mean in my heart that
6 I believe I made any accusations of deceit? No, I do not.
7 But if it helped Richard and if that was his view, I'm
8 happy to have written it.

9
10 Q. Mr Comben, that statement, particularly in the third
11 paragraph, about accusations of deceit --

12 A. Yes.

13
14 Q. -- to any reasonable observer or reader of that
15 letter, it would not have the qualification that you've
16 just posed - sorry, I withdraw that. It's clumsily put.
17 Any reasonable reader of this particular letter would not
18 understand that this was an apology based on what you
19 wanted Mr Campion - what you said Mr Campion believed about
20 the issues of deceit?

21 A. I don't think that was a question, sir. I don't
22 understand that.

23
24 Q. Well, there's no qualification in there, in this
25 particular letter, that you're stating these things because
26 that is what Mr Campion believes, is there?

27 A. No.

28
29 Q. So, in other words, a reasonable reader of this
30 particular letter would conclude that you had made many
31 accusations of deceit; is that not correct?

32 A. And I'm happy that if I was wrong in - if I've made
33 accusations of deceit, that I was apologising to
34 Mr Campion. I have been put on my mettle and tested in the
35 adducement of evidence here about should I have said
36 something which was better? I could have argued a point.
37 I chose to give Mr Campion some comfort and I hope some
38 closure. If that is my crime, I plead guilty.

39
40 Q. Sir, it's simply the matter that you indicated there
41 that you had made many accusations of deceit when, in your
42 heart, if you like, as a matter of truth, you did not
43 believe that you had made such accusations of deceit; is
44 that correct?

45 A. You are being extremely hard. That is absolutely
46 correct. I lied in that. But if Mr Campion - or if I made
47 an accusation of deceit which I didn't know of, I was happy

1 to apologise for it.

2

3 MR BECKETT: Those are the questions.

4

5 <EXAMINATION BY MS WASS:

6

7 MS WASS: Q. Mr Comben, I appear on behalf of Mr Gerber
8 in these proceedings, and I just want to ask you a couple
9 of questions just by way of clarification of your earlier
10 evidence given on Friday. By November 2005, how long had
11 the professional standards committee been operating in
12 Grafton?

13 A. I would have gone to Grafton just after synod in 2004.
14 I wrote the ordinance there, or redacted it from the
15 Brisbane ordinance. It would have gone to
16 Bishop-in-Council. It was a couple of months before it was
17 done. So late 2004, more likely early 2005.

18

19 Q. In the early time of the professional standards
20 committee, was the view taken that you desired - when I say
21 "you", the Diocese of Grafton desired - the benefit of the
22 experience and expertise of Mr Gerber?

23 A. Oh, very much so. There was no-one in the diocese
24 that had that sort of experience. We had no real
25 understanding of what the ordinance and the protocol meant,
26 because there had never been any sorts of proceedings in
27 Grafton. There had been in Brisbane. I was vaguely aware
28 of those in Brisbane. And we needed someone of the order
29 and capability and experience of Mr Gerber.

30

31 Q. Was there any provision in the Grafton budget to allow
32 for a full-time professional standards director like
33 Mr Gerber or someone of his ilk?

34 A. No, the budget for the year would have been set before
35 my time there and accepted by synod, and I don't know that
36 synod would have had before it any real comprehension of
37 the needs, certainly it passed the ordinance, but not the
38 protocol; nor would we would have been aware at that stage
39 of the four or five cases that we would have settled in
40 that first year. So, no, there wouldn't have been any
41 provision in the budget.

42

43 Q. As the 41 claims came forward, was there discussion in
44 the diocese to getting a full-time professional standards
45 director?

46 A. No, never. We had by that time under our belt the
47 four or five settlements, the experience that we saw in two

1 other dioceses, which had done things a lot worse than us
2 in terms of their approach to recalcitrant priests,
3 et cetera, and so with Mr Gerber still being always on
4 tap - he couldn't come, he was busy, but he always managed
5 to get back to us in terms of giving advice, and, quite
6 frankly, at about that time, I was trying to get some more
7 admin assistance into the diocese and I was flat out
8 getting two days casual. I would not have had a hope of
9 being able to get a full-time director of professional
10 standards.

11
12 Q. Would you have had a hope of getting one part time?

13 A. I don't believe so. I got someone on two days a week,
14 and I think I thought myself pretty lucky to have got
15 someone on for a short period. Thankfully that person
16 proved to be very good and was able to be kept on, but
17 originally it was only part time, a short period.

18
19 Q. So far as your understanding as to how the committee
20 interacted with Mr Gerber, was it the case that from time
21 to time he was to provide ad hoc advice as and when asked?

22 A. I don't think there was ever a point at which that
23 suddenly occurred, but certainly from the beginning, when
24 the expectation was that he would be there, whatever that
25 meant, to a period a couple of years later, I think I'd
26 support what Mr Gerber said on Thursday, that something
27 changed; he became busier; we had more things. It just
28 became a lot easier for us to handle some of those things
29 ourselves, as agent for him, and we picked up knowledge and
30 understanding during that period. So we actually made the
31 system work. It's easy to say we didn't follow the
32 ordinance - well, I think we did follow the ordinance but
33 not the protocol. But we were making sure the outcomes
34 that were desired, as far as we could see, were there.

35
36 Q. Do I take it that that was a situation that existed as
37 at and going forward from November 2005?

38 A. From November 2005?

39
40 Q. Yes.

41 A. Yes, yes.

42
43 Q. When you used the expression that you were "acting as
44 agent for Mr Gerber", by that do you mean you were doing
45 some duties that you thought, if he weren't so busy, he
46 could be doing?

47 A. I wouldn't have put it in those terms because

1 I appreciate how busy, but we knew we were doing some
2 things which were not the registrar's job, et cetera, but
3 with four or five matters behind us, a full defrocking of
4 a priest and deposition of a priest, we were feeling fairly
5 robust about our ability to be able to handle these
6 matters.

7
8 Q. Was Mr Gerber, and perhaps one other person, the only
9 members of the committee that weren't resident in Grafton?

10 A. Yes, the lawyer, Aniko, would have been resident in
11 Lismore.

12
13 Q. That being the case, was it the case also that
14 Mr Gerber did not have ready access to the files of the
15 diocese?

16 A. That's right. He could have had access at any time,
17 and I would think that he - I don't think there would have
18 ever been any question if he had said, "Well, I'll take the
19 files with me", but the reality was that that was going to
20 be impractical. If I could go back to Mr Gerber's
21 evidence at one stage - he talked about Newcastle and the
22 scuttlebutt that was around about the cathedral - that was
23 where we were going to have difficulties with someone away
24 from the place, because I talked to the bishop at one stage
25 about those things, about Campbell Brown, and such, and
26 that low-level information provision could be done if you
27 were face to face. It couldn't be done with professional
28 standards director working 10 or 12 hours a day,
29 650 kilometres away.

30
31 Q. Could I just deal with the 41 claims. Given that the
32 view was taken that those matters will be dealt with solely
33 through the lawyers, was it the case that you expected
34 Mr Gerber to have little, if any, role in respect of those
35 matters?

36 A. Again, I don't think I would have applied my mind to
37 that, but that was the reality, that I knew Mr Gerber would
38 always be on the phone at the other end, had we needed
39 support in that and our thinking about it, and that's as it
40 proved to be when the matters needed to be referred to the
41 police.

42
43 Q. Are you referring to the situation where you asked him
44 to write particular letters and he did so?

45 A. Yes, again because I didn't have the experience to
46 know why we were referring these matters to the police when
47 solicitors acting for them had all the information. That

1 has always puzzled me and I still don't understand it,
2 except that that's what the ordinance requires.

3

4 Q. Was it your experience that as and when asked,
5 Mr Gerber appeared to do his very best to assist the
6 diocese?

7 A. Oh, I'd put it at a higher order than that. He was
8 excellent. We couldn't have done the work we did without
9 his input, and with his experience, always willing to teach
10 us.

11

12 MS WASS: Thank you, your Honour.

13

14 THE CHAIR: Ms McGlinchey, do you have any questions?

15

16 MS McGLINCHEY: I have some very brief questions.

17

18 THE CHAIR: I think you should go first.

19

20 **<EXAMINATION BY MS McGLINCHEY:**

21

22 MS McGLINCHEY: Q. Mr Comben, I appear for
23 Archdeacon Ezzy. In your evidence on Friday, you said that
24 following receipt of the second letter of complaint - that
25 is, the letter from [CA] in October 2005 - you caused some
26 inquiries to be made. Do you recall that evidence?

27 A. Yes, yes.

28

29 Q. And that one of the people that you spoke to was
30 Archdeacon Ezzy?

31 A. Yes.

32

33 Q. I think you also mentioned the former secretary of the
34 home?

35 A. Yes, Reverend Geoff Foley.

36

37 Q. And that you received back some very varying views
38 about two issues - firstly, the status of the home, and
39 also what had actually happened at the home. Do you recall
40 giving that evidence?

41 A. Yes - yes.

42

43 Q. Just on the matter of what actually happened at the
44 home, on that issue, do you recall that Archdeacon Ezzy
45 told you that during his time in the position of chair of
46 the board, he never heard of any allegation of abuse during
47 that time?

1 A. Not in those words.
2
3 Q. What words do you think that he used?
4 A. He said that nothing happened.
5
6 Q. He wouldn't have been in a position to know that,
7 would he?
8 A. Well, that's - I'm repeating to you the words I was
9 told. It wasn't put in the terms that he was not aware.
10 I was told that nothing happened. His wife was up there.
11
12 Q. Well, his wife certainly wasn't up there for the whole
13 period for which the complaints were received?
14 A. You asked a question. I'm giving you the answer.
15 I was told that - he said nothing happened.
16
17 Q. Can I just put it to you that the conversation was
18 that he had never heard of any allegations, rather than
19 that nothing had happened?
20 A. No, I'm not accepting that.
21
22 Q. On the second issue - that is, the status of the
23 home - you have had various conversations with
24 Archdeacon Ezzy over the years about that particular issue,
25 haven't you?
26 A. No.
27
28 Q. Have you had any conversations with him about that?
29 A. I don't think so.
30
31 Q. No conversations at all?
32 A. I don't think so, no.
33
34 Q. Are you aware that Archdeacon Ezzy's attitude has
35 always been that the home and the church are connected?
36 Are you aware that that's his attitude?
37 A. I would have thought that if that was the view, it
38 would have been brought up at Bishop-in-Council. I have no
39 recollection of that, nor the recollection which is
40 contained in his statement to the Royal Commission saying
41 that he had conversations with me and another person.
42 I have no recollection of that.
43
44 Q. Just in relation to the complaint about Mrs Ezzy that
45 I think you have alluded to in your evidence --
46 A. Yes.
47

1 Q. Would you agree with me that the substance of that
2 complaint was that Mrs Ezzy directed, in her role as
3 superintendent, the dismantling of a skateboard ramp?

4 A. I believe so, yes.

5

6 Q. And that that was done, at least on her view at the
7 time, that it was a safety issue, a child had been injured
8 on the skateboard ramp, so it was dismantled?

9 A. My recollection is the allegation made rather than
10 what Mrs Ezzy said about it. I know there was
11 a conversation, but, yes, my recollection is the material
12 contained in the stat dec.

13

14 Q. The person who put up the skateboard ramp took some
15 offence at that, but essentially that's what happened - the
16 skateboard ramp was dismantled?

17 A. Yes, the evidence in the stat dec was that the
18 skateboard ramp had a bit more substance to it than I think
19 Mrs Ezzy suggested. I'm not saying which is right or
20 wrong, but they were the two views. The young man involved
21 said it was some building which he had done, and such.
22 I think Mrs Ezzy said it was a simple skateboard ramp.

23

24 Q. A skateboard ramp does involve some construction, but
25 essentially that's what it was about - it was about
26 a skateboard ramp?

27 A. My understanding is, yes.

28

29 MS McGLINCHEY: Thank you. That's all I have.

30

31 **<EXAMINATION BY MR GRIFFIN:**

32

33 MR GRIFFIN: Q. Mr Comben, my name is Griffin. I appear
34 on behalf of Archbishop Aspinall and Bishop McLary. Could
35 the witness be shown RM-2. Mr Comben, I think you were
36 taken to that document by counsel assisting?

37 A. Yes.

38

39 Q. Can I ask you to look at the 10 dot points under:

40

41 *He has provided the following*
42 *information ...*

43

44 A. Yes.

45

46 Q. Do they accurately set out, in summary form, what you
47 said to Mr McLary?

1 A. I think except, as I said in evidence this morning,
2 number 5, about the "all except eight relate to
3 disciplinary". I think I would have been referring to all
4 except eight clergy matters, because there was always in my
5 mind 8, 20 and 40.

6
7 Q. Apart from that matter, are you satisfied that the
8 other nine dot points accurately set out what you
9 communicated to Mr McLary?

10 A. I believe so, yes.

11
12 Q. Could the witness be shown RM-3. Would you read to
13 yourself the first four paragraphs?

14 A. Yes.

15
16 Q. Do paragraphs 3 and 4 amount to an accurate summary of
17 information you provided to Mr McLary?

18 A. Paragraphs 1 and 2 are the one-liners at the top, are
19 they?

20
21 Q. Yes.

22 A. And 3 and 4 are the substantial ones?

23
24 Q. Correct.

25 A. Yes.

26
27 Q. So you agree they're an accurate summary of the
28 information you provided?

29 A. Yes.

30
31 Q. At the time, were you aware that Mr McLary was seeking
32 this information on behalf of Archbishop Aspinall?

33 A. No, but I - I assumed he was seeking it on behalf of
34 himself and that he would probably be passing it on to the
35 archbishop. I would have had no problems with that.

36
37 Q. Did you have an expectation that Archbishop Aspinall
38 would eventually receive that information and would --

39 A. I had no expectation and no interest in it. I was
40 being asked questions by director of professional
41 standards. I was answering them truthfully and honestly,
42 end of story for me.

43
44 MR GRIFFIN: Thank you, your Honour.

45
46
47

1 <EXAMINATION BY MR TAYLOR:
2

3 MR TAYLOR: Q. Mr Comben, I appear on behalf of
4 Bishop Slater. Is it Mr Comben or Reverend Comben?

5 A. It was reverend until Friday. I signed letters of
6 deposition and holy orders relinquishment outside of this
7 Commission last Friday morning, so I think I'm "Mr".
8

9 Q. Can I just ask you some general questions to begin
10 with. You had a background in financial matters when you
11 came to the job as registrar?

12 A. I'd say management rather than finance, but I've got
13 a nodding acquaintance with finance, yes.
14

15 Q. As part of your duties as a registrar, you were to
16 deal with the financial matters of the diocese?

17 A. Yes.
18

19 Q. In fact, you were the person in control of the
20 finances, effectively?

21 A. Yes.
22

23 Q. It's the situation that you prepared reports for
24 Bishop-in-Council meetings on a regular basis in relation
25 to finances?

26 A. Yes.
27

28 Q. Did you know Bishop Slater before you were appointed
29 registrar?

30 A. Yes. We had both been at St Francis Theological
31 College in the mid-70s, I as a secular student, he as an
32 ordinand, and he had a parish during part of this time next
33 to my electorate in Brisbane, so we'd had a nodding
34 acquaintanceship over 40 years.
35

36 Q. And during the time that you were the registrar, and
37 I think you described it as a financial adviser after you
38 resigned as registrar?

39 A. Business adviser was the term used by the diocese.
40

41 Q. In that period of time, you got to know Bishop Slater
42 more intimately?

43 A. Well, I don't know about "intimately", but I knew him
44 a lot better, yes.
45

46 Q. Sorry, a clumsy word. In the course of your
47 discussions with Bishop Slater, did you form an opinion as

1 to his knowledge or understanding of financial matters?

2 A. Yes, I did.

3

4 Q. And what was that opinion?

5 A. I'd sometimes have to lead him through the finances.

6 He - it was not his strong suit.

7

8 Q. As far as you were aware, he had no training or
9 knowledge of financial matters?

10 A. Oh, that would be to overreach. He had been a parish
11 priest. He knew how to read a balance sheet or a profit
12 and loss, I suppose, more than anything, but not in the
13 complex situation that we had of Bishop-in-Council, trust
14 funds, corporate trustees, developments going on, parishes,
15 et cetera. That takes it to a whole new level, and I think
16 I'd have to say that the bishop and most members of
17 Bishop-in-Council, and even some of the trustees, never got
18 a full grasp of all of that. It took me a long time to be
19 able to understand, and even then the auditors, the new
20 auditors, came along and said, "The past has got it all
21 wrong; we've got to start again."

22

23 Q. Would it be fair to say that the bishop relied upon
24 you to give him information to financial matters such as
25 you just talked about?

26 A. Very much so, at two levels: one, quite informally,
27 at a low level just to check the money was there; and then,
28 often at a higher level when we were going to have
29 discussions at Bishop-in-Council.

30

31 Q. And during your time as registrar, you formed an
32 opinion as to the financial health of the diocese; is that
33 correct?

34 A. I formed various opinions at various times as to its
35 health or illness, yes.

36

37 Q. During the time that negotiations were taking place in
38 respect of the group claim, was it your view that
39 financially the diocese, although it might be asset rich,
40 was cash poor and therefore financially unhealthy?

41 A. Yes, but I gave evidence on Friday saying that when
42 I first went there, in the middle of 2004, I formed a view
43 fairly quickly that there was actually money there
44 somewhere, and my view would have been that perhaps over
45 the first two years there was money there, but then when
46 some of the land development speculation stuff went wrong
47 and the school, which I said I walked past every day for

1 18 months thinking, "How is that place viable?" - all of
2 that then had an impact on, did we really have money or
3 have we got some money to be able to cover something which
4 is looming on the horizon?

5

6 Q. Before you undertook that investigation, and you've
7 told us on Friday about moneys, various accounts,
8 squirrelled away and things of that nature - until you
9 formed the view that things weren't as bad as what they
10 were perhaps conveyed to you when you started, did you form
11 the view that Bishop Slater had any view one way or the
12 other on the finances of the diocese?

13 A. No, he had been - I think he was consecrated about
14 November. I would have gone there after synod in mid-year
15 2004, and there had been the man that later became the
16 General Secretary of the Anglican Church, Reverend
17 Bruce McAteer - he was an accountant by trade, and I think
18 that everything was left to him, and perhaps that's why, in
19 some ways, there wasn't much learning or knowledge or
20 corporate memory of the accounts and how they were done,
21 because Bruce knew it all and it was all fine.

22

23 Q. Would you agree with the proposition that
24 Bishop Slater relied on other people to tell him what the
25 finances of the diocese were?

26 A. Yes.

27

28 Q. From time to time?

29 A. Yes.

30

31 Q. And that was throughout the period that you were
32 registrar?

33 A. Oh, yes. He certainly ramped up his knowledge, and
34 especially in the bad times. But at times when you're
35 sitting around with the executive and everyone was
36 scratching their head, he would be the first one to be
37 saying, "Well, let's hope they", or me, "have got it
38 right."

39

40 Q. Do you recall giving evidence this morning about the
41 preparation of that schedule that you produced after
42 receipt of the rather lengthy letter from Mr Harrison in
43 September 2006 in respect of the various complainants and
44 the issues relating to each complainant?

45 A. Yes.

46

47 Q. I think you said, in response to a question from

1 counsel assisting as to whether you provided that schedule
2 to Bishop Slater, that you weren't sure; it's more likely
3 you spoke to him, just to paraphrase a rather lengthy
4 answer you gave. Is that correct?

5 A. I think so, because I was conscious of the ordinance
6 saying keep a distance, but I was also in the business,
7 especially of something like that, in making sure the
8 bishop was aware.

9

10 Q. You certainly have no recollection, sitting in the
11 witness box today, that you actually did provide that
12 document to Bishop Slater, do you?

13 A. No. And I have reflected on it since, over lunch, and
14 I have no reflection - no recollection of giving him that
15 document.

16

17 Q. Would you agree that it's more likely than not that
18 you didn't give him the document?

19 A. I think that's quite likely.

20

21 Q. Can I move now to the media release, you described it
22 as; the document which was, I think you were led to
23 believe, published in the Northern Star?

24 A. Yes, I think the Northern Star had said, "This is what
25 is being said to us. Do you have any responses?"

26

27 Q. Once again, in response to a direct question from
28 counsel assisting about whether you spoke to Bishop Slater
29 about that, I think you said, "I would have, yes", or words
30 to that effect?

31 A. Yes.

32

33 Q. Is it the situation that you actually drafted
34 the document?

35 A. Yes.

36

37 Q. Do you have a recollection of ever showing that
38 document to Bishop Slater?

39 A. No, I don't have a recollection one way or the other.

40

41 Q. It's more likely than not that you didn't?

42 A. Oh, I'm not sure. He would have certainly been made
43 aware, if he was - he would have been made aware, wherever
44 he was, that I was going to say something. He would have
45 been given some detail. Whether I would have actually
46 shown it to him or whether he trusted me to put it out is
47 a different question. But - yes.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Q. Just in relation to that, he relied upon you and trusted you explicitly, didn't he?

A. That's a question to put to him. I am still concerned about that I apparently left the diocese, that I left not on good terms, which I knew nothing about that, so I think that's a question for the bishop.

Q. At no time during your tenure did Bishop Slater make any complaint to you about your performance?

A. None whatsoever, nor did anyone at Bishop-in-Council, and they all came to my wedding after I had left.

Q. He didn't complain to you that he couldn't trust you or rely upon you at any stage, did he?

A. Could I go back to the question. It was very clear that he relied on me, as I relied on him in spiritual matters, that it was actually a good partnership.

Q. Just to take up the point about not leaving on good terms, is it the situation there was a dispute about whether you should be given time off to pursue certain studies?

A. Oh, I don't think so. I had been uncomfortable for a while about the finances of the diocese. I wasn't totally comfortable, as I think my evidence has shown, about the settlement of the claims. I had lost my wife not long before. And I wouldn't have minded doing some study. But I gave as the prime reason for me getting out my belief that they could not afford me. I wasn't earning a huge salary, but something had to be done to get the budget back into order, so I said I had to go. I later found out that someone was put on on a higher salary than me, which was rather interesting.

Q. Was it fair to say that you actually did approach the diocese to seek to reduce your hours that you were working so that you could perform studies outside?

A. I don't recall that. But we were close enough. We all lived next door to each other. There were plenty of dinner parties with a bit of red wine. That could easily have been raised, but it wasn't raised formally. I actually wanted to get out. I was - as I say, I had lost my wife not long before. I was stressed out of my mind. The diocese was not going in a good direction. I was pretty unhappy about some things going on, so I eventually just said I want out. But then, as I say, they asked me to

1 stay on as some sort of business adviser.
2
3 Q. How long did you stay on as business adviser for?
4 A. Until the early part of the following year,
5 February/March, March/April.
6
7 Q. Going back to your media release, I think you said you
8 had already done some media by the time you drafted that
9 document; is that correct?
10 A. Yes.
11
12 Q. How did that come about?
13 A. I think a camera turned up somewhere. There was
14 a thing called Gunundi, which was a piece of land that was
15 of some notoriety and controversy. I did some media on
16 that. And this, I, with my past, was a lot more
17 comfortable with the media than the bishop was. As long as
18 it wasn't speaking about certain matters, the bishop was
19 content. I think they were the only two pieces of media
20 I did.
21
22 Q. In discussing the media release with the bishop, did
23 you talk in specifics or generalities?
24 A. Generalities.
25
26 Q. Was that due in part because of your understanding
27 that the bishop would need to be kept at arm's length
28 because of the procedure that should have been followed?
29 A. Yes, and I think the Northern Star was seeking some
30 responses almost immediately. Normally I would have gone
31 on the telephone. I was conscious that I could be
32 potentially misquoted or something, so I took the view that
33 I would write it down as the bishop would have done in most
34 cases. He would very rarely go and ad lib, so I did that
35 as a means of making sure there could never be any question
36 as to what I had actually said or what I had meant to say.
37
38 Q. At some stage you had discussions with Bishop Slater
39 in late 2006 about a view that had been expressed by
40 Archbishop Aspinall in relation to the approach of the
41 diocese to the group claim; is that correct?
42 A. Yes.
43
44 Q. Was it more than one discussion?
45 A. Yes.
46
47 Q. During the course of that discussion, Bishop Slater

1 made clear to you, did he not, various points that the
2 archbishop had raised with him?

3 A. Yes.

4

5 Q. In fact, I think you've seen the documents where part
6 of the dot points that had been made in Bishop Aspinall's
7 correspondence were incorporated in correspondence that you
8 instructed Mr Roland to write; is that correct?

9 A. Yes.

10

11 Q. In respect of that, it was Bishop Slater who raised
12 these issues with you?

13 A. Oh, yes.

14

15 Q. No-one else prior to that?

16 A. No.

17

18 Q. Later on in 2007, after the settlement of the group
19 claim whilst Mr Campion and [CA]'s claims were still on
20 foot, once again you had a discussion with or a number of
21 discussions with Bishop Slater about your role in dealing
22 with those claims?

23 A. Yes.

24

25 Q. Do you recall those conversations?

26 A. Yes. I don't know I'd be saying "conversations", but
27 certainly I was informed when Bishop Slater returned from
28 the conversation with those two individuals that there was
29 a problem with me continuing to be actively involved, so
30 could I step back, and I said yes.

31

32 Q. Notwithstanding that, from time to time thereafter you
33 had conversations with Bishop Slater about what should be
34 done in progressing those claims?

35 A. Yes. Generally it was simply on the financial side.
36 At times it might have been, as I said earlier, an
37 anonymous inquiry, which I knew was concerning those
38 matters, but he kept me at arm's length to honour his
39 commitment to Mr Campion.

40

41 Q. He did, however, rely upon you, as you said, to do the
42 figures or financials; is that correct?

43 A. Yes.

44

45 Q. I think you said in your evidence earlier today that
46 you calculated, for instance, the interest component of the
47 offer that was put --

1 A. I actually did a bit more than that. I didn't just
2 calculate it. I suggested it be put in there.
3
4 Q. Can I just ask you some general questions about the
5 Bishop-in-Council procedure. You were a member of
6 Bishop-in-Council whilst you were the registrar?
7 A. Yes, yes.
8
9 Q. Had you been involved in a Bishop-in-Council situation
10 prior to that?
11 A. Well, I was in Brisbane. I'd never heard of it.
12 I came down to Grafton thinking it was on top of the range.
13 I didn't know where Grafton was before I came down.
14
15 Q. During the course of those regular meetings, there
16 were discussions between the various members?
17 A. Yes.
18
19 Q. Eventually there were resolutions put up, or, sorry,
20 motions put up and resolutions passed?
21 A. Yes.
22
23 Q. That was the result of a vote?
24 A. Oh, probably 50/50, just consensus. Probably more
25 would be consensus, 60, 70 per cent would be consensus. It
26 was unusual to go - it wasn't unusual, but it was far more
27 usual, just consensus, or ayes or nos.
28
29 Q. And as far as that was concerned, would you accept
30 that Bishop Slater didn't have a vote in those matters?
31 A. He certainly didn't normally vote. He would have had
32 a casting vote, I think, under the ordinance, but, yes, he
33 didn't normally vote.
34
35 Q. Do you have any specific knowledge whether he had any
36 sort of vote, casting or otherwise, in relation to
37 Bishop-in-Council meetings?
38 A. My belief is that at Bishop-in-Council he had
39 a casting vote, yes. But I never saw it exercised.
40
41 Q. It's the situation, isn't it, that you moved forward
42 in relation to the group claims and other matters as
43 a result of what you took to be the instructions you
44 received from Bishop-in-Council?
45 A. Very much so.
46
47 Q. It was governance by committee, wasn't it?

1 A. Yes.
2
3 Q. Can you think of any instance where Bishop Slater said
4 words to the effect of, "Hang on, everyone, this is not
5 right. We have to do it another way", or anything of that
6 nature, as a result of Bishop-in-Council coming to
7 a conclusion on a particular matter?
8 A. No, and my close association with him would have
9 generally been - he would have known what I was taking to
10 Bishop-in-Council, and that discussion might have been
11 taken beforehand. I was at times waiting for people around
12 the table to have that sort of discussion with me. They
13 never did.
14
15 Q. I think you said in relation to the apology for the
16 group claim, you actually drafted that; is that correct?
17 A. Yes.
18
19 Q. And I think the word you used was that you drafted it
20 and you would have done the "thrust of it"; is that
21 correct?
22 A. Yes.
23
24 Q. Is it the situation I think you said that
25 Bishop Slater may have finessed it?
26 A. Yes, I think edited it, finessed it, yes.
27
28 Q. Do you accept as an accurate proposition that you
29 drafted the apology, you gave it to the bishop, he made
30 some minor changes to it, and then it was settled?
31 A. After he had requested me to draft the apology, yes.
32
33 Q. He made no major changes to the draft that you
34 prepared; is that correct?
35 A. I don't have a recollection of that, but the end of it
36 is more his words than mine.
37
38 Q. When you say "his words than mine", it was the words
39 that you drafted for him as part of your job, wasn't it?
40 A. Yes, but he would often add something in about, well,
41 look, the blessings and the "prayers are with you",
42 et cetera, certainly in that apology. There used to be
43 a bit of a joke around the office that people could
44 actually tell my writing as against his, and I think in
45 that case you can at least see the end was done and he
46 didn't - he certainly didn't have a quick look and give it
47 back or anything like that.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Q. I'm not suggesting that at all. Would it be fair to say that he looked at the more spiritual content of the document rather than the substance of the document that you had drafted?

A. That would sum up our different personalities and certainly what happened, yes.

Q. I appreciate that you have given some evidence about the apologies. Do you recollect either being handed all the apologies signed by the bishop or alternatively his personal assistant, Mary Elliott?

A. No.

Q. Is it possible either of those circumstances occurred, that is, the bishop handed them to you or Mary Elliott handed them to you?

A. It could have been. I think I would have recalled it. The other option there is that Mary Elliott could have taken it straight down to Foott Law & Co, if that was the case, as she would at times with matters from the bishop.

Q. You gave some evidence about the various offers that were made during the course of the two-day settlement conference in December 2006; do you remember that evidence?

A. Yes.

Q. Is it the situation that the offer from Mr Harrison on behalf of the group at the end of the conference was an amount of \$1.2 million?

A. I'd have said 1.25, but yes.

Q. And did you reject that out of hand?

A. Yes.

Q. You thought you had sufficient authority at that stage to do so?

A. Yes.

Q. There was no doubt in your mind about that?

A. None whatsoever.

Q. And as far as the calculation of any of the offers that were made on behalf of the diocese, would it be fair to say that you were the author of those settlement offers?

A. That would be correct.

1 Q. It was you who calculated the money?
2 A. Yes.
3
4 Q. And right up until the time that the Bishop-in-Council
5 authorised a maximum of \$950,000, it was effectively you
6 deciding how much would be proposed?
7 A. Deciding how much should be proposed and also asking
8 Mr Roland to put into the bottom of the letter to
9 Simon Harrison that we still wanted to have some
10 particulars as to who was to get what, so that we could
11 approach it more pastorally, so that we were clearly
12 working out which ones were central and which were heavy
13 and which ones were, as I said this morning, on the edges.
14
15 Q. During the course of the two-day conference, there was
16 on one occasion a phone call put through to Bishop Slater
17 about the status of the offers to and fro; correct?
18 A. Yes, that's correct.
19
20 Q. Is it fair to say that Bishop Slater suggested that
21 there be an increase in the offer of the diocese at that
22 time?
23 A. Yes.
24
25 Q. And would it be fair to say that that's the only time
26 that he made any comment about the actual dollars and cents
27 involved in the offer being made?
28 A. I think so, yes.
29
30 Q. Just dealing with the logistics of the group claim,
31 did you get draft letters from Mr Roland to approve before
32 they were sent out or did he send letters out and then send
33 you copies?
34 A. Oh, generally the letters would go out and send
35 copies. There might have been an occasion when he might
36 have said, especially with ones such as the matters from
37 Archbishop Aspinall, when he might have sent that back and
38 said, "Is this okay?" I would at times go down to the
39 office and he would even at times dictate letters while
40 I was there so that we were both aware what was being said,
41 but they were his letters, yes.
42
43 Q. Is it fair to say that Bishop Slater made no
44 contribution, as it were, to the construction of any of
45 those letters?
46 A. No, it would not be fair because he certainly made
47 a contribution on the one which concerned the

1 Bishop Aspinall material. He wanted that in.

2

3 Q. Save for that letter, is it fair to say that, in
4 general, Bishop Slater was not involved in the day-to-day
5 processing of the correspondence that was to go to the
6 other side during the course of the settlement negotiations
7 on the group claim?

8 A. Save for that letter, that is correct.

9

10 Q. Are you aware if Bishop Slater ever received copies of
11 the letters that had been sent on behalf of the diocese?

12 A. He would not have done as a matter of course. If
13 there was something important - well, from the letters
14 sent, no, he generally wouldn't have done.

15

16 Q. You will remember being shown the document which was
17 the professional standards committee meeting minutes of
18 21 November 2006 where you weren't present. Do you
19 remember that document?

20 A. That's correct.

21

22 Q. If you need to see it, let me know.

23 A. No.

24

25 Q. It seemed to indicate that you were tasked, or would
26 be tasked, to inform Bishop Slater about what was to happen
27 in relation to reporting to police; is that correct?

28 A. That's correct.

29

30 Q. And did you do so?

31 A. I would have done, yes.

32

33 Q. Do you have a recollection of doing so?

34 A. No, but I would have done. It was my standard
35 practice to at least let him know in general terms where we
36 were and what we were doing. So I would have got
37 those minutes and at some stage just said a few words to
38 him.

39

40 Q. When you say "at some stage", you can't give us any
41 idea of how long it was after you became aware of
42 those minutes that you actually did inform Bishop Slater;
43 is that correct?

44 A. Yes, again because of the personal matters in my own
45 life. But can I add that at about that time when I became
46 conscious of it being reverend Campbell Brown being again
47 involved, I certainly had a conversation with the bishop at

1 that time saying, "We've got to do something about this",
2 and the bishop very strongly agreeing with me.

3

4 Q. It was left, was it not, that you would have to follow
5 that matter up on behalf of the bishop; correct?

6 A. Yes, very much so.

7

8 Q. It wasn't a situation where the bishop said, "Leave it
9 to me. I will do this", or "I will do that".

10 A. No.

11

12 Q. That wasn't his job, was it?

13 A. No, and we knew that very well. There's been a lot of
14 discussion about protocol and finer points of that,
15 et cetera. In the matter of Lawton where we deposed
16 a priest, I kept the bishop quietly informed but kept him
17 at arm's length because eventually, even though the board
18 made the decision that he should be deposed, it was going
19 to be his final decision and there should be no hint or
20 suggestion of bias, so we were conscious of that, so we
21 kept it away from him.

22

23 MR TAYLOR: Nothing further, thank you, your Honour.

24

25 <EXAMINATION BY MR BECKETT:

26

27 MR BECKETT: A couple of brief matters arising,
28 your Honour.

29

30 Q. Do I take it from the evidence you've given, first
31 about finances and the advice to the bishop about finances,
32 and his involvement in correspondence with Mr Roland, am
33 I right in saying that throughout the group claims, the
34 bishop looked to you and to Mr Roland to advise him about
35 the carriage of the group claim matters?

36 A. About the carriage of it, subject to
37 Bishop-in-Council's instructions, yes, that is correct.

38

39 Q. I think it is the case, isn't it, that you had an
40 adjoining office to the bishop?

41 A. Yes.

42

43 Q. And that as a result of that proximity, you were
44 frequently in conversation with him?

45 A. Yes.

46

47 Q. Just one minor matter. At the beginning of your

1 examination by Mr Taylor, you indicated that last week you
2 agreed to relinquishment of holy orders.

3 A. I did not agree. I relinquished holy orders. I did
4 it on my own bat.

5

6 Q. So was there a request from the diocese for you to do
7 that?

8 A. No. The Venerable Greg Ezzy looked at the instrument
9 and said, "What's this? I've never seen anything like this
10 before."

11

12 MR BECKETT: Those are the questions.

13

14 THE CHAIR: Yes, thank you, Mr Comben, you may step down.
15 You're excused. Thank you.

16

17 <THE WITNESS WITHDREW

18

19 THE CHAIR: Yes, Mr Beckett.

20

21 MR BECKETT: I call Bishop Keith Slater.

22

23 <KEITH FRANCIS SLATER, sworn: [3.08pm]

24

25 <EXAMINATION BY MR BECKETT:

26

27 MR BECKETT: Q. Bishop, I wonder if you could state your
28 full name and occupation for the Royal Commission, please?

29 A. Keith Francis Slater. Retired.

30

31 Q. Prior to becoming the Bishop of Grafton, what was your
32 experience, if I can call it that? What offices had you
33 held within the Anglican Church of Australia?

34 A. I think you need to appreciate that I'd been ordained
35 for 28 years at that stage.

36

37 Q. So, bishop, you had been ordained for 28 years?

38 A. Yes.

39

40 Q. Before you became Bishop of Grafton, what offices
41 within the Anglican Church did you hold?

42 A. Prior to going to Grafton Diocese, I was serving in
43 the Diocese of Brisbane from 1994 to 2003, and during that
44 time I was the rector of a parish called St Clements on the
45 Hill, Stafford, and also for a portion of that time, from
46 about 1996, I think, I was one of the archdeacons in
47 Brisbane Diocese.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Q. As an archdeacon in the Brisbane Diocese, were you involved in the financial management of the diocese?

A. Only so much as being on the diocesan council.

Q. I understand that you had some involvement with professional standards matters at the Diocese of Brisbane, is that correct, while you were there?

A. Not majorly. The diocese was moving these matters forward, putting policies and procedures in place, so it was in those initial stages of all that happening.

Q. In 2003, what part of 2003 - when did you become the Bishop of Grafton?

A. 14 November 2003.

Q. In 2004, as I understand it, the Diocese of Grafton adopted the Professional Standards Ordinance of 2004?

A. Yes.

Q. Had you been at General Synod when that particular model ordinance had been adopted?

A. I have been reflecting upon this, the dates and times and so forth. The actual model ordinance, with a raft of other motions at General Synod, was passed in October 2004, and I had some confusion in my mind because we actually passed this legislation in May 2004, prior to General Synod. We were actually being proactive in that sense, because there was a lot of work going on at the national synod level, and we had picked this up fairly strongly and enacted the legislation. That's the only reason I can think of - because I was going through this last night thinking how could this be that we had a model ordinance that General Synod was recommending, yet we had already the same as this, 2004; the dates must be wrong. But obviously it's not.

Q. Also the related protocol with respect to matters of sexual abuse was also adopted in that year within the Diocese of Grafton?

A. Adopted in August, I think, that year.

Q. And it was the case that the protocol in Grafton was based on the Brisbane protocol?

A. That's correct.

Q. So you were able to look to Brisbane during that time

1 for assistance about drafting the protocol?
2 A. This is the normal practice across the Australian
3 church - if you are looking for new legislation, look
4 around to see who has already got legislation in place.
5

6 Q. So I take it, then, given that involvement with the
7 Professional Standards Ordinance, you understood that the
8 three key components, if you like, of the Professional
9 Standards Ordinance were a professional standards
10 committee, a professional standards director and
11 a professional standards board; is that correct?

12 A. Yes.
13

14 Q. I understand Mr Gerber had been serving as
15 professional standards director, perhaps not in that name,
16 for some years, is that right, by the time we come to 2004?

17 A. Could you repeat that question, please?
18

19 Q. Maybe I should ask it the other way around. When you
20 assumed the position of bishop - and please correct me if
21 I'm using the wrong term, but when you came Bishop of
22 Grafton - was Mr Gerber providing services of
23 a professional standards director to the Diocese of
24 Grafton?

25 A. I'm not aware. I can't answer that.
26

27 Q. Do you remember when the Diocese of Grafton first
28 appointed Mr Gerber --

29 A. August 2004.
30

31 Q. So you adopted the ordinance first and then you
32 appointed him as professional standards director?

33 A. I think the evidence shows that within a few days of
34 the protocol being accepted by Bishop-in-Council, I wrote
35 to Mr Gerber and appointed him.
36

37 Q. I think the evidence that we have so far is that
38 Mr Gerber was first appointed to the professional standards
39 committee of the Diocese of Grafton. Is that your
40 recollection?

41 A. I think my letter in August says - I meant to check
42 it, but I think my letter appointed him as professional
43 standards director. I think that's correct.
44

45 Q. As far as you were concerned, I presume that the
46 purpose of that appointment was so that Mr Gerber would be
47 able to undertake the role of a professional standards

1 director in accordance with the Professional Standards
2 Ordinance?
3 A. Yes.
4
5 Q. You understood, I presume, that clause 24 of the
6 ordinance required all clergy to report any information to
7 the professional standards committee?
8 A. Yes.
9
10 Q. And that that term "information" is in fact defined in
11 the ordinance to include numerous matters but those which
12 include child sexual abuse?
13 A. Yes.
14
15 Q. So by the time we come to Mr Campion's letter in
16 August 2005, was it your understanding that the Diocese of
17 Grafton had a structure for dealing with professional
18 standards complaints, including child sexual abuse, which
19 followed the Professional Standards Ordinance?
20 A. Yes.
21
22 Q. I'll just take you to some matters in the protocol, if
23 I could. It's exhibit 3-3, tab 2. If we could go
24 immediately to clause 14, the qualifications are set out
25 there. If we go over to the next page, reporting to
26 professional standards committee and Bishop-in-Council.
27 You'd agree, wouldn't you, that the professional standards
28 director has a number of duties that he or she is to
29 undertake?
30 A. Yes.
31
32 Q. And that those duties include reporting to police in
33 appropriate circumstances?
34 A. Yes.
35
36 Q. The appointment of a contact person for a claimant who
37 has come forward?
38 A. Yes.
39
40 Q. The provision of a pastoral support person; that's
41 correct, isn't it?
42 A. Yes.
43
44 Q. That the professional standards director may make
45 recommendations to the professional standards committee
46 about the need for any internal assessment?
47 A. Sorry, whereabouts are we?

1
2 Q. Sorry, that's 14.11, if we could scroll down, please.
3 A. Right. Thank you.
4
5 Q. Do you agree that that's part of the role of the
6 professional standards director?
7 A. Yes.
8
9 Q. Then 14.12, that the person has a role - that is, the
10 professional standards director has a role - in terms of
11 appointing counselling for a victim?
12 A. Yes.
13
14 Q. In fact, if we just look at that first line:
15
16 *When the Contact Person has obtained*
17 *details of the Allegations, consider*
18 *whether there may be a moral duty for the*
19 *Diocese to pay for counselling of the*
20 *victim.*
21
22 Do you see that?
23 A. Mmm-hmm.
24
25 Q. So do I take it from that that it's not necessarily
26 based on some legal duty to pay for counselling; is that
27 correct?
28 A. Right, yes.
29
30 Q. That sort of moral duty would arise, would it not,
31 where the allegations of abuse had occurred at the hands of
32 clergy?
33 A. I'm sorry, the question again?
34
35 Q. That moral duty would arise, for example, where the
36 abuse that was alleged had occurred at the hands of clergy?
37 A. Certainly.
38
39 Q. Or other church workers within the diocese?
40 A. Yes.
41
42 Q. Then the professional standards director is involved
43 in proposing appropriate forms of redress to the
44 professional standards committee?
45 A. Can you scroll it up? Thank you.
46
47 Q. And if we could go over the page as well with respect

1 to 14.13.
2 A. Yes.
3
4 Q. And that the kinds of redress that might be included
5 are those matters set out there on page 16?
6 A. Yes.
7
8 Q. Then the process, at the bottom of the screen there,
9 is that the professional standards committee may recommend
10 redress and in doing so should check with the general
11 manager or registrar that funding is available?
12 A. Yes.
13
14 Q. If we go through to the role of the registrar at 21 --
15
16 THE CHAIR: Mr Beckett, where does all this go?
17
18 MR BECKETT: In terms of the bishop's knowledge of the
19 protocol.
20
21 THE CHAIR: Yes, and why do we need to know what he knew?
22
23 MR BECKETT: In terms of what happens next and the
24 structures that were adopted.
25
26 THE CHAIR: That it wasn't followed?
27
28 MR BECKETT: Yes.
29
30 THE CHAIR: Wasn't that the real question?
31
32 MR BECKETT: Yes.
33
34 THE CHAIR: Q. Bishop, I'm sure you have read this many
35 times, particularly probably in the last few days. We've
36 read it, too. I think Mr Beckett is going to take you to
37 what actually happened.
38 A. Yes, thank you.
39
40 MR BECKETT: Thank you, your Honour.
41
42 Q. So, bishop, if we could go, then, to the start of the
43 process, which appears to be Mr Campion's letter of August
44 2005, was that letter shown to you about the time that it
45 was received - late August, early September?
46 A. As far as I recall, yes.
47

1 Q. Was it Mr Comben that showed you a copy of that
2 letter?
3 A. The letter that went to the - originally to the
4 Archbishop of Sydney?
5
6 Q. Yes, that's correct. Would you like me to show you
7 the letter?
8 A. No, I know the letter you mean. Thank you. I'm just
9 trying to recall. It may well have been directed to me by
10 the Archbishop of Sydney, but I saw it at some point, yes.
11
12 Q. Did Mr Comben speak with you about what response he
13 proposed to provide to Mr Campion?
14 A. I suspect we had a conversation at that time. I'm
15 trying to recall the words of it, but I'm not always good
16 at recalling those kinds of conversations. But thinking
17 back into it, I probably directed that this is where it
18 went to, to the professional standards committee.
19
20 Q. So you asked for it to be referred to a professional
21 standards committee; is that what you said?
22 A. With the action that followed, I suspect that's what
23 I did at that time.
24
25 Q. When you say "the action that followed", what are you
26 referring to?
27 A. Well, it was obviously dealt with at the professional
28 standards level at that point.
29
30 Q. You're aware that almost immediately Mr Comben offered
31 Mr Campion counselling?
32 A. Yes.
33
34 Q. And he also offered some funds for transport?
35 A. If that was at that time, the transport.
36
37 Q. I'll just have the letter brought up. PG-13. That
38 was the first letter, the one of 2 September 2005.
39 A. That's prior to my returning.
40
41 Q. All right, so you were away at this time?
42 A. That's right, yes.
43
44 Q. If PG-18 could be brought up, then, please.
45 A. Which probably means that letter didn't come directly
46 to me at that point, or else it was opened by the
47 commissary at that point.

1
2 Q. So you can see there from Mr Comben's letter that he'd
3 offered a diocesan cheque for \$500 to assist with
4 travelling?
5 A. I see that, yes, thank you.
6
7 Q. And it's reasonable to assume, I would have thought,
8 that counselling was also being provided by the diocese at
9 that particular stage?
10 A. Yes.
11
12 Q. Did Mr Comben show you a copy of this letter before he
13 sent it?
14 A. I don't recall seeing the letter, but I think we had
15 a conversation.
16
17 Q. Were you aware as a result of that conversation that
18 Mr Comben was providing the counselling and the travel
19 costs for Mr Campion?
20 A. I was aware that the counselling was being offered,
21 and the travel was there, yes.
22
23 Q. Were you aware that it was actually Mr Comben who was
24 offering that directly to Mr Campion?
25 A. I'm not certain.
26
27 Q. Bishop, it appears that at this early stage of the
28 process, Mr Comben has departed from the protocol to the
29 extent that he was dealing with the costs of counselling
30 and travel costs and so forth, rather than the professional
31 standards director; do you see that?
32 A. Yes, I do.
33
34 Q. Did that cause you any concern as to whether it was
35 appropriate for Mr Comben to be doing those matters as
36 opposed to Mr Gerber?
37 A. At the time, no. I think as Mr Comben gave evidence
38 and talked about being an agent of the PSC and of the
39 director, I assumed, I think, that's probably what was
40 happening, but I can't be certain on that.
41
42 Q. But it didn't cause you to do anything as a result of
43 coming to that knowledge; is that correct?
44 A. That's correct.
45
46 Q. I think at this stage [CA] had written a letter to
47 Mr Comben concerning abuse that she had received as a child

1 at North Coast Children's Home. I wonder if PG-20 could be
2 brought up, please. Do you recall receiving this letter?
3 A. I didn't receive this letter. It's addressed to
4 Mr Comben.
5
6 Q. Did he show you a copy of the letter?
7 A. I think that's so, yes.
8
9 Q. So you knew, I presume, that she was making certain
10 allegations --
11 A. Yes.
12
13 Q. -- about abuse that she said had occurred at North
14 Coast Children's Home?
15 A. Yes.
16
17 Q. It was not dissimilar to the complaint that you'd
18 received from Mr Champion?
19 A. Yes.
20
21 Q. What instructions did you give to Mr Comben about
22 dealing with this particular matter?
23 A. I think I assumed that it would automatically go to
24 the professional standards committee.
25
26 Q. And be dealt with in accordance with the ordinance and
27 the protocol?
28 A. Yes, yes.
29
30 Q. At about this time there was a proposal to adopt the
31 Sydney care and assistance package, wasn't there?
32 A. Yes.
33
34 Q. The evidence is that it was discussed at
35 a professional standards committee meeting on 20 September,
36 and then also discussed at a Bishop-in-Council meeting in
37 September 2005. Do you recall that?
38 A. Yes.
39
40 Q. I think the proposal was that the issue would carry
41 over to the November 2005 Bishop-in-Council meeting?
42 A. If that's what the minutes say.
43
44 Q. Then when we come to November 2005 - I'll have to
45 brought up; it's exhibit 3-2, tender bundle 23 - it's
46 apparent that the Bishop-in-Council approved the care and
47 assistance package of the Diocese of Sydney. Do you see

1 that?
2 A. Not yet.
3
4 Q. Sorry, I'll have it brought up and then you'll see it.
5 Sorry, it's 23C. If we could scroll down, please. So it's
6 you presiding. At the bottom of page 6, "Professional
7 standards care and assistance package", perhaps if you
8 could read that to yourself?
9 A. Yes.
10
11 Q. Bishop, it's clear from that that the diocese, having
12 considered it earlier in September, was now moving to adopt
13 the Sydney care and assistance package. Do you see that?
14 A. I see that, yes.
15
16 Q. Did you understand, then, that that included the
17 prospect of financial settlements for individual claims up
18 to about \$75,000?
19 A. I knew that was a part of the Sydney scheme. As
20 I shared in the private hearing, I was uncertain, because
21 I had not seen the documentation at that stage, of this,
22 and I couldn't recall actually this going through. But
23 I have seen it since, obviously, and that's certainly
24 adopted. But my memory was that the word - focused around
25 the word "appraisal", "appraisal program", and I have been
26 trying to recollect, I hope not reconstruct but recollect
27 at least, that we were trying to find the procedures by
28 which matters could be dealt, and I think the focus was
29 really on how cases were appraised rather than specifically
30 upon the compensation amounts that were in there.
31
32 THE CHAIR: Q. Well, bishop, the resolution obviously
33 was passed after a question was asked about the process
34 gone through, "They will be assessed by an expert", and so
35 on. Was assessment the same as appraisal?
36 A. Yes, I guess it is, yes. I think there were --
37
38 Q. Well, it's pretty clear that what the
39 Bishop-in-Council did was adopt this process after
40 understanding what was involved?
41 A. It would appear like that, your Honour, yes. I don't
42 know that the understanding was as deep as that, but.
43
44 Q. Well, that's a different issue.
45 A. It is. It is.
46
47 Q. You, by this stage, had laid before you the processes

1 that you, with your members of council, accepted should be
2 adopted; correct?

3 A. Yes.

4

5 MR BECKETT: Q. Bishop, you will probably recall from
6 reading the correspondence between Mr Campion and Mr Comben
7 that Mr Comben provided Mr Campion with a copy of the care
8 and assistance package available at Sydney. Were you aware
9 of that?

10 A. Yes. I was told, yes.

11

12 Q. You were told that?

13 A. Mmm.

14

15 Q. Do I take it that you were aware or that you were not
16 aware that that package included a dollar figure for the
17 possibility of financial settlement of a particular claim?

18 A. If it was a copy of the actual Sydney care and
19 assistance program, it would have had dollar amounts in it,
20 I think.

21

22 Q. The evidence from Mr Comben is that he wrote to
23 Mr Campion, providing him with a copy of that program, or
24 it may have been questions and answers with respect to that
25 particular program, but, in any event, Mr Campion has said
26 that it included the schedule of dollar amounts?

27 A. I accept that.

28

29 Q. So at about this time in October and November 2005, it
30 was appropriate, wasn't it, for Mr Comben to convey that
31 copy of that process to Mr Campion?

32 A. That would be correct.

33

34 Q. I understand also at about this time there were some
35 other professional standards matters that were being
36 considered. If tab 24 from exhibit 3-2 could be brought
37 up, please. If we could scroll down, do you recall this
38 memorandum from Mr Comben?

39 A. Yes.

40

41 Q. Could we go over the page, please, to the final
42 paragraph on the page where Mr Comben talks about an
43 agreement to settle that matter of \$54,500. Do you see
44 that?

45 A. Yes.

46

47 Q. Was that a process that had been undergone through the

1 operation of the Sydney care and assistance package, or was
2 it outside of that process?

3 A. I think the first paragraph suggests that it would be
4 done outside the Sydney program - panel - care and review
5 panel.

6
7 Q. Was that your approach as well, that the Sydney care
8 and assistance package would be potentially slower than if,
9 for example, the registrar was to engage in direct
10 negotiations?

11 A. I'm trying to recall whether this matter was before
12 the professional standards committee at this stage.

13
14 Q. The evidence is that it was and that it had been
15 considered by the professional standards committee for
16 some months?

17 A. Right. Sorry, are you asking a question?

18
19 Q. Sorry, I'll ask the question again. You'll see that
20 there appears to be an approach adopted by Mr Comben where
21 he has set to one side the care and assistance process
22 adopted from Sydney and was dealing with the claimant
23 herself or himself directly; is that correct?

24 A. I don't know whether he was dealing directly with the
25 claimant or whether this is directed from the professional
26 standards committee and he's acting as agent here.

27
28 Q. You will see the last paragraph, where he indicates
29 that:

30
31 *The representative of the person rang me*
32 *[Mr Comben] at home late in the evening and*
33 *said that [the person] would be prepared to*
34 *accept a figure of \$54,500.00.*

35
36 That seems to indicate, doesn't it, that Mr Comben was
37 engaging in direct negotiations himself at that stage?

38 A. It does appear that, yes.

39
40 Q. In any event, do you recall the press that was around
41 in late 2005 from Mr Campion with respect to the prospect
42 of a group claim being lodged?

43 A. Yes.

44
45 Q. You heard what Mr Comben had to say. Did you consider
46 that there was particular pressure upon the diocese at that
47 stage with respect to those group claims?

1 A. Yes, I think there was a sense of some pressure, for
2 where is this going to take us to?
3
4 Q. Did you speak to Mr Comben about how such a group
5 claim would be dealt with by the diocese?
6 A. I'm sure we had conversations about it, but as for
7 having any plan at that stage, we were still awaiting the
8 notification.
9
10 Q. You're aware that on 6 January Mr Harrison wrote to
11 the diocese and indicated that he was representing a number
12 of people and that a group claim would be forthcoming?
13 A. Yes.
14
15 Q. What was your response to being told of that letter?
16 A. I'm not sure what my response was at the time.
17 I guess I was a little worried about such a - the
18 possibility of such a large group claim and how we might
19 handle it.
20
21 Q. Indeed. We have a letter from Mr Comben to Mr Roland
22 providing instructions to him, that is to Mr Roland, to
23 represent the diocese with respect to the group claims.
24 Were you aware of that letter going?
25 A. From what I recall, yes.
26
27 Q. So whose decision was it to instruct lawyers at that
28 stage in January 2006?
29 A. I think it - I can't truthfully answer that one,
30 I don't think, because I'm not sure. On reflection,
31 looking back to that time, I would have imagined that we
32 would have had a conversation and seeing the claim had come
33 from a lawyer, we felt that that was probably the
34 appropriate initial response, lawyer to lawyer.
35
36 Q. You'd just adopted the Sydney care and assistance
37 package. What did you do to engage those new claimants who
38 were coming forward in the care and assistance package that
39 you had adopted from Sydney?
40 A. I don't recall that we did anything at that point.
41
42 Q. You had just adopted this new process - that is to
43 say, Bishop-in-Council had just adopted the Sydney care and
44 assistance package on proposal from the professional
45 standards committee; that's correct, isn't it?
46 A. Mmm-hmm.
47

1 Q. You had the professional standards director from
2 Sydney acting as professional standards director for
3 Grafton; that's correct, isn't it?
4 A. Yes.
5
6 Q. Wasn't he the sensible person to refer any new claims
7 of child sexual abuse to?
8 A. Yes.
9
10 Q. Why didn't you do it?
11 A. I have no answer to that.
12
13 Q. Bishop, in 2006 - you have no doubt heard the evidence
14 to date - the greatest amount of activity with respect to
15 the group claimants was occurring between the lawyers.
16 Let's just take the period up to September 2006. You would
17 agree with that, wouldn't you?
18 A. Certainly lawyer to lawyer, yes.
19
20 Q. And you've heard what Mr Gerber's evidence was to the
21 Royal Commission?
22 A. Can you remind me where you're referring?
23
24 Q. All right. Mr Gerber has said that he was aware of
25 the group claims, but he did not receive any specific
26 references of those claims to him for him to deal with.
27 Are you aware of that now?
28 A. I'm aware of it now, yes.
29
30 Q. Do you accept that no steps were taken between January
31 and September of 2006 to refer the claims to Mr Gerber?
32 A. I've had a conversation with the chair of the
33 professional standards committee, who, in generality, said
34 to me that they were kept informed of where the process was
35 at.
36
37 Q. What about referral to the professional standards
38 director to undertake the tasks that are set out quite
39 explicitly in the protocol?
40 A. I think I assumed because the PSC knew, that that
41 would be an automatic part of the role, seeing that the
42 director is a part of the PSC.
43
44 Q. So you assumed that the fact that the PSC knew meant
45 that the professional standards director would be brought
46 in to handle those claims; is that correct?
47 A. I think I'm making a reference to referral to the

1 police.

2

3 Q. We'll leave the police issue to one side for the
4 moment, but I just want to ask you specifically about the
5 response to the individual claimants that were coming
6 forward through Mr Simon Harrison. Is that clear? So what
7 I'm asking you is whether apart from ensuring that the PSC
8 was looking at the matter, you took any steps to have the
9 claims that were coming forward referred to the
10 professional standards director?

11 A. No.

12

13 Q. Were you aware that during that period January to
14 September 2006 that the primary negotiations between the
15 claimants and the diocese were being undertaken by the
16 lawyers?

17 A. Yes.

18

19 Q. Were you aware that the professional standards
20 director, save for his involvement in professional
21 standards committee meetings, was not involved in the new
22 claims, save for Mr Campion's claim?

23 A. That's probably so.

24

25 Q. Did you raise that as an issue between you and
26 Mr Comben as to how these claims were to be dealt with,
27 whether under the ordinance and the protocol or solely
28 between lawyers?

29 A. I think it had become the mind of the
30 Bishop-in-Council that taking the legal response was the
31 way, under the circumstances at that time, because of the
32 question of legal responsibility.

33

34 Q. Where did that come from? Who was advocating that
35 position to Bishop-in-Council?

36 A. I think initially it probably came from Mr Comben, in
37 trying to explore the relationship between the diocese and
38 the home.

39

40 Q. So when the matter was first raised in
41 Bishop-in-Council, are you saying that Mr Comben expressed
42 the opinion that he was sceptical as to the responsibility
43 of the diocese for what had occurred in the home?

44 A. I think he had concerns that the linkages between the
45 home and the diocese at a legal level, legal responsibility
46 level, that there were some issues there.

47

1 Q. Later there is a considerable amount of material
2 that's provided in September by Mr Harrison, but up until
3 that period of time were you aware of the association
4 between the Diocese of Grafton and the North Coast
5 Children's Home?
6 A. In which period are we talking about?
7
8 Q. January to September 2006.
9 A. Thank you. I think as the time went by, I became more
10 aware of some of the history. It was an emerging thing
11 more than anything else, as we began to look at the history
12 of it.
13
14 Q. I presume during that period 2003, when you commenced,
15 and 2005, you had been to Lismore, hadn't you?
16 A. Yes, yes.
17
18 Q. And you had been to St Andrew's, to the church there?
19 A. Yes, yes.
20
21 Q. You had been to the rectory?
22 A. Well, yes, what is the rectory now, yes.
23
24 Q. You were aware of the location of CASPA, I presume, by
25 that stage?
26 A. I think I probably was. It wasn't high on my agenda
27 at that stage in the early days.
28
29 Q. But you were aware that the North Coast Children's
30 Home was co-located with St Andrew's and various other
31 diocesan buildings?
32 A. Yes.
33
34 Q. Were you aware in that period, the first nine months
35 of 2006, that the home was known to the local community as
36 the Church of England North Coast Children's Home?
37 A. No, I wasn't aware of that at that stage.
38
39 Q. Were you aware that the rector was the chair of the
40 North Coast Children's Home, certainly under the 1951
41 constitution?
42 A. I think I probably became aware at some point that
43 year.
44
45 Q. In any event, a great deal of additional material was
46 provided and it's referred to in Bishop-in-Council as
47 450 pages worth of material. Do you recall that?

1 A. The declarations you're talking about?
2
3 Q. Yes, so on 15 September Mr Harrison wrote to
4 Mr Roland, providing him with statutory declarations for
5 all the claimants?
6 A. Thank you, yes. Mmm-hmm.
7
8 Q. And he also provided a 14-page letter, together with
9 a number of annexures.
10 A. Right.
11
12 Q. Do you recall that?
13 A. I recall being told that it had arrived.
14
15 Q. So you didn't consider that material yourself, did
16 you?
17 A. I think I need to state right from the word go, as
18 Mr Comben had said, that when the protocol was set up, it
19 was set up so that the bishop was at arm's length, so when
20 there were the opportunities to act as the bishop, that
21 I wasn't being influenced by other matters. So I tried to
22 work strongly from that position quite often, and that's
23 why a lot of my responses are almost non-responses, in
24 a sense.
25
26 Q. In any event, you ultimately are responsible as
27 bishop, or you were ultimately responsible as bishop for
28 the application of and adherence to that ordinance, weren't
29 you?
30 A. That's true, and that's a conflict, in a sense -
31 trying to exercise that oversight as well as keep at arm's
32 length.
33
34 Q. Yes, indeed. Did you ever form an opinion at any
35 stage during 2006, leading up to particularly when
36 Archbishop Aspinall spoke with you, that the protocol was
37 not being adhered to by the diocese?
38 A. Sorry, just the beginning of your question again?
39
40 Q. During that period - I'll take the period now up until
41 8 December 2006 when Archbishop Aspinall wrote to you. So
42 during that entire period of 2006, did you form an opinion
43 that the protocol was being adhered to?
44 A. I would have thought that the response from the
45 Bishop-in-Council earlier in the year - was May, was it -
46 in which they wanted to defend the claim in some way,
47 that - sorry, I've lost the question again.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

THE CHAIR: Q. You are being asked, bishop, whether you formed the opinion that the protocol was being adhered to before December 2006.

A. Yes.

Q. It's pretty clear that the course that had been set by the Bishop-in-Council and your understanding of what was happening at the hand of others would have led you to the clear knowledge that it wasn't being followed?

A. I think that's where my answer was going.

Q. It must be.

A. But I lost the thread, sorry.

THE CHAIR: There's another question that follows from that, but I'll leave that to you.

MR BECKETT: Q. Given that you had formed the opinion that the protocol was not being adhered to, and arguably the ordinance as well, what steps did you take to make sure that it was adhered to?

A. I think initially my attention was drawn to the non-adherence more so by the primate, and I was thankful for his intervention at that stage, and I think the conversation which emerged from that, which sets out certain principles, was helpful, and as we heard earlier today in the hearing with Mr Comben, I conveyed those - that conversation to Mr Comben and Mr Roland, and the following letter to Simon Harrison was, I think, an attempt to try and get some of that back on track. I think earlier in the year, even in Peter Roland's file note in May - 12 May - that we were really, even at that stage, informing Mr Harrison that there was a protocol and that we - that it was there in place. I think probably we didn't actually promote it as much, but I suspect we also were forming an opinion, sense of that opinion.

THE CHAIR: Q. Bishop, there is not a lot of time left. I want to summarise where we're up to at this point in time. It's clear that the diocese had adopted the protocol and the Sydney approach to these matters, but by this stage - that is, up to December 2006 - I assume that what you were now receiving by way of information about prospective claimants meant that you could see a significant number of people that you would have to deal with. Is that right?

1 A. I think it was anticipated that there might certainly
2 be more claims, yes.

3

4 Q. And I need to ask you, at that stage did that raise
5 for you and the others a concern about the potential cost
6 to the diocese?

7 A. Certainly there was a potential cost, even with the
8 initial group claim, and certainly with ongoing claims,
9 yes.

10

11 Q. Is it right to think that your decision making was
12 being influenced by the concern about that cost?

13 A. I think it probably was.

14

15 Q. Is it also right to think that because the claim was
16 coming to you from some lawyers in a fairly sophisticated
17 way, your thinking was that you needed lawyers to respond?

18 A. Yes.

19

20 Q. Now, was it the case or not that those matters came
21 together to divert you from properly considering the
22 protocol that you had adopted and the response that you had
23 adopted?

24 A. I think that would be a correct analysis, yes.

25

26 Q. And in there lies a significant failure; is that
27 right?

28 A. Yes, I would agree.

29

30 THE CHAIR: That might be an appropriate time, Mr Beckett.
31 We will adjourn until 10 in the morning.

32

33 **AT 4PM THE COMMISSION ADJOURNED TO TUESDAY, 26 NOVEMBER**
34 **2013 AT 10AM**

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

#				
	2204:24, 2204:29, 2204:30, 2204:34, 2248:5	2171:3, 2193:25, 2193:38, 2211:3	2231:10, 2231:17, 2232:37, 2232:38, 2234:25, 2254:16, 2256:44, 2257:38, 2259:37, 2259:41, 2259:44, 2261:29, 2262:41, 2266:15	2249:18, 2256:14
#3-12 [1] - 2195:4		18 [1] - 2240:1		22 [3] - 2166:19, 2166:23, 2222:45
#3-13 [1] - 2210:14		181.7 [1] - 2213:44		23 [1] - 2259:45
#3-14 [1] - 2224:38		19 [6] - 2190:35, 2194:19, 2194:26, 2194:28, 2195:41, 2223:7		23C [1] - 2260:5
\$				
\$10,000 [1] - 2183:5	'60s [2] - 2165:34, 2171:17	1940s [1] - 2171:20	2006 [45] - 2155:8, 2156:3, 2156:27, 2157:23, 2158:7, 2158:31, 2158:37, 2158:45, 2159:9, 2165:43, 2166:23, 2167:5, 2183:15, 2188:18, 2188:30, 2188:33, 2192:1, 2196:35, 2210:1, 2213:7, 2213:18, 2213:25, 2214:15, 2215:3, 2215:12, 2215:14, 2215:19, 2218:1, 2228:42, 2240:43, 2243:39, 2247:25, 2249:18, 2263:28, 2264:13, 2264:16, 2264:31, 2265:14, 2266:8, 2266:35, 2267:35, 2267:41, 2267:42, 2268:4, 2268:43	24 [6] - 2157:37, 2173:10, 2228:36, 2254:5, 2261:36
\$100,000 [1] - 2215:36	'80s [1] - 2171:17	1950s [1] - 2171:20		24(1) [1] - 2157:47
\$12 [1] - 2218:42	'the [1] - 2167:27	1951 [1] - 2266:40		25 [1] - 2154:27
\$14 [1] - 2218:42	0	1975 [2] - 2201:30, 2203:5		26 [5] - 2155:26, 2155:31, 2158:37, 2188:29, 2269:33
\$141.69 [1] - 2214:41	0.7 [1] - 2214:23	1994 [1] - 2251:43		28 [7] - 2207:28, 2223:23, 2223:25, 2224:13, 2224:29, 2251:35, 2251:37
\$178 [1] - 2218:16	000 [1] - 2216:47	1996 [1] - 2251:46		28/06/2007 [1] - 2224:38
\$181 [1] - 2217:20	1	19th [1] - 2194:29		29 [5] - 2185:11, 2207:28, 2225:31, 2226:13, 2226:39
\$190 [1] - 2214:45		2		3
\$2,245,000 [1] - 2215:18	1 [4] - 2157:36, 2175:9, 2191:35, 2237:18	2 [12] - 2175:10, 2186:34, 2210:23, 2210:42, 2225:12, 2225:16, 2225:19, 2226:4, 2226:38, 2237:18, 2254:23, 2257:38	2006/2007 [1] - 2219:4	3 [9] - 2159:30, 2191:35, 2210:18, 2218:19, 2223:8, 2224:45, 2237:16, 2237:22
\$2,300,000 [1] - 2215:30	1.2 [2] - 2204:20, 2247:30	2.1 [1] - 2216:5	2007 [26] - 2156:27, 2196:12, 2196:24, 2196:35, 2200:19, 2200:24, 2201:9, 2208:45, 2210:2, 2216:38, 2216:45, 2217:45, 2218:3, 2218:6, 2222:45, 2223:8, 2223:23, 2223:25, 2224:29, 2224:41, 2224:45, 2225:3, 2225:38, 2226:29, 2227:42, 2244:18	3-11 [1] - 2194:37
\$2.675 [1] - 2216:40	1.25 [1] - 2247:31	2.2 [1] - 2216:5		3-12 [3] - 2194:40, 2194:46, 2195:14
\$2.83 [1] - 2210:29	1.3 [1] - 2214:40	2.3 [1] - 2215:37		3-14 [1] - 2224:36
\$20,000 [1] - 2204:42	1.9 [1] - 2215:28	2.4 [2] - 2213:20, 2216:40		3-2 [9] - 2155:21, 2174:22, 2204:22, 2208:3, 2222:15, 2225:29, 2227:9, 2259:45, 2261:36
\$209 [1] - 2217:20	10 [11] - 2167:24, 2192:22, 2192:24, 2212:37, 2212:43, 2218:9, 2218:17, 2218:19, 2233:28, 2236:39, 2269:31	2.5 [3] - 2215:20, 2216:17, 2216:22		3-3 [2] - 2157:36, 2254:23
\$210 [1] - 2218:15	10.00am [1] - 2154:27	20 [9] - 2172:17, 2172:30, 2172:37, 2172:45, 2183:15, 2189:11, 2191:10, 2237:5, 2259:35		3-5 [2] - 2219:14, 2224:12
\$35,343 [1] - 2213:2	10AM [1] - 2269:34	2002 [3] - 2201:24, 2201:28, 2201:31		3.08pm [1] - 2251:23
\$396,000 [1] - 2216:3	10am [1] - 2155:1	2003 [5] - 2251:43, 2252:13, 2252:15, 2266:14		30 [1] - 2171:4
\$40 [1] - 2218:24	11 [6] - 2213:23, 2213:24, 2213:26, 2213:28, 2216:44, 2218:22	2004 [16] - 2201:43, 2202:4, 2202:7, 2210:25, 2211:6, 2231:13, 2231:17, 2239:42, 2240:15, 2252:17, 2252:18, 2252:25, 2252:27, 2252:35, 2253:16, 2253:29		31 [3] - 2211:4, 2213:25, 2215:3
\$400,000 [1] - 2213:20	11.5 [1] - 2213:44	2005 [31] - 2158:19, 2158:24, 2185:11, 2185:20, 2185:25, 2186:34, 2210:18, 2210:25, 2211:6, 2211:10, 2212:38, 2213:2, 2213:5, 2215:12, 2215:18, 2217:45, 2218:1,		32 [2] - 2195:19, 2195:34
\$487,000 [1] - 2216:3	11.6 [1] - 2213:15			34AA [1] - 2171:2
\$496,000 [2] - 2211:5, 2211:45	12 [3] - 2172:25, 2233:28, 2268:33			34AC [2] - 2171:3, 2171:25
\$496,962 [1] - 2211:10	124 [1] - 2225:29			39 [6] - 2155:21, 2157:3, 2188:23, 2188:35, 2191:21, 2195:4
\$5,000 [1] - 2183:4	126 [1] - 2227:8			4
\$500 [1] - 2258:3	14 [6] - 2177:17, 2177:20, 2208:45, 2227:9, 2252:15, 2254:24			4 [7] - 2175:20,
\$54,500 [1] - 2261:43	14-page [1] - 2267:8			
\$54,500.00 [1] - 2262:34	14.11 [1] - 2255:2			
\$600,000 [1] - 2183:6	14.12 [1] - 2255:9			
\$7,730 [1] - 2228:2	14.13 [1] - 2256:1			
\$75,000 [1] - 2260:18	1452 [1] - 2223:24			
\$750,000 [2] - 2183:16, 2204:20	15 [2] - 2155:8, 2267:3			
\$8,768 [1] - 2212:37	16 [6] - 2193:19, 2196:12, 2197:46, 2213:1, 2215:19, 2256:5			
\$800,000 [3] - 2205:6, 2205:23, 2205:28	17 [5] - 2154:21,			
\$825,000 [3] - 2205:27, 2206:46, 2207:5				
\$840 [1] - 2216:47				
\$840,000 [1] - 2213:24				
\$85,000 [1] - 2211:11				
\$870,000 [1] - 2205:45				
\$90,000 [1] - 2216:4				
\$900,000 [6] - 2204:43, 2204:45, 2204:46, 2205:29, 2205:34, 2215:33				
\$950,000 [5] -				

2175:46, 2211:1,
2213:9, 2223:25,
2237:16, 2237:22

40 [4] - 2172:46,
2191:6, 2237:5,
2238:34

40.9 [2] - 2214:23,
2214:33

41 [4] - 2191:7,
2207:8, 2231:43,
2233:31

42 [3] - 2172:8,
2172:17

42-odd [1] - 2207:9

450 [2] - 2155:9,
2266:47

450-page [2] -
2157:18, 2188:19

4PM [1] - 2269:33

5

5 [3] - 2213:36,
2223:9, 2237:2

5.5 [1] - 2215:27

50 [1] - 2174:22

50/50 [1] - 2245:24

5A [1] - 2211:43

6

6 [7] - 2158:28,
2213:18, 2214:21,
2214:29, 2215:19,
2260:6, 2263:10

60 [2] - 2161:34,
2245:25

607 [1] - 2195:18

65 [1] - 2213:14

650 [1] - 2233:29

66 [2] - 2204:22,
2222:15

7

7 [2] - 2217:16,
2218:40

70 [1] - 2245:25

76 [1] - 2223:6

8

8 [11] - 2172:17,
2173:27, 2173:40,
2175:1, 2210:32,
2210:36, 2214:17,
2216:38, 2218:40,
2237:5, 2267:41

80 [1] - 2161:34

81 [2] - 2207:46,

2208:3

9

9 [4] - 2209:35,
2211:43, 2212:1,
2212:3

A

AA [1] - 2171:3

ability [2] - 2183:40,
2233:5

able [22] - 2160:46,
2171:2, 2171:23,
2171:30, 2171:34,
2181:19, 2184:5,
2189:5, 2199:30,
2201:39, 2203:7,
2206:33, 2208:14,
2215:12, 2217:37,
2232:9, 2232:16,
2233:5, 2239:19,
2240:3, 2252:47,
2253:47

absolutely [3] -
2177:32, 2203:9,
2230:45

abuse [46] - 2161:33,
2162:12, 2162:13,
2162:20, 2162:21,
2162:26, 2162:27,
2162:30, 2163:7,
2163:16, 2172:10,
2172:16, 2172:26,
2172:37, 2172:41,
2172:46, 2176:20,
2185:17, 2186:3,
2186:4, 2186:15,
2186:24, 2186:26,
2188:41, 2188:45,
2189:10, 2191:47,
2192:5, 2192:16,
2195:23, 2201:25,
2203:5, 2220:25,
2225:22, 2229:20,
2229:35, 2234:46,
2252:39, 2254:12,
2254:18, 2255:31,
2255:36, 2258:47,
2259:13, 2264:7

ABUSE [1] - 2154:13

abused [3] - 2160:41,
2189:12, 2217:26

abusers [1] - 2169:23

AC [1] - 2171:3

accept [26] - 2157:15,
2157:17, 2157:20,
2158:43, 2158:46,
2169:8, 2169:29,
2172:15, 2172:39,

2172:45, 2172:47,
2173:2, 2174:15,
2193:4, 2193:41,
2204:40, 2205:43,
2207:22, 2209:40,
2219:35, 2226:38,
2245:29, 2246:28,
2261:27, 2262:34,
2264:30

acceptable [2] -
2184:31, 2208:31

acceptance [1] -
2184:46

accepted [10] -
2158:5, 2158:8,
2184:30, 2205:35,
2219:29, 2224:24,
2231:35, 2253:34,
2261:1

accepting [3] -
2172:34, 2209:12,
2235:20

access [3] - 2175:16,
2233:14, 2233:16

accordance [4] -

2168:4, 2226:45,
2254:1, 2259:26

account [6] - 2162:13,
2174:43, 2184:2,
2211:16, 2216:33,
2218:29

accountant [1] -
2240:17

accountants [1] -
2214:8

accounted [1] -
2212:5

accounts [4] -
2212:30, 2214:6,
2240:7, 2240:20

accumulated [1] -
2210:36

accurate [4] -
2168:23, 2237:16,
2237:27, 2246:28

accurately [2] -
2236:46, 2237:8

accusation [1] -
2230:47

accusations [8] -
2229:36, 2229:42,
2230:6, 2230:11,
2230:31, 2230:33,
2230:41, 2230:43

achieving [1] - 2182:6

acknowledgment [1] -
2176:4

acquaintance [1] -
2238:13

acquaintanceship [1]

- 2238:34

Act [2] - 2168:5,
2217:39

act [1] - 2267:20

acting [11] - 2161:1,
2169:28, 2170:14,
2188:14, 2191:2,
2192:11, 2194:13,
2232:43, 2233:47,
2262:26, 2264:2

action [8] - 2196:4,
2196:37, 2196:40,
2200:28, 2203:18,
2203:22, 2257:22,
2257:25

actively [1] - 2244:29

activity [1] - 2264:14

acts [3] - 2193:12,
2201:28, 2202:41

actual [5] - 2169:2,
2218:44, 2248:26,
2252:24, 2261:18

ad [2] - 2232:21,
2243:34

adaptation [1] -
2176:39

add [2] - 2246:40,
2249:45

added [1] - 2177:7

additional [4] -
2177:37, 2187:32,
2188:6, 2266:45

address [4] - 2181:28,
2196:22, 2196:23,
2202:21

addressed [1] -
2259:3

addresses [1] -
2192:34

adduced [6] -
2173:21, 2183:7,
2187:5, 2198:14,
2207:26, 2228:43

adducement [1] -
2230:35

adequate [1] -
2181:29

adequately [1] -
2181:3

adequately" [1] -
2181:6

adhered [5] - 2267:37,
2267:43, 2268:3,
2268:20, 2268:22

adherence [2] -
2267:28, 2268:24

adjoining [1] -
2250:40

adjourn [2] - 2221:14,
2269:31

adjournment [2] -

2195:9, 2221:12

admin [1] - 2232:7

admission [3] -

2200:39, 2200:43,
2201:6

admit [1] - 2219:22

adopt [4] - 2173:35,
2259:30, 2260:12,
2260:39

adopted [22] -

2175:12, 2184:1,
2184:6, 2205:12,
2206:33, 2252:18,
2252:22, 2252:39,
2252:41, 2253:31,
2256:24, 2260:24,
2261:2, 2262:20,
2262:22, 2263:36,
2263:39, 2263:42,
2263:43, 2268:41,
2269:22, 2269:23

adoption [1] - 2175:11

adumbrate [1] -
2169:15

advice [11] - 2159:39,
2166:16, 2170:30,
2174:19, 2175:25,
2186:39, 2187:16,
2225:35, 2232:5,
2232:21, 2250:31

advise [2] - 2166:17,
2250:34

advised [3] - 2164:45,
2169:34, 2174:10

adviser [5] - 2182:29,
2238:37, 2238:39,
2243:1, 2243:3

advocate [1] - 2204:41

advocating [1] -
2265:34

afford [1] - 2242:30

affront [5] - 2163:46,
2164:8, 2164:24,
2165:3, 2165:8

aftermath [1] -
2229:19

afternoon [1] -
2161:11

afterwards [2] -
2166:14, 2183:9

age [1] - 2161:34

agenda [2] - 2191:19,
2266:26

agent [4] - 2232:29,
2232:44, 2258:38,
2262:26

ago [7] - 2158:5,
2162:3, 2173:31,
2185:15, 2186:2,

2203:11, 2223:15
agree [17] - 2177:7, 2181:44, 2182:38, 2193:5, 2205:9, 2205:12, 2209:24, 2221:2, 2236:1, 2237:27, 2240:23, 2241:17, 2251:3, 2254:27, 2255:5, 2264:17, 2269:28
agreed [6] - 2186:2, 2188:28, 2205:27, 2207:8, 2227:10, 2251:2
agreeing [1] - 2250:2
agreement [2] - 2207:12, 2261:43
allegation [3] - 2193:25, 2234:46, 2236:9
allegations [21] - 2160:12, 2160:41, 2166:31, 2168:17, 2185:16, 2186:2, 2186:35, 2188:45, 2189:10, 2190:14, 2191:46, 2192:5, 2192:16, 2192:44, 2193:20, 2199:3, 2200:29, 2235:18, 2255:17, 2255:31, 2259:10
alleged [9] - 2160:2, 2160:11, 2162:12, 2169:23, 2174:24, 2188:40, 2194:14, 2199:1, 2255:36
allow [1] - 2231:31
alluded [1] - 2235:45
almost [5] - 2217:20, 2217:35, 2243:30, 2257:30, 2267:23
alternative [1] - 2183:43
alternatively [1] - 2247:11
Alzheimer's [1] - 2198:38
amended [1] - 2175:17
amount [25] - 2155:13, 2158:19, 2165:24, 2171:34, 2183:11, 2183:22, 2184:30, 2184:34, 2204:29, 2204:34, 2204:42, 2204:46, 2206:15, 2207:8, 2210:44, 2212:37, 2216:24, 2217:7, 2218:29, 2227:37, 2227:38, 2237:16, 2247:30, 2264:14, 2266:1
amounts [8] - 2179:42, 2183:34, 2205:35, 2206:21, 2217:9, 2260:30, 2261:19, 2261:26
analysis [2] - 2201:2, 2269:24
Andrew's [2] - 2266:18, 2266:30
ANG.0012.002.0002 [1] - 2223:8
ANG.0030.001.0041 [1] - 2210:23
ANG.0030.001.0063 [1] - 2213:13
ANG.0030.001.0090 [1] - 2213:41
ANG.0030.001.0183 [1] - 2217:17
ANG.0030.001.0210 [1] - 2216:39
ANG.0030.001.0286 [1] - 2218:14
ANG.9320.1804.1455 [1] - 2223:24
Anglican [10] - 2166:22, 2169:2, 2201:1, 2202:29, 2210:7, 2229:21, 2229:34, 2240:16, 2251:33, 2251:41
ANGLICAN [1] - 2210:15
angst [1] - 2209:18
Aniko [1] - 2233:10
annexures [1] - 2267:9
annual [2] - 2210:18, 2212:45
anomalies [1] - 2212:33
anonymous [1] - 2244:37
answer [9] - 2179:14, 2222:9, 2222:45, 2235:14, 2241:4, 2253:25, 2263:29, 2264:11, 2268:11
answered [1] - 2228:26
answering [1] - 2237:41
answers [1] - 2261:24
anticipated [1] - 2269:1
antipathy [2] - 2180:2, 2182:37
anyway [2] - 2197:12, 2212:18
apart [4] - 2181:40, 2182:34, 2237:7, 2265:7
apologies [7] - 2189:23, 2208:15, 2208:17, 2208:22, 2230:1, 2247:10, 2247:11
apologise [8] - 2156:43, 2156:47, 2202:33, 2209:17, 2209:28, 2229:17, 2230:5, 2231:1
apologising [2] - 2229:28, 2230:33
apology [34] - 2174:38, 2207:16, 2207:31, 2207:32, 2207:33, 2207:36, 2207:39, 2207:43, 2208:7, 2208:11, 2208:14, 2208:16, 2208:18, 2208:30, 2208:34, 2209:16, 2209:32, 2223:38, 2228:5, 2228:13, 2228:16, 2228:19, 2228:23, 2228:27, 2228:31, 2228:32, 2228:35, 2229:25, 2230:18, 2246:15, 2246:29, 2246:31, 2246:42
apparent [2] - 2223:26, 2259:46
Appeal [1] - 2225:37
appear [12] - 2156:25, 2203:46, 2211:32, 2216:45, 2221:1, 2231:7, 2234:22, 2236:33, 2238:3, 2260:41, 2262:38
appeared [2] - 2181:46, 2234:5
application [1] - 2267:28
applied [2] - 2189:31, 2233:36
applies [1] - 2212:44
appointed [6] - 2238:28, 2253:28, 2253:32, 2253:35, 2253:38, 2253:42
appointing [1] - 2255:11
appointment [2] - 2253:46, 2254:36
appraisal [3] - 2260:25, 2260:35
appraised [1] - 2260:29
appreciate [3] - 2233:1, 2247:9, 2251:34
approach [15] - 2172:2, 2177:31, 2179:4, 2181:41, 2183:28, 2214:24, 2217:25, 2226:30, 2232:2, 2242:36, 2243:40, 2248:11, 2262:7, 2262:20, 2268:42
approached [1] - 2182:5
approaching [1] - 2173:22
appropriate [10] - 2176:5, 2177:1, 2180:6, 2186:25, 2254:33, 2255:43, 2258:35, 2261:30, 2263:34, 2269:30
appropriately [1] - 2161:2
approval [2] - 2205:33, 2205:36
approve [1] - 2248:31
approved [3] - 2204:24, 2204:29, 2259:46
April [1] - 2223:7
Archbishop [12] - 2173:10, 2173:17, 2175:35, 2236:34, 2237:32, 2237:37, 2243:40, 2248:37, 2257:4, 2257:10, 2267:36, 2267:41
archbishop [3] - 2166:39, 2237:35, 2244:2
Archdeacon [5] - 2234:23, 2234:30, 2234:44, 2235:24, 2235:34
archdeacon [1] - 2252:2
archdeacons [1] - 2251:46
Archer's [1] - 2206:47
arguable [1] - 2218:4
arguably [1] - 2268:20
argue [1] - 2184:24
argued [1] - 2230:36
argument [6] - 2164:21, 2168:47, 2169:10, 2169:15, 2169:19, 2195:38
argumentative [2] - 2160:45, 2160:47
arise [2] - 2255:30, 2255:35
arising [2] - 2194:25, 2250:27
arm [1] - 2178:21
arm's [5] - 2243:27, 2244:38, 2250:17, 2267:19, 2267:31
arms [1] - 2174:6
Armstrong [2] - 2198:3, 2198:7
arrive [1] - 2183:20
arrived [3] - 2158:28, 2197:5, 2267:13
article [2] - 2171:12, 2171:31
articles [1] - 2171:2
ascertain [1] - 2200:25
aside [2] - 2169:35, 2178:4
Aspinall [14] - 2173:10, 2173:17, 2173:31, 2173:38, 2175:23, 2175:36, 2236:34, 2237:32, 2237:37, 2243:40, 2248:37, 2249:1, 2267:36, 2267:41
Aspinall's [2] - 2173:26, 2244:6
assault [3] - 2161:42, 2201:25, 2201:36
asserted [1] - 2220:24
assessed [1] - 2260:34
assessing [1] - 2183:43
assessment [2] - 2254:46, 2260:35
asset [4] - 2210:33, 2215:6, 2219:7, 2239:39
assets [14] - 2210:24, 2210:28, 2210:37, 2210:43, 2211:38, 2211:39, 2211:44, 2212:41, 2214:5, 2214:25, 2214:44, 2215:2, 2215:7, 2217:32
assist [6] - 2155:45, 2184:38, 2188:36, 2222:43, 2234:5, 2258:3
assistance [16] - 2174:25, 2174:39,

2232:7, 2253:1,
2259:31, 2259:47,
2260:7, 2260:13,
2261:8, 2261:19,
2262:1, 2262:8,
2262:21, 2263:36,
2263:38, 2263:44
assistant [1] - 2247:12
assistants [2] -
2166:10, 2182:1
assisting [3] -
2236:36, 2241:1,
2241:28
Assisting [1] -
2154:38
association [2] -
2246:8, 2266:3
assume [5] - 2180:40,
2186:20, 2201:34,
2258:7, 2268:43
assumed [6] -
2237:33, 2253:20,
2258:39, 2259:23,
2264:40, 2264:44
assuming [1] -
2180:47
assumption [2] -
2199:12, 2200:6
assurance [1] -
2175:24
AT [2] - 2269:33,
2269:34
atrocities [1] -
2168:19
attaches [1] - 2167:25
attack [2] - 2161:32,
2162:12
attacking [1] -
2162:27
attempt [2] - 2180:7,
2268:30
attempted [1] - 2169:3
attempting [1] -
2204:6
attend [1] - 2189:20
attention [1] - 2268:23
attitude [2] - 2235:34,
2235:36
audited [1] - 2213:35
auditors [5] - 2212:32,
2214:4, 2214:7,
2239:19, 2239:20
August [10] - 2185:11,
2185:20, 2185:21,
2228:36, 2252:41,
2253:29, 2253:41,
2254:16, 2256:43,
2256:45
auspices [1] - 2169:4
Australia [4] - 2162:2,
2162:30, 2181:9,
2251:33
Australian [1] - 2253:2
author [1] - 2247:45
authorised [1] -
2248:5
authority [1] - 2247:36
automatic [1] -
2264:41
automatically [1] -
2259:23
available [4] -
2183:23, 2219:10,
2256:11, 2261:8
awaiting [1] - 2263:7
aware [7] - 2157:41,
2158:10, 2158:41,
2166:31, 2173:9,
2182:29, 2184:45,
2187:41, 2190:41,
2193:16, 2199:25,
2199:28, 2199:30,
2201:20, 2201:23,
2201:35, 2201:38,
2202:4, 2202:8,
2202:14, 2202:18,
2203:16, 2206:6,
2208:29, 2208:31,
2209:11, 2218:5,
2219:17, 2219:31,
2219:34, 2224:12,
2224:40, 2227:23,
2228:26, 2229:44,
2231:27, 2231:38,
2235:9, 2235:34,
2235:36, 2237:31,
2239:8, 2241:8,
2241:43, 2248:40,
2249:10, 2249:41,
2253:25, 2257:30,
2258:17, 2258:20,
2258:23, 2261:8,
2261:15, 2261:16,
2263:10, 2263:24,
2264:24, 2264:27,
2264:28, 2265:13,
2265:19, 2266:3,
2266:10, 2266:24,
2266:29, 2266:34,
2266:37, 2266:39,
2266:42
away [1] - 2220:41
eyes [1] - 2245:27

B

background [2] -
2159:25, 2238:10
bad [2] - 2240:9,
2240:34
bailed [1] - 2185:5
balance [13] -
2210:22, 2210:24,
2210:45, 2212:21,
2212:35, 2213:10,
2213:37, 2214:5,
2214:14, 2216:37,
2217:16, 2218:10,
2239:11
Ballina [1] - 2165:25
balls [1] - 2203:36
band [1] - 2227:34
bar [1] - 2168:42
bare [2] - 2168:30,
2168:35
bargain [1] - 2170:16
base [1] - 2177:15
based [6] - 2172:15,
2208:39, 2209:3,
2230:18, 2252:44,
2255:26
basis [9] - 2177:25,
2182:5, 2182:17,
2183:39, 2198:40,
2217:24, 2225:43,
2226:20, 2238:24
bat [1] - 2251:4
bay [1] - 2157:26
became [12] -
2201:38, 2202:4,
2202:8, 2202:17,
2232:27, 2232:28,
2240:15, 2249:41,
2249:45, 2251:40,
2266:9, 2266:42
Beckett [9] - 2154:39,
2155:33, 2166:9,
2202:31, 2209:34,
2251:19, 2256:16,
2256:36, 2269:30
BECKETT [57] -
2155:3, 2155:5,
2159:29, 2161:20,
2163:42, 2165:39,
2166:3, 2166:7,
2166:13, 2171:1,
2171:11, 2171:19,
2171:25, 2171:33,
2171:40, 2182:33,
2183:32, 2185:8,
2191:26, 2191:34,
2194:31, 2194:35,
2194:40, 2194:44,
2195:7, 2195:13,
2206:44, 2209:47,
2210:5, 2210:12,
2210:17, 2211:43,
2212:3, 2212:8,
2212:20, 2212:35,
2216:36, 2219:4,
2221:11, 2222:3,
2224:28, 2224:33,
2224:40, 2231:3,
2250:25, 2250:27,
2251:12, 2251:21,
2251:25, 2251:27,
2256:18, 2256:23,
2256:28, 2256:32,
2256:40, 2261:5,
2268:19
become [4] - 2201:35,
2215:27, 2252:13,
2265:29
becoming [1] -
2251:31
beforehand [2] -
2207:2, 2246:11
began [1] - 2266:11
begin [2] - 2224:24,
2238:9
beginning [6] -
2202:17, 2206:5,
2213:13, 2232:23,
2250:47, 2267:38
begins [1] - 2223:37
behalf [10] - 2203:14,
2231:7, 2236:34,
2237:32, 2237:33,
2238:3, 2247:29,
2247:44, 2249:11,
2250:5
behaviour [2] -
2179:35, 2179:38
behind [4] - 2184:39,
2215:19, 2227:30,
2233:3
belief [6] - 2170:29,
2183:35, 2198:15,
2200:2, 2242:29,
2245:38
believes [1] - 2230:26
belonged [1] -
2210:38
belonging [2] -
2210:37, 2212:11
belt [1] - 2231:46
Bench [1] - 2210:5
benefit [1] - 2231:21
bequest [1] - 2218:38
bespeak [1] - 2211:27
best [6] - 2170:17,
2180:15, 2180:26,
2209:37, 2214:4,
2234:5
better [4] - 2202:34,
2209:27, 2230:36,
2238:44
between [22] -
2165:40, 2174:17,
2180:2, 2182:37,
2185:46, 2186:14,
2186:19, 2202:7,
2205:28, 2206:10,
2209:8, 2210:25,
2245:16, 2261:6,
2264:15, 2264:30,
2265:14, 2265:25,
2265:28, 2265:37,
2265:44, 2266:4
beyond [1] - 2162:45
bias [1] - 2250:20
big [2] - 2215:41,
2216:5
bigger [1] - 2185:4
Bishop [112] - 2156:3,
2156:7, 2156:8,
2173:9, 2173:16,
2173:27, 2173:35,
2173:37, 2175:34,
2183:24, 2184:10,
2184:19, 2184:21,
2184:25, 2184:32,
2184:37, 2184:40,
2202:12, 2204:23,
2204:28, 2205:36,
2206:1, 2206:11,
2206:19, 2208:44,
2217:40, 2220:27,
2220:31, 2220:33,
2220:45, 2221:9,
2222:6, 2222:7,
2222:14, 2222:17,
2222:23, 2222:47,
2223:7, 2223:22,
2223:25, 2223:36,
2224:19, 2224:20,
2224:25, 2224:28,
2228:10, 2228:19,
2231:16, 2235:38,
2236:34, 2238:4,
2238:24, 2238:28,
2238:41, 2238:47,
2239:13, 2239:17,
2239:29, 2240:11,
2240:24, 2241:2,
2241:12, 2241:28,
2241:38, 2242:9,
2242:11, 2243:38,
2243:47, 2244:6,
2244:11, 2244:21,
2244:27, 2244:33,
2245:5, 2245:6,
2245:9, 2245:30,
2245:37, 2245:38,
2245:44, 2246:3,
2246:6, 2246:10,
2246:25, 2248:4,
2248:16, 2248:20,
2248:43, 2249:1,
2249:4, 2249:10,

2249:26, 2249:42,
2250:37, 2251:21,
2251:31, 2251:40,
2252:14, 2253:21,
2253:34, 2254:26,
2259:36, 2259:41,
2259:46, 2260:39,
2263:43, 2265:30,
2265:35, 2265:41,
2266:46, 2267:45,
2268:8
bishop [58] - 2159:21,
2184:37, 2184:41,
2190:5, 2190:7,
2190:20, 2197:6,
2202:26, 2202:33,
2203:30, 2207:17,
2207:44, 2207:46,
2208:9, 2208:46,
2208:47, 2224:42,
2225:6, 2227:30,
2228:27, 2233:24,
2239:16, 2239:23,
2241:8, 2242:7,
2243:17, 2243:18,
2243:22, 2243:27,
2243:33, 2246:29,
2247:11, 2247:16,
2247:21, 2249:47,
2250:2, 2250:5,
2250:8, 2250:16,
2250:31, 2250:34,
2250:40, 2251:27,
2251:37, 2253:20,
2256:34, 2256:42,
2258:27, 2260:11,
2260:32, 2261:5,
2264:13, 2267:19,
2267:20, 2267:27,
2268:2, 2268:39
BISHOP [1] - 2224:38
bishop's [1] - 2256:18
Bishop-in-Council
[62] - 2156:7,
2175:34, 2183:24,
2184:10, 2184:19,
2184:21, 2184:25,
2184:32, 2184:37,
2184:40, 2204:23,
2204:28, 2205:36,
2206:1, 2217:40,
2220:27, 2220:31,
2220:33, 2220:45,
2221:9, 2222:6,
2222:7, 2222:14,
2222:17, 2222:23,
2222:47, 2223:7,
2223:22, 2223:25,
2224:19, 2224:20,
2224:25, 2224:28,
2231:16, 2235:38,
2238:24, 2239:13,
2239:17, 2239:29,
2242:11, 2245:5,
2245:6, 2245:9,
2245:37, 2245:38,
2245:44, 2246:6,
2246:10, 2248:4,
2253:34, 2254:26,
2259:36, 2259:41,
2259:46, 2260:39,
2263:43, 2265:30,
2265:35, 2265:41,
2266:46, 2267:45,
2268:8
**BISHOP-IN-
COUNCIL** [1] -
2224:38
Bishop-in-Council's
[1] - 2250:37
bishops [1] - 2211:14
Bishopsholme [1] -
2211:14
bit [13] - 2156:34,
2157:28, 2182:8,
2188:25, 2196:17,
2200:40, 2207:19,
2219:17, 2225:45,
2236:18, 2242:41,
2245:1, 2246:43
bite [1] - 2206:5
black [1] - 2205:38
Blake [5] - 2166:15,
2174:9, 2174:19,
2176:39, 2177:8
blame [1] - 2204:6
 blessings [1] -
2246:41
board [3] - 2234:46,
2250:17, 2253:11
book [10] - 2178:28,
2178:29, 2178:37,
2194:42, 2202:19,
2202:27, 2202:29,
2206:47, 2207:1,
2214:8
books [7] - 2211:41,
2212:13, 2215:42,
2215:46, 2216:10,
2216:25, 2216:33
borrowings [1] -
2211:37
bottom [7] - 2203:27,
2216:39, 2217:18,
2223:9, 2248:8,
2256:8, 2260:6
bow [2] - 2162:14,
2164:26
box [1] - 2241:11
break [4] - 2189:9,
2194:44, 2195:13,
2222:4
brief [3] - 2166:15,
2234:16, 2250:27
briefly [1] - 2222:13
bring [9] - 2175:6,
2182:45, 2183:1,
2184:6, 2206:34,
2220:42, 2223:21,
2223:23, 2227:8
Bring [1] - 2182:40
bringing [2] - 2222:23,
2223:12
Brisbane [14] -
2166:21, 2166:33,
2201:31, 2231:15,
2231:27, 2231:28,
2238:33, 2245:11,
2251:43, 2251:47,
2252:2, 2252:7,
2252:44, 2252:47
broad [1] - 2217:46
brought [25] -
2155:21, 2157:37,
2158:13, 2158:17,
2158:35, 2166:39,
2171:3, 2171:26,
2185:34, 2188:34,
2189:17, 2196:9,
2208:3, 2222:15,
2225:12, 2225:29,
2227:16, 2235:38,
2257:37, 2257:44,
2259:2, 2259:45,
2260:4, 2261:36,
2264:45
Brown [28] - 2155:39,
2185:17, 2185:30,
2186:5, 2186:36,
2189:25, 2189:31,
2190:31, 2193:21,
2195:45, 2196:47,
2197:33, 2197:46,
2198:20, 2198:29,
2198:44, 2199:13,
2199:22, 2199:41,
2200:7, 2201:9,
2202:17, 2202:22,
2202:45, 2203:29,
2204:13, 2233:25,
2249:46
Bruce [2] - 2240:17,
2240:21
brushed [1] - 2162:43
budget [4] - 2231:31,
2231:34, 2231:41,
2242:31
building [1] - 2236:21
buildings [4] -
2214:34, 2215:2,
2218:24, 2266:31
Buildings [1] -
2214:39
bull [1] - 2209:8
bullied [3] - 2178:2,
2178:7, 2178:18
bulls [1] - 2181:45
bullying [1] - 2161:1
bundle [9] - 2155:21,
2157:3, 2174:22,
2188:23, 2188:35,
2191:21, 2207:46,
2227:8, 2259:45
BUNDLE [1] - 2195:5
busier [1] - 2232:27
business [5] -
2182:28, 2238:39,
2241:6, 2243:1,
2243:3
busy [5] - 2202:47,
2203:3, 2232:4,
2232:45, 2233:1
BY [7] - 2155:3,
2231:5, 2234:20,
2236:31, 2238:1,
2250:25, 2251:25

C

CA [9] - 2165:44,
2171:27, 2219:34,
2219:42, 2220:3,
2224:41, 2229:18,
2234:25, 2258:46
CAJ's [2] - 2225:4,
2244:19
calculate [1] - 2245:2
calculated [2] -
2244:46, 2248:1
calculation [1] -
2247:43
camera [1] - 2243:13
Campbell [10] -
2155:39, 2185:17,
2185:30, 2186:5,
2189:25, 2195:45,
2202:17, 2202:22,
2233:25, 2249:46
Campion [47] -
2160:42, 2161:15,
2165:44, 2185:11,
2199:3, 2208:30,
2219:34, 2219:41,
2220:2, 2223:31,
2224:41, 2224:46,
2227:2, 2227:10,
2227:17, 2227:37,
2228:10, 2228:24,
2228:30, 2228:36,
2228:40, 2229:4,
2229:9, 2229:18,
2229:26, 2229:30,
2229:43, 2229:47,
2230:19, 2230:26,
2230:34, 2230:37,
2230:46, 2244:19,
2244:39, 2257:13,
2257:31, 2258:19,
2258:24, 2259:18,
2261:6, 2261:7,
2261:23, 2261:25,
2261:31, 2262:41
Campion's [5] -
2155:34, 2155:40,
2254:15, 2256:43,
2265:22
Canon [1] - 2193:26
canon [1] - 2193:29
capability [1] -
2231:29
capacity [1] - 2181:1
care [17] - 2174:25,
2208:25, 2208:26,
2209:41, 2259:31,
2259:46, 2260:7,
2260:13, 2261:7,
2261:18, 2262:1,
2262:4, 2262:7,
2262:21, 2263:36,
2263:38, 2263:43
carriage [3] - 2179:22,
2250:35, 2250:36
carry [2] - 2187:47,
2259:40
case [21] - 2167:11,
2179:46, 2184:11,
2188:4, 2191:46,
2192:15, 2212:20,
2217:43, 2219:4,
2225:36, 2226:44,
2232:20, 2233:13,
2233:33, 2246:45,
2247:21, 2250:39,
2252:43, 2269:20
cases [4] - 2170:41,
2231:39, 2243:34,
2260:29
cash [5] - 2215:6,
2218:47, 2219:2,
2219:6, 2239:40
CASPA [1] - 2266:24
cast [1] - 2160:27
casting [4] - 2160:33,
2245:32, 2245:36,
2245:39
casual [2] - 2200:10,
2232:8
cathedral [4] -
2198:17, 2199:10,
2214:12, 2233:22
Catholic [1] - 2198:13

Catt [3] - 2156:44, 2157:1, 2189:28
caused [3] - 2165:2, 2191:11, 2234:25
causing [1] - 2164:24
CE [1] - 2226:41
cease [1] - 2187:47
ceased [1] - 2202:8
cemetery [1] - 2214:13
cent [1] - 2245:25
central [1] - 2248:12
centre [1] - 2177:44
cents [2] - 2225:8, 2248:26
certain [8] - 2156:8, 2214:7, 2242:22, 2243:18, 2258:25, 2258:40, 2259:9, 2268:27
certainly [43] - 2157:20, 2157:32, 2158:9, 2158:18, 2160:36, 2162:47, 2164:11, 2166:30, 2175:34, 2178:20, 2182:19, 2183:36, 2187:9, 2195:29, 2196:39, 2201:19, 2201:20, 2209:21, 2211:24, 2211:31, 2215:7, 2225:5, 2231:37, 2232:23, 2235:12, 2240:33, 2241:10, 2241:42, 2244:27, 2245:31, 2246:42, 2246:46, 2247:7, 2248:46, 2249:47, 2255:37, 2260:23, 2264:18, 2266:40, 2269:1, 2269:7, 2269:8
cetera [14] - 2183:34, 2197:9, 2204:11, 2212:33, 2214:11, 2215:44, 2216:9, 2216:32, 2218:39, 2232:3, 2233:2, 2239:15, 2246:42, 2250:15
CF [1] - 2226:41
CG [1] - 2226:41
CHAIR [50] - 2159:12, 2160:40, 2162:35, 2165:6, 2165:37, 2165:47, 2166:5, 2166:9, 2167:23, 2171:6, 2171:15, 2171:22, 2171:30, 2171:37, 2180:36, 2183:20, 2184:9, 2191:31, 2194:33, 2194:37, 2194:42, 2194:46, 2195:9, 2206:24, 2206:42, 2209:14, 2210:10, 2211:3, 2212:1, 2212:17, 2212:25, 2215:11, 2218:33, 2221:14, 2224:31, 2224:35, 2234:14, 2234:18, 2251:14, 2251:19, 2256:16, 2256:21, 2256:26, 2256:30, 2256:34, 2260:32, 2268:2, 2268:16, 2268:39, 2269:30
chair [5] - 2178:25, 2178:36, 2234:45, 2264:32, 2266:39
Chair [1] - 2154:32
challenge [4] - 2161:23, 2161:41, 2163:29, 2180:21
challenged [1] - 2201:2
chance [4] - 2181:24, 2181:30, 2182:18, 2182:20
change [4] - 2216:17, 2216:18, 2217:40
changed [3] - 2184:11, 2212:32, 2232:27
changes [2] - 2246:30, 2246:33
chaplain's [1] - 2197:4
charge [1] - 2171:15
charges [1] - 2202:3
charity [1] - 2169:36
chase [1] - 2202:17
chased [1] - 2208:27
chasing [1] - 2196:15
check [5] - 2189:8, 2189:31, 2239:27, 2253:41, 2256:10
cheque [1] - 2258:3
chest [1] - 2193:7
CHILD [1] - 2154:13
child [17] - 2162:12, 2162:13, 2162:20, 2162:26, 2176:20, 2185:17, 2188:45, 2189:10, 2191:47, 2192:16, 2203:5, 2220:25, 2236:7, 2254:12, 2254:18, 2258:47, 2264:7
children [1] - 2229:20
CHILDREN'S [1] - 2210:14
children's [1] - 2167:10
Children's [17] - 2166:27, 2197:8, 2201:29, 2210:7, 2217:4, 2217:27, 2217:45, 2220:24, 2223:10, 2223:26, 2225:21, 2259:1, 2259:14, 2266:5, 2266:29, 2266:36, 2266:40
China [1] - 2184:47
china [1] - 2181:45
choosing [1] - 2170:16
chose [1] - 2230:37
Christian [3] - 2169:36, 2173:22, 2180:7
chronologically [1] - 2225:11
church [29] - 2160:3, 2161:8, 2163:35, 2168:13, 2168:23, 2168:26, 2168:42, 2168:45, 2169:4, 2169:16, 2169:24, 2169:28, 2170:2, 2170:5, 2170:26, 2181:28, 2183:28, 2184:38, 2184:42, 2185:6, 2203:45, 2206:40, 2214:11, 2217:39, 2219:36, 2235:35, 2253:3, 2255:39, 2266:18
Church [11] - 2166:22, 2167:27, 2168:4, 2169:2, 2198:13, 2201:1, 2209:12, 2240:16, 2251:33, 2251:41, 2266:36
church's [4] - 2168:29, 2170:45, 2180:47, 2181:2
churches [1] - 2181:10
circumstances [6] - 2181:4, 2183:28, 2184:3, 2247:15, 2254:33, 2265:31
CL [1] - 2193:20
CL] [1] - 2197:30
claim [35] - 2158:20, 2160:27, 2161:14, 2162:27, 2163:36, 2172:1, 2172:38, 2176:47, 2177:15, 2205:46, 2217:10, 2224:47, 2225:4, 2226:20, 2227:11, 2227:38, 2239:38, 2243:41, 2244:19, 2246:16, 2248:30, 2249:7, 2250:35, 2261:17, 2262:42, 2263:5, 2263:12, 2263:18, 2263:32, 2265:22, 2267:46, 2269:8, 2269:15
claim's [1] - 2176:46
claimant [8] - 2162:11, 2162:25, 2183:5, 2184:3, 2195:19, 2254:36, 2262:22, 2262:25
claimants [52] - 2159:30, 2161:32, 2161:39, 2161:41, 2161:43, 2165:3, 2175:25, 2175:39, 2175:41, 2176:20, 2176:28, 2177:12, 2177:38, 2179:36, 2179:39, 2180:8, 2180:20, 2180:31, 2180:33, 2182:44, 2183:29, 2183:39, 2184:15, 2204:20, 2204:37, 2205:19, 2205:45, 2206:16, 2207:9, 2207:12, 2207:17, 2207:18, 2207:28, 2207:43, 2208:17, 2209:9, 2209:23, 2209:25, 2213:32, 2217:6, 2219:28, 2219:35, 2219:41, 2226:20, 2226:40, 2227:5, 2263:37, 2264:15, 2265:5, 2265:15, 2267:5, 2268:45
claimants' [1] - 2160:33
claims [58] - 2155:46, 2157:26, 2158:14, 2159:24, 2160:33, 2161:33, 2163:15, 2163:16, 2164:8, 2166:16, 2167:1, 2172:3, 2173:43, 2179:3, 2183:16, 2206:38, 2209:39, 2217:3, 2217:6, 2217:10, 2217:26, 2217:44, 2218:2, 2218:4, 2218:5, 2220:22, 2222:8, 2222:37, 2223:18, 2224:18, 2224:42, 2225:7, 2225:38, 2225:44, 2226:29, 2227:34, 2228:41, 2231:43, 2233:31, 2242:27, 2244:19, 2244:22, 2244:34, 2245:42, 2250:33, 2260:17, 2262:47, 2263:23, 2264:6, 2264:25, 2264:26, 2264:31, 2264:46, 2265:9, 2265:22, 2265:26, 2269:2, 2269:8
clarification [2] - 2155:43, 2231:9
clarify [1] - 2155:33
clause [6] - 2157:37, 2157:43, 2175:46, 2254:5, 2254:24
clear [17] - 2156:20, 2156:30, 2159:39, 2163:15, 2169:14, 2170:10, 2172:6, 2177:38, 2222:43, 2242:16, 2244:1, 2260:11, 2260:38, 2265:6, 2268:7, 2268:10, 2268:41
clearly [4] - 2163:18, 2170:36, 2203:32, 2248:11
Clements [1] - 2251:44
clergy [22] - 2172:29, 2172:43, 2183:36, 2185:35, 2185:40, 2185:43, 2185:46, 2186:12, 2186:19, 2195:41, 2196:15, 2196:36, 2201:3, 2203:6, 2203:8, 2216:5, 2216:6, 2229:34, 2237:4, 2254:6, 2255:32, 2255:36
cleric [1] - 2172:19
cleric-related [1] - 2172:19
clerical [1] - 2192:47
clerics [2] - 2172:22, 2194:22
clicked [1] - 2202:15
client [1] - 2226:15
clients [7] - 2170:18, 2170:31, 2176:17,

2176:31, 2179:4,
2194:10, 2209:40
clients^[2] - 2176:10,
2179:45
close^[8] - 2166:32,
2197:22, 2197:47,
2219:42, 2224:18,
2226:7, 2242:39,
2246:8
closed^[2] - 2184:14,
2184:17
closely^[1] - 2166:21
closure^[3] - 2184:6,
2206:34, 2230:38
clumsily^[1] - 2230:16
clumsy^[1] - 2238:46
CN^[3] - 2189:4,
2191:36, 2191:47
co^[1] - 2266:30
Co^[3] - 2167:24,
2225:13, 2247:20
co-located^[1] -
2266:30
COAST^[1] - 2210:14
Coast^[17] - 2166:27,
2197:8, 2201:29,
2210:7, 2217:4,
2217:26, 2217:44,
2220:23, 2223:10,
2223:26, 2225:20,
2259:1, 2259:14,
2266:4, 2266:29,
2266:36, 2266:40
Coate^[1] - 2154:33
collection^[2] -
2167:28, 2193:30
College^[1] - 2238:31
coloured^[1] - 2170:29
column^[3] - 2171:13,
2188:39, 2195:22
COMBEN^[1] - 2155:1
Comben^[96] - 2155:5,
2157:3, 2157:38,
2158:18, 2159:29,
2161:38, 2162:32,
2162:35, 2164:29,
2165:6, 2166:13,
2167:23, 2171:46,
2173:8, 2178:7,
2178:40, 2179:17,
2179:41, 2180:1,
2182:34, 2185:8,
2187:8, 2187:40,
2188:28, 2188:35,
2189:9, 2191:5,
2191:34, 2192:4,
2192:15, 2192:36,
2192:43, 2193:10,
2194:18, 2195:13,
2198:19, 2198:47,
2200:10, 2203:3,
2203:11, 2203:21,
2203:39, 2204:22,
2205:43, 2206:24,
2208:29, 2209:14,
2209:47, 2210:17,
2212:20, 2212:35,
2216:36, 2217:23,
2218:9, 2219:13,
2222:3, 2224:40,
2230:10, 2231:7,
2234:22, 2236:33,
2236:35, 2238:3,
2238:4, 2251:14,
2257:1, 2257:12,
2257:30, 2258:12,
2258:18, 2258:23,
2258:28, 2258:35,
2258:37, 2258:47,
2259:4, 2259:21,
2261:6, 2261:7,
2261:22, 2261:30,
2261:38, 2261:42,
2262:20, 2262:32,
2262:36, 2262:45,
2263:4, 2263:21,
2265:26, 2265:36,
2265:41, 2267:18,
2268:28, 2268:29
Comben's^[1] - 2258:2
comfort^[1] - 2230:37
comfortable^[2] -
2242:26, 2243:17
coming^[20] - 2161:34,
2169:19, 2184:15,
2187:35, 2215:46,
2217:6, 2217:9,
2218:4, 2218:47,
2223:46, 2224:1,
2224:3, 2225:16,
2229:15, 2246:6,
2258:43, 2263:38,
2265:5, 2265:9,
2269:16
commence^[4] -
2188:7, 2196:1,
2199:32, 2203:22
commenced^[5] -
2178:23, 2199:22,
2199:26, 2219:45,
2266:14
comment^[4] -
2182:36, 2197:19,
2209:1, 2248:26
commentary^[1] -
2200:35
commercial^[3] -
2205:12, 2205:14,
2222:33
commissary^[1] -
2257:47
COMMISSION^[2] -
2154:12, 2269:33
Commission^[7] -
2191:23, 2191:27,
2226:40, 2235:40,
2238:7, 2251:28,
2264:21
Commissioners^[2] -
2154:33, 2162:36
commitment^[1] -
2244:39
committed^[1] -
2168:18
committee^[40] -
2156:6, 2156:13,
2156:17, 2156:24,
2156:29, 2156:32,
2156:37, 2158:2,
2158:7, 2168:39,
2188:46, 2189:29,
2190:20, 2191:18,
2192:39, 2192:45,
2193:8, 2231:11,
2231:20, 2232:19,
2233:9, 2245:47,
2249:17, 2253:10,
2253:39, 2254:7,
2254:26, 2254:45,
2255:44, 2256:9,
2257:18, 2257:21,
2259:24, 2259:35,
2262:12, 2262:15,
2262:26, 2263:45,
2264:33, 2265:21
committees^[1] -
2156:26
common^[10] -
2157:26, 2161:12,
2161:13, 2162:37,
2169:28, 2177:14,
2180:39, 2181:1,
2181:20, 2181:24
Commonwealth^[1] -
2200:38
communicate^[1] -
2224:41
communicated^[2] -
2193:11, 2237:9
communication^[5] -
2166:35, 2194:10,
2194:12, 2229:1,
2229:2
communications^[2] -
2206:10, 2230:2
community^[11] -
2161:23, 2161:42,
2163:26, 2163:30,
2163:32, 2163:34,
2163:36, 2165:13,
2208:39, 2209:3,
2266:35
compare^[1] - 2215:12
compared^[1] -
2216:47
comparison^[1] -
2227:33
compassion^[1] -
2208:25
compensation^[3] -
2181:14, 2216:9,
2260:30
compilation^[1] -
2157:18
compiling^[1] -
2193:30
complain^[1] -
2242:14
complainant^[1] -
2240:44
complainants^[4] -
2165:35, 2172:8,
2187:23, 2240:43
complained^[3] -
2162:1, 2162:19,
2162:42
complaint^[5] -
2234:24, 2235:44,
2236:2, 2242:10,
2259:17
complaints^[17] -
2162:39, 2162:45,
2163:2, 2163:6,
2163:45, 2164:12,
2164:16, 2164:17,
2164:19, 2164:20,
2164:21, 2164:23,
2164:24, 2165:7,
2186:40, 2235:13,
2254:18
complex^[1] - 2239:13
component^[1] -
2244:46
components^[1] -
2253:8
comprehension^[1] -
2231:36
comprised^[1] -
2157:44
concede^[2] - 2215:8
concentrated^[1] -
2176:30
concern^[9] - 2159:46,
2172:29, 2173:22,
2184:12, 2198:42,
2205:47, 2258:34,
2269:5, 2269:12
concerned^[18] -
2160:26, 2172:1,
2175:38, 2179:36,
2186:24, 2186:27,
2192:30, 2194:3,
2194:9, 2196:35,
2198:47, 2199:2,
2220:1, 2226:40,
2242:4, 2245:29,
2248:47, 2253:45
concerning^[6] -
2174:30, 2198:16,
2225:13, 2225:20,
2244:37, 2258:47
concerns^[2] - 2199:9,
2265:44
conclude^[2] -
2216:37, 2230:30
conclusion^[2] -
2223:12, 2246:7
concrete^[1] - 2223:46
conduct^[3] - 2158:25,
2187:45, 2192:6
conducted^[1] -
2168:13
conference^[10] -
2173:42, 2181:33,
2182:33, 2182:39,
2183:3, 2184:43,
2194:12, 2247:25,
2247:29, 2248:15
conferences^[3] -
2166:34, 2181:39,
2182:15
confident^[1] -
2180:47
confidential^[1] -
2156:5
conflict^[2] - 2194:13,
2267:30
confusion^[1] -
2252:26
connected^[1] -
2235:35
conscious^[8] -
2166:30, 2172:23,
2199:10, 2200:5,
2241:5, 2243:31,
2249:46, 2250:20
consciousness^[1] -
2190:15
consecrated^[1] -
2240:13
consensus^[4] -
2245:24, 2245:25,
2245:27
consider^[16] -
2162:26, 2176:27,
2176:45, 2177:1,
2179:4, 2179:29,
2180:6, 2194:21,
2195:32, 2199:46,
2202:40, 2217:24,

2229:8, 2255:17,
2262:45, 2267:15
considerable [6] -
2158:19, 2180:2,
2182:37, 2184:12,
2209:18, 2266:1
considerably [1] -
2183:38
consideration [1] -
2201:8
considered [5] -
2190:20, 2219:22,
2260:12, 2261:36,
2262:15
considering [3] -
2173:47, 2199:44,
2269:21
consistent [2] -
2188:9, 2224:4
constitution [6] -
2167:31, 2167:44,
2169:1, 2169:6,
2169:17, 2266:41
construction [2] -
2236:24, 2248:44
contact [11] - 2166:26,
2185:9, 2196:46,
2197:2, 2197:14,
2198:28, 2200:33,
2225:42, 2226:2,
2228:40, 2254:36
Contact [1] - 2255:16
contacts [2] - 2199:7,
2228:43
contained [3] -
2194:5, 2235:40,
2236:12
contempt [1] -
2229:19
contemptuous [1] -
2178:44
content [3] - 2167:39,
2243:19, 2247:3
context [3] - 2170:17,
2180:37, 2220:41
continued [3] -
2158:31, 2204:33,
2224:41
CONTINUING [1] -
2155:3
continuing [1] -
2244:29
contrast [1] - 2175:23
contribute [1] -
2181:25
contribution [4] -
2215:41, 2215:43,
2248:44, 2248:47
contributions [3] -
2215:36, 2215:37,
2215:40
control [1] - 2238:19
controversy [1] -
2243:15
conversation [24] -
2171:43, 2172:27,
2173:4, 2173:8,
2173:13, 2173:17,
2187:27, 2197:45,
2221:8, 2222:4,
2222:6, 2222:9,
2235:17, 2236:11,
2244:28, 2249:47,
2250:44, 2257:14,
2258:15, 2258:17,
2263:32, 2264:32,
2268:26, 2268:29
conversations [11] -
2173:18, 2199:16,
2235:23, 2235:28,
2235:31, 2235:41,
2244:25, 2244:26,
2244:33, 2257:16,
2263:6
convey [4] - 2197:32,
2197:39, 2197:40,
2261:30
conveyed [4] -
2188:29, 2198:3,
2240:10, 2268:28
convicted [1] -
2201:24
conviction [4] -
2201:28, 2203:4,
2203:45
convictions [1] -
2201:36
convince [1] - 2177:39
copied [1] - 2196:19
copies [4] - 2191:26,
2248:33, 2248:35,
2249:10
copy [20] - 2155:20,
2155:44, 2156:2,
2156:12, 2156:28,
2157:5, 2157:14,
2157:17, 2189:17,
2194:38, 2195:1,
2224:31, 2228:9,
2257:1, 2258:12,
2259:6, 2261:7,
2261:18, 2261:23,
2261:31
COPY [1] - 2195:4
corner [1] - 2178:42
corporate [16] -
2210:38, 2210:45,
2211:1, 2211:36,
2212:21, 2212:28,
2213:9, 2213:15,
2213:35, 2213:43,
2214:17, 2215:33,
2217:17, 2217:19,
2239:14, 2240:20
Corporate [1] -
2212:13
correct [92] - 2155:27,
2155:28, 2158:32,
2158:38, 2160:34,
2164:46, 2165:29,
2166:24, 2167:2,
2167:6, 2172:3,
2172:4, 2173:35,
2175:3, 2177:45,
2178:31, 2183:17,
2185:27, 2185:33,
2187:33, 2189:20,
2190:1, 2193:3,
2195:28, 2196:38,
2196:45, 2198:30,
2199:18, 2201:46,
2202:10, 2202:30,
2202:31, 2205:20,
2205:24, 2205:25,
2205:30, 2205:37,
2207:9, 2207:17,
2210:46, 2213:25,
2213:47, 2217:38,
2220:26, 2220:30,
2223:19, 2225:1,
2225:39, 2226:30,
2226:35, 2226:46,
2227:6, 2230:31,
2230:44, 2230:46,
2237:24, 2239:33,
2241:4, 2243:9,
2243:41, 2244:8,
2244:42, 2246:16,
2246:21, 2246:34,
2247:46, 2248:17,
2248:18, 2249:8,
2249:20, 2249:27,
2249:28, 2249:43,
2250:5, 2250:37,
2252:8, 2252:45,
2253:11, 2253:20,
2253:43, 2254:41,
2255:27, 2257:6,
2258:43, 2258:44,
2261:2, 2261:32,
2262:23, 2263:45,
2264:3, 2264:46,
2269:24
corresponded [1] -
2160:42
correspondence [6] -
2226:37, 2244:7,
2249:5, 2250:32,
2261:6
corroboration [1] -
2201:12
cost [5] - 2170:44,
2170:45, 2269:5,
2269:7, 2269:12
costs [13] - 2176:9,
2179:46, 2204:41,
2216:5, 2216:6,
2216:10, 2216:13,
2216:15, 2216:21,
2258:19, 2258:29,
2258:30
COUNCIL [1] -
2224:38
council [2] - 2252:4,
2261:1
Council [62] - 2156:7,
2175:34, 2183:24,
2184:10, 2184:19,
2184:21, 2184:25,
2184:32, 2184:37,
2184:40, 2204:23,
2204:28, 2205:36,
2206:1, 2217:40,
2220:27, 2220:31,
2220:33, 2220:45,
2221:9, 2222:6,
2222:7, 2222:14,
2222:17, 2222:23,
2222:47, 2223:7,
2223:22, 2223:25,
2224:19, 2224:20,
2224:25, 2224:28,
2231:16, 2235:38,
2238:24, 2239:13,
2239:17, 2239:29,
2242:11, 2245:5,
2245:6, 2245:9,
2245:37, 2245:38,
2245:44, 2246:6,
2246:10, 2248:4,
2253:34, 2254:26,
2259:36, 2259:41,
2259:46, 2260:39,
2263:43, 2265:30,
2265:35, 2265:41,
2266:46, 2267:45,
2268:8
Council's [1] -
2250:37
counsel [5] - 2166:15,
2204:42, 2236:36,
2241:1, 2241:28
Counsel [1] - 2154:38
counselling [12] -
2174:38, 2176:4,
2181:13, 2227:46,
2255:11, 2255:19,
2255:26, 2257:31,
2258:8, 2258:18,
2258:20, 2258:29
counts [1] - 2201:24
couple [10] - 2155:32,
2184:44, 2187:40,
2208:34, 2212:29,
2216:36, 2231:8,
2231:16, 2232:25,
2250:27
course [18] - 2162:45,
2165:28, 2168:17,
2168:37, 2181:8,
2181:47, 2195:2,
2200:28, 2217:39,
2217:47, 2238:46,
2243:47, 2245:15,
2247:24, 2248:15,
2249:6, 2249:12,
2268:7
court [7] - 2160:13,
2165:41, 2175:17,
2175:25, 2181:1,
2183:1, 2199:2
Court [1] - 2225:37
cover [1] - 2240:3
coverage [1] -
2201:32
covered [2] - 2201:37,
2216:9
covers [1] - 2163:17
created [1] - 2169:3
creates [1] - 2177:37
crime [1] - 2230:38
Crimes [2] - 2189:37,
2190:38
criminal [3] - 2187:43,
2192:6, 2203:44
critical [1] - 2203:43
cross [1] - 2169:38
crossover [2] -
2165:40, 2165:43
crystal [2] - 2169:14,
2170:10
Current [1] - 2213:29
current [2] - 2212:36,
2212:41

D

damage [2] - 2169:29,
2170:39
damaged [2] - 2170:4,
2181:4
damages [1] - 2180:39
date [6] - 2159:8,
2217:13, 2222:23,
2225:14, 2227:42,
2264:14
dated [8] - 2155:26,
2158:28, 2167:23,
2171:3, 2171:4,
2186:34, 2203:5,

2225:31
dates [3] - 2224:13, 2252:23, 2252:35
day-to-day [1] - 2249:4
days [11] - 2155:32, 2177:43, 2184:45, 2205:3, 2207:2, 2227:15, 2232:8, 2232:13, 2253:33, 2256:35, 2266:27
dead [1] - 2156:41
deal [11] - 2156:11, 2158:24, 2170:33, 2184:16, 2223:18, 2223:45, 2233:31, 2238:16, 2264:26, 2266:45, 2268:46
dealing [15] - 2158:13, 2175:9, 2183:11, 2201:22, 2204:10, 2212:38, 2217:44, 2223:39, 2244:21, 2248:30, 2254:17, 2258:29, 2259:22, 2262:22, 2262:24
dealings [4] - 2166:33, 2166:34, 2184:42, 2208:29
dealt [13] - 2157:25, 2157:29, 2174:7, 2220:25, 2222:8, 2226:29, 2226:45, 2233:32, 2257:27, 2259:26, 2260:28, 2263:5, 2265:26
death [1] - 2218:44
debate [2] - 2170:1, 2170:25
dec [2] - 2236:12, 2236:17
decade [1] - 2169:5
decades [1] - 2162:23
deceased [1] - 2193:29
deceit [10] - 2229:36, 2229:42, 2230:6, 2230:11, 2230:20, 2230:31, 2230:33, 2230:41, 2230:43, 2230:47
December [20] - 2173:27, 2173:40, 2175:1, 2177:17, 2177:20, 2183:15, 2190:35, 2192:1, 2194:19, 2194:26, 2194:28, 2195:41, 2196:35, 2211:4, 2213:25, 2215:3, 2247:25, 2267:41, 2268:4, 2268:43
deciding [2] - 2248:6, 2248:7
decision [10] - 2194:18, 2194:19, 2194:20, 2202:47, 2205:16, 2226:22, 2250:18, 2250:19, 2263:27, 2269:11
decisions [2] - 2192:39, 2192:40
declarations [4] - 2194:5, 2201:11, 2267:1, 2267:4
declined [1] - 2167:10
decrease [1] - 2218:23
deed [1] - 2207:13
deep [1] - 2260:42
defend [3] - 2182:44, 2184:11, 2267:46
defending [4] - 2195:27, 2195:32, 2195:36, 2195:37
deferred [1] - 2188:5
deficit [1] - 2211:11
defined [2] - 2162:16, 2254:10
defrock [1] - 2200:38
defrocked [1] - 2204:14
defrocking [1] - 2233:3
degree [2] - 2180:2, 2182:37
delay [1] - 2176:46
denial [1] - 2174:30
denied [1] - 2183:37
denying [1] - 2174:22
departed [1] - 2258:28
department [1] - 2214:37
departure [1] - 2199:27
deposed [2] - 2250:15, 2250:18
deposition [2] - 2233:4, 2238:6
described [3] - 2163:23, 2238:37, 2241:21
desired [3] - 2231:20, 2231:21, 2232:34
desk [1] - 2202:26
detail [1] - 2241:45
detailed [2] - 2188:19, 2215:14
details [3] - 2197:10, 2209:44, 2255:17
determine [1] - 2181:1, 2252:17, 2252:40, 2253:23, 2253:27, 2253:39, 2254:16, 2259:47, 2266:4
determined [1] - 2157:24
development [2] - 2211:30, 2239:46
developments [1] - 2239:14
devised [1] - 2181:9
diagnosed [1] - 2156:33
Dick [3] - 2218:27, 2218:38, 2219:9
dick [1] - 2218:37
dictate [1] - 2248:39
died [1] - 2218:41
difference [6] - 2203:34, 2215:30, 2215:35, 2215:37, 2216:4, 2216:22
different [7] - 2164:19, 2169:11, 2177:30, 2183:34, 2241:47, 2247:6, 2260:44
differentiation [1] - 2164:16
difficult [4] - 2192:31, 2192:33, 2209:24, 2211:40
difficulties [4] - 2169:42, 2169:43, 2169:46, 2233:23
difficulty [1] - 2198:37
diminished [1] - 2225:5
dinner [1] - 2242:41
diocesan [7] - 2167:38, 2177:44, 2211:39, 2222:32, 2252:4, 2258:3, 2266:31
Diocesan [1] - 2215:31
DIOCESE [1] - 2210:15
Diocese [41] - 2155:7, 2157:25, 2157:29, 2167:27, 2174:26, 2175:13, 2177:39, 2179:6, 2179:17, 2179:44, 2187:10, 2190:31, 2193:45, 2196:37, 2199:7, 2199:30, 2202:40, 2203:14, 2210:7, 2210:19, 2212:11, 2212:22, 2213:43, 2215:4, 2216:37, 2217:33, 2219:5, 2231:21, 2251:42, 2251:43, 2251:47, 2252:2, 2252:7, 2252:17, 2252:40, 2253:23, 2253:27, 2253:39, 2254:16, 2259:47, 2266:4
diocese [98] - 2158:23, 2162:41, 2167:4, 2167:9, 2167:47, 2169:2, 2169:7, 2171:47, 2173:41, 2174:38, 2175:26, 2175:31, 2175:35, 2177:8, 2177:18, 2177:20, 2178:9, 2180:17, 2180:28, 2182:25, 2182:35, 2183:16, 2183:40, 2190:16, 2194:6, 2194:11, 2196:4, 2197:5, 2199:35, 2200:5, 2200:37, 2200:45, 2202:41, 2202:46, 2203:22, 2203:46, 2204:2, 2204:3, 2204:4, 2204:19, 2205:5, 2205:29, 2209:9, 2209:19, 2210:1, 2210:28, 2210:38, 2210:43, 2212:27, 2213:19, 2215:42, 2215:43, 2216:30, 2216:33, 2217:24, 2219:6, 2220:11, 2220:14, 2225:38, 2226:17, 2226:33, 2231:23, 2231:44, 2232:7, 2233:15, 2234:6, 2238:16, 2238:39, 2239:32, 2239:39, 2240:12, 2240:25, 2242:5, 2242:25, 2242:37, 2242:45, 2243:41, 2247:44, 2248:21, 2249:11, 2251:6, 2252:3, 2252:9, 2255:19, 2255:39, 2258:8, 2260:11, 2262:46, 2263:5, 2263:11, 2263:23, 2265:15, 2265:37, 2265:43, 2265:45, 2267:37, 2268:41, 2269:6
dioceses [3] - 2184:47, 2185:4, 2232:1
direct [5] - 2224:2, 2228:31, 2241:27, 2262:9, 2262:37
directed [5] - 2209:15, 2236:2, 2257:9, 2262:25
direction [2] - 2194:47, 2242:45
directly [6] - 2196:18, 2222:47, 2257:45, 2258:24, 2262:23, 2262:24
director [33] - 2157:31, 2157:33, 2158:12, 2166:21, 2193:12, 2203:19, 2203:31, 2203:33, 2231:32, 2231:45, 2232:9, 2233:28, 2237:40, 2253:10, 2253:15, 2253:23, 2253:32, 2253:43, 2254:1, 2254:28, 2254:44, 2255:6, 2255:10, 2255:42, 2258:31, 2258:39, 2264:1, 2264:2, 2264:38, 2264:42, 2264:45, 2265:10, 2265:20
Director [1] - 2190:25
directory [1] - 2202:30
disappointed [2] - 2199:36, 2203:43
discharged [1] - 2193:43
disciplinary [20] - 2172:9, 2172:42, 2185:10, 2186:25, 2187:45, 2196:2, 2196:37, 2196:40, 2198:41, 2199:5, 2199:21, 2199:25, 2199:32, 2199:47, 2200:32, 2200:47, 2201:8, 2202:3, 2202:42, 2203:46
disciplinary" [1] - 2237:3
discipline [4] - 2186:11, 2186:22, 2201:23, 2201:45
discipliners [1] - 2187:46
disciplining [1] - 2199:40
disclosed [1] - 2201:41
discounting [1] - 2204:43
discuss [2] - 2173:43, 2178:3
discussed [3] - 2184:36, 2259:34,

2259:36
discussing [1] - 2243:22
discussion [20] - 2181:18, 2181:19, 2181:25, 2185:3, 2188:10, 2205:39, 2206:26, 2222:10, 2222:24, 2222:36, 2222:38, 2222:39, 2223:45, 2231:43, 2243:44, 2243:47, 2244:20, 2246:10, 2246:12, 2250:14
discussions [8] - 2173:41, 2178:23, 2228:18, 2238:47, 2239:29, 2243:38, 2244:21, 2245:16
dismantled [2] - 2236:8, 2236:16
dismantling [1] - 2236:3
dismissive [1] - 2178:44
disowning [1] - 2209:16
disposed [2] - 2174:3, 2174:6
dispute [2] - 2209:8, 2242:21
dissimilar [1] - 2259:17
distance [1] - 2241:6
distinction [6] - 2172:21, 2185:46, 2186:14, 2186:18, 2186:30, 2186:31
divert [1] - 2269:21
document [22] - 2156:5, 2166:38, 2188:36, 2189:3, 2191:29, 2194:33, 2212:3, 2213:13, 2223:21, 2228:14, 2236:36, 2241:12, 2241:15, 2241:18, 2241:22, 2241:34, 2241:38, 2243:9, 2247:4, 2249:16, 2249:19
documentation [1] - 2260:21
documents [7] - 2157:18, 2167:28, 2167:31, 2201:40, 2202:14, 2225:46, 2244:5
dollar [3] - 2261:16, 2261:19, 2261:26
dollars [2] - 2225:8, 2248:26
done [48] - 2155:37, 2155:38, 2155:41, 2155:45, 2159:23, 2165:19, 2165:21, 2165:24, 2169:30, 2170:5, 2170:40, 2170:41, 2173:3, 2176:20, 2183:8, 2183:39, 2184:1, 2193:47, 2196:39, 2208:10, 2211:33, 2211:35, 2214:15, 2215:39, 2216:6, 2223:12, 2223:15, 2231:17, 2232:1, 2233:26, 2233:27, 2234:8, 2236:6, 2236:21, 2240:20, 2242:31, 2243:8, 2243:33, 2244:34, 2246:20, 2246:45, 2249:12, 2249:14, 2249:31, 2249:34, 2262:4
door [2] - 2178:36, 2242:40
dossier [2] - 2157:23, 2188:19
dot [5] - 2167:14, 2173:20, 2236:39, 2237:8, 2244:6
double [1] - 2212:5
double-accounted [1] - 2212:5
doubt [5] - 2160:27, 2160:33, 2191:18, 2247:40, 2264:13
down [32] - 2169:36, 2170:8, 2170:27, 2171:11, 2179:32, 2180:12, 2187:21, 2187:25, 2188:13, 2188:16, 2189:23, 2189:36, 2197:28, 2213:41, 2214:22, 2216:2, 2217:18, 2218:10, 2218:15, 2218:30, 2219:17, 2222:16, 2223:9, 2243:33, 2245:12, 2245:13, 2247:20, 2248:38, 2251:14, 2255:2, 2260:5, 2261:37
downplay [1] - 2172:38
Dr [5] - 2173:26, 2173:31, 2173:38, 2175:23, 2175:36
draft [10] - 2159:5, 2174:9, 2208:6, 2208:9, 2208:35, 2227:26, 2228:22, 2246:31, 2246:33, 2248:31
drafted [11] - 2194:27, 2207:43, 2208:44, 2208:46, 2241:33, 2243:8, 2246:16, 2246:19, 2246:29, 2246:39, 2247:5
drafting [3] - 2228:14, 2228:27, 2253:1
drawer [2] - 2203:27
drawn [1] - 2268:23
dreamt [1] - 2164:27
dubious [1] - 2182:9
due [5] - 2195:1, 2200:28, 2210:44, 2211:21, 2243:26
during [27] - 2165:33, 2184:43, 2189:8, 2199:16, 2199:22, 2217:45, 2229:4, 2232:30, 2234:45, 2234:46, 2238:32, 2238:36, 2239:31, 2239:37, 2242:9, 2243:47, 2245:15, 2247:24, 2248:15, 2249:6, 2251:43, 2252:47, 2265:13, 2266:14, 2267:35, 2267:40, 2267:42
dusty [1] - 2203:28
duties [5] - 2199:47, 2232:45, 2238:15, 2254:28, 2254:32
duty [6] - 2193:44, 2199:39, 2255:18, 2255:26, 2255:30, 2255:35

E

early [10] - 2165:34, 2171:17, 2213:7, 2226:27, 2231:17, 2231:19, 2243:4, 2256:45, 2258:27, 2266:27
earning [1] - 2242:30
easier [1] - 2232:28
easily [3] - 2200:36, 2219:10, 2242:41
easy [2] - 2169:47, 2232:31
edges [1] - 2248:13
edited [1] - 2246:26
editor [1] - 2171:26
editorial [1] - 2209:1
effect [9] - 2161:38, 2161:40, 2176:27, 2195:32, 2202:34, 2207:24, 2221:2, 2241:30, 2246:4
effectively [9] - 2157:24, 2168:13, 2181:20, 2199:21, 2210:44, 2214:6, 2220:1, 2238:20, 2248:5
eight [8] - 2172:9, 2172:18, 2172:28, 2172:30, 2172:43, 2173:6, 2237:2, 2237:4
either [9] - 2184:36, 2196:2, 2211:25, 2220:40, 2222:46, 2223:3, 2224:5, 2247:10, 2247:15
electorate [1] - 2238:33
Elliott [4] - 2193:12, 2247:12, 2247:16, 2247:19
Ellis [1] - 2225:36
elsewhere [1] - 2219:2
email [9] - 2196:12, 2196:23, 2196:43, 2197:46, 2200:20, 2200:21, 2200:25, 2200:27, 2226:8
email" [1] - 2226:1
embarrassed [2] - 2182:1
emerged [1] - 2268:26
emerging [2] - 2223:35, 2266:10
employed [1] - 2216:8
Employee [1] - 2213:29
employees [2] - 2213:29, 2216:25
employer [1] - 2209:22
employment [3] - 2216:13, 2216:15, 2216:21
enacted [1] - 2252:31
end [23] - 2164:42, 2171:20, 2171:46, 2179:8, 2179:33, 2182:16, 2182:33, 2183:3, 2183:15, 2198:24, 2201:43, 2204:18, 2214:15, 2215:42, 2219:13, 2220:2, 2226:28, 2227:4, 2233:38, 2237:42, 2246:35, 2246:45, 2247:29
ended [2] - 2202:46, 2211:4
endedness [1] - 2175:35
engage [2] - 2262:9, 2263:37
engaging [1] - 2262:37
England [3] - 2168:4, 2209:12, 2266:36
ensure [4] - 2160:29, 2177:12, 2201:45, 2209:39
ensuring [1] - 2265:7
enter [1] - 2207:13
entering [1] - 2178:41
entertaining [1] - 2226:33
entire [2] - 2222:39, 2267:42
entirely [1] - 2211:21
entirety [1] - 2222:39
entitled [1] - 2210:7
ENTITLED [1] - 2210:14
entries [1] - 2212:33
entry [1] - 2223:26
Equipment [3] - 2214:22, 2214:30, 2218:23
equipment [2] - 2214:26, 2214:45
Equipment" [1] - 2219:1
equity [6] - 2213:14, 2213:19, 2213:42, 2213:44, 2216:40, 2217:19
errors [1] - 2160:19
especially [4] - 2215:40, 2240:34, 2241:7, 2248:36
espoused [1] - 2175:39
essence [1] - 2220:44
essential [2] - 2164:2, 2165:11
essentially [10] - 2164:7, 2171:46, 2177:17, 2193:42, 2212:20, 2226:28, 2227:3, 2228:46, 2236:15, 2236:25
Estate [1] - 2218:28
estate [3] - 2218:36,

2218:37, 2219:9
et [14] - 2183:34, 2197:9, 2204:11, 2212:33, 2214:11, 2215:44, 2216:9, 2216:32, 2218:39, 2232:3, 2233:2, 2239:15, 2246:42, 2250:15
evening [1] - 2262:32
event [17] - 2158:12, 2183:3, 2188:39, 2189:9, 2189:45, 2196:22, 2204:45, 2207:4, 2217:32, 2219:40, 2224:17, 2226:6, 2226:11, 2261:25, 2262:40, 2266:45, 2267:26
events [1] - 2222:24
eventually [8] - 2178:34, 2183:5, 2184:18, 2203:26, 2237:38, 2242:46, 2245:19, 2250:17
evidence [55] - 2157:4, 2165:39, 2169:18, 2173:21, 2175:45, 2182:29, 2183:7, 2185:28, 2187:5, 2192:43, 2193:3, 2193:4, 2193:5, 2193:10, 2193:45, 2198:14, 2199:9, 2201:6, 2201:10, 2201:37, 2204:19, 2205:3, 2205:6, 2207:26, 2210:6, 2219:8, 2220:35, 2223:22, 2223:46, 2228:43, 2230:35, 2231:10, 2233:21, 2234:23, 2234:26, 2234:40, 2235:45, 2236:17, 2237:1, 2239:41, 2240:40, 2242:26, 2244:45, 2247:9, 2247:23, 2247:25, 2250:30, 2253:33, 2253:37, 2258:37, 2259:34, 2261:22, 2262:14, 2264:13, 2264:20
ex [8] - 2165:23, 2165:25, 2176:10, 2176:17, 2176:31, 2219:23, 2219:27, 2219:30
ex-resident [1] - 2165:25
ex-residents [1] - 2165:23
exactly [3] - 2190:11, 2196:28, 2200:47
examination [2] - 2200:45, 2251:1
example [6] - 2192:23, 2193:19, 2205:44, 2208:30, 2255:35, 2262:9
examples [1] - 2212:29
excellent [1] - 2234:8
except [7] - 2172:9, 2204:16, 2211:29, 2234:2, 2237:1, 2237:2, 2237:4
excess [1] - 2170:31
excused [1] - 2251:15
executive [1] - 2240:35
executors [1] - 2218:45
exercise [2] - 2169:36, 2267:31
exercised [1] - 2245:39
EXHIBIT [3] - 2195:4, 2210:14, 2224:38
exhibit [16] - 2155:21, 2157:36, 2194:37, 2195:1, 2195:14, 2204:22, 2208:3, 2219:14, 2222:15, 2224:12, 2224:36, 2225:29, 2227:9, 2254:23, 2259:45, 2261:36
existed [1] - 2232:36
expanded [1] - 2173:5
expect [2] - 2208:9, 2227:28
expectation [3] - 2232:24, 2237:37, 2237:39
expectations [1] - 2170:31
expected [3] - 2211:32, 2215:34, 2233:33
expecting [3] - 2158:29, 2187:20, 2200:44
expense [1] - 2216:24
expenses [2] - 2176:9, 2215:26
experience [12] - 2171:28, 2181:43, 2181:44, 2208:39, 2231:22, 2231:24, 2231:29, 2231:47, 2233:45, 2234:4, 2234:9, 2251:32
expert [1] - 2260:34
expertise [1] - 2231:22
explain [2] - 2216:13, 2218:30
explicitly [2] - 2242:3, 2264:39
explore [1] - 2265:37
express [1] - 2159:46
expressed [2] - 2243:39, 2265:41
expression [1] - 2232:43
extended [1] - 2163:6
extensive [1] - 2208:29
extent [4] - 2200:14, 2203:1, 2217:46, 2258:29
extraordinary [8] - 2211:5, 2211:8, 2211:10, 2211:11, 2211:27, 2211:29, 2211:44, 2215:15
extreme [1] - 2163:16
extremely [1] - 2230:45
eyes [2] - 2164:1, 2165:11
Ezzy [11] - 2164:12, 2234:23, 2234:30, 2234:44, 2235:24, 2235:44, 2236:2, 2236:10, 2236:19, 2236:22, 2251:8
Ezzy's [1] - 2235:34

F

face [5] - 2183:23, 2223:38, 2233:27
face-to-face [1] - 2223:38
facilitation [3] - 2174:17, 2174:37, 2177:34
facilitators [2] - 2174:43, 2176:45
facility [6] - 2163:38, 2168:9, 2168:19, 2168:46, 2208:40, 2209:3
fact [29] - 2164:30, 2169:3, 2172:16, 2172:37, 2177:13, 2178:13, 2178:17, 2178:18, 2183:47, 2186:21, 2189:10, 2189:46, 2190:44, 2193:11, 2194:26, 2202:41, 2205:22, 2208:21, 2209:30, 2213:36, 2219:34, 2220:34, 2225:36, 2226:39, 2238:19, 2244:5, 2254:10, 2255:14, 2264:44
factor [1] - 2176:47
Facts [1] - 2167:27
factual [2] - 2159:25, 2160:19
Fahey [1] - 2179:32
failed [1] - 2199:39
failing [1] - 2199:46
failings [1] - 2203:34
failure [1] - 2269:26
fair [11] - 2156:34, 2206:14, 2239:23, 2242:36, 2247:2, 2247:44, 2248:20, 2248:25, 2248:43, 2248:46, 2249:3
fairly [7] - 2183:24, 2197:47, 2215:31, 2233:4, 2239:43, 2252:30, 2269:16
fallen [2] - 2210:25, 2213:19
false [1] - 2229:46
familiar [1] - 2196:29
family [1] - 2195:27
far [17] - 2170:31, 2173:4, 2179:8, 2179:25, 2187:36, 2194:26, 2198:43, 2220:1, 2232:19, 2232:34, 2239:8, 2245:26, 2245:29, 2247:43, 2253:37, 2253:45, 2256:46
Farrer [1] - 2154:22
favourable [1] - 2175:39
favourably [3] - 2171:27, 2174:3, 2174:6
February [1] - 2222:45
February/March [1] - 2243:5
fees [1] - 2205:34
feet [1] - 2178:25
fell [1] - 2157:43
felt [4] - 2158:23, 2164:33, 2263:33
few [7] - 2168:42, 2182:21, 2207:2, 2214:13, 2249:37, 2253:33, 2256:35
fight [2] - 2161:4, 2170:14
figure [7] - 2183:10, 2183:13, 2183:21, 2204:30, 2218:46, 2261:16, 2262:34
figures [3] - 2172:41, 2183:8, 2244:42
file [12] - 2166:38, 2167:23, 2175:44, 2184:17, 2187:6, 2197:40, 2200:27, 2203:26, 2206:9, 2206:44, 2219:42, 2268:32
files [2] - 2233:14, 2233:19
final [3] - 2226:12, 2250:19, 2261:41
finalise [1] - 2202:45
finance [2] - 2238:12, 2238:13
finances [8] - 2238:20, 2238:25, 2239:5, 2240:12, 2240:25, 2242:25, 2250:31
financial [30] - 2174:38, 2177:40, 2180:19, 2180:30, 2184:39, 2203:36, 2204:11, 2210:1, 2211:44, 2213:36, 2214:18, 2215:4, 2215:9, 2216:47, 2217:5, 2217:24, 2220:29, 2226:34, 2227:10, 2238:10, 2238:16, 2238:37, 2239:1, 2239:9, 2239:24, 2239:32, 2244:35, 2252:3, 2260:17, 2261:17
Financial [1] - 2210:8
FINANCIAL [1] - 2210:15
financially [2] - 2239:39, 2239:40
financials [1] - 2244:42
fine [1] - 2240:21
finer [2] - 2209:44, 2250:14
finessed [4] - 2207:19, 2207:47, 2246:25, 2246:26
finished [1] - 2227:4
firm [1] - 2179:46

first [40] - 2155:25, 2155:34, 2155:39, 2166:15, 2167:14, 2169:22, 2172:36, 2175:9, 2176:4, 2180:11, 2181:24, 2182:21, 2187:41, 2191:41, 2197:5, 2202:7, 2208:35, 2211:20, 2212:29, 2215:26, 2215:29, 2223:24, 2224:15, 2225:47, 2226:7, 2231:40, 2234:18, 2237:13, 2239:42, 2239:45, 2240:36, 2250:30, 2253:27, 2253:31, 2253:38, 2255:14, 2257:38, 2262:3, 2265:40, 2266:34

firstly [4] - 2183:33, 2197:11, 2211:21, 2234:38

Fitzgerald [1] - 2154:34

five [5] - 2175:10, 2177:43, 2231:39, 2231:47, 2233:3

flat [1] - 2232:7

flexibility [1] - 2224:14

flicked [1] - 2202:23

focus [2] - 2198:19, 2260:28

focused [2] - 2204:10, 2260:24

folder [2] - 2210:2, 2210:6

FOLDER [1] - 2210:14

folders [1] - 2210:5

Foley [1] - 2234:35

follow [6] - 2193:37, 2193:43, 2198:3, 2232:31, 2232:32, 2250:4

followed [7] - 2201:46, 2243:28, 2254:19, 2256:26, 2257:22, 2257:25, 2268:10

following [7] - 2160:15, 2164:29, 2173:8, 2234:24, 2236:41, 2243:4, 2268:30

follows [1] - 2268:16

foot [1] - 2244:20

Foott [3] - 2167:24, 2225:13, 2247:20

forensic [2] - 2200:44, 2201:1

forgotten [1] - 2182:26

form [11] - 2170:10, 2173:42, 2176:31, 2177:40, 2178:9, 2202:3, 2236:46, 2238:47, 2240:10, 2267:34, 2267:42

formal [1] - 2200:13

formally [4] - 2187:14, 2197:40, 2202:36, 2242:42

formed [6] - 2239:31, 2239:34, 2239:42, 2240:9, 2268:3, 2268:19

former [3] - 2155:1, 2225:20, 2234:33

forming [1] - 2268:36

forms [1] - 2255:43

forth [2] - 2252:24, 2258:30

forthcoming [1] - 2263:12

forward [22] - 2164:8, 2172:8, 2174:11, 2184:15, 2203:30, 2213:18, 2217:6, 2217:9, 2220:38, 2220:42, 2223:3, 2223:46, 2224:3, 2227:5, 2231:43, 2232:37, 2245:41, 2252:10, 2254:37, 2263:38, 2265:6, 2265:9

four [7] - 2205:3, 2222:24, 2228:33, 2231:39, 2231:47, 2233:3, 2237:13

fourth [2] - 2171:12, 2185:38

frame [3] - 2170:38, 2177:46, 2178:1

FRANCIS [1] - 2251:23

Francis [2] - 2238:30, 2251:29

frankly [1] - 2232:6

frequently [1] - 2250:44

Friday [14] - 2155:6, 2161:11, 2168:30, 2169:18, 2185:28, 2198:15, 2201:37, 2203:26, 2231:10, 2234:23, 2238:5, 2238:7, 2239:41, 2240:7

friend [2] - 2166:32, 2200:4

fro [1] - 2248:17

frolic [1] - 2195:39

front [10] - 2170:36, 2177:12, 2189:3, 2192:38, 2193:8, 2195:15, 2201:40, 2202:14, 2202:22, 2225:46

full [9] - 2176:17, 2204:9, 2204:14, 2231:32, 2231:44, 2232:9, 2233:3, 2239:18, 2251:28

full-time [3] - 2231:32, 2231:44, 2232:9

fully [4] - 2181:44, 2204:1, 2206:6, 2217:29

fumed [1] - 2198:5

fund [1] - 2211:35

Fund [1] - 2215:31

fundamentally [1] - 2212:10

funding [1] - 2256:11

funds [4] - 2210:36, 2211:36, 2239:14, 2257:34

furious [1] - 2164:31

Furness [1] - 2154:38

future [6] - 2217:5, 2222:7, 2222:36, 2223:18, 2224:18, 2227:46

G

Gail [1] - 2154:38

Garth [2] - 2174:9, 2177:8

gather [1] - 2202:31

gathered [1] - 2187:33

GDIF [1] - 2211:38

General [5] - 2240:16, 2252:21, 2252:25, 2252:27, 2252:34

general [8] - 2162:24, 2197:7, 2217:32, 2238:9, 2245:4, 2249:4, 2249:35, 2256:10

General's [2] - 2214:37, 2215:3

generalities [2] - 2243:23, 2243:24

generality [1] - 2264:33

generally [9] - 2159:24, 2172:41, 2181:41, 2211:36, 2215:41, 2244:35, 2246:9, 2248:34, 2249:14

generous [1] - 2219:22

gentleman [1] - 2222:5

genuine [1] - 2209:16

genuinely [1] - 2217:41

Geoff [1] - 2234:35

Gerber [32] - 2189:46, 2190:35, 2190:44, 2191:11, 2195:42, 2196:20, 2198:15, 2202:35, 2203:13, 2203:18, 2231:7, 2231:22, 2231:29, 2231:33, 2232:3, 2232:20, 2232:26, 2232:44, 2233:8, 2233:14, 2233:34, 2233:37, 2234:5, 2253:14, 2253:22, 2253:28, 2253:35, 2253:38, 2253:46, 2258:36, 2264:24, 2264:31

Gerber's [5] - 2157:4, 2187:38, 2199:9, 2233:20, 2264:20

GFC [2] - 2218:35, 2218:42

gifts [1] - 2200:1

given [24] - 2160:20, 2170:30, 2174:19, 2179:3, 2181:34, 2191:46, 2205:33, 2207:16, 2207:43, 2209:8, 2209:41, 2212:28, 2217:3, 2217:23, 2223:11, 2223:14, 2231:10, 2233:31, 2241:45, 2242:22, 2247:9, 2250:30, 2253:6, 2268:19

glance [2] - 2211:20, 2215:27

globo [3] - 2183:9, 2183:12, 2183:20

God [1] - 2216:8

governance [1] - 2245:47

government's [1] - 2214:37

Governor [1] - 2154:21

grab [1] - 2213:37

Grafton [55] - 2155:7, 2157:25, 2157:29, 2157:30, 2157:32, 2167:27, 2174:26, 2175:13, 2177:39, 2179:6, 2179:18, 2179:44, 2184:44, 2185:5, 2186:38, 2187:10, 2193:45, 2196:37, 2199:7, 2199:30, 2199:37, 2201:35, 2202:40, 2203:14, 2210:8, 2210:19, 2212:22, 2213:43, 2215:4, 2215:31, 2216:38, 2217:33, 2219:6, 2231:12, 2231:13, 2231:21, 2231:27, 2231:31, 2233:9, 2245:12, 2245:13, 2251:31, 2251:40, 2251:42, 2252:14, 2252:17, 2252:40, 2252:43, 2253:22, 2253:24, 2253:27, 2253:39, 2254:17, 2264:3, 2266:4

GRAFTON [1] - 2210:15

grasp [1] - 2239:18

gratia [6] - 2176:10, 2176:17, 2176:31, 2219:23, 2219:27, 2219:30

great [6] - 2164:2, 2165:11, 2165:19, 2165:21, 2205:47, 2266:45

Great [1] - 2184:47

greatest [1] - 2264:14

Greg [1] - 2251:8

GRIFFIN [3] - 2236:31, 2236:33, 2237:44

Griffin [1] - 2236:33

gross [1] - 2163:6

group [30] - 2158:20, 2163:14, 2163:18, 2167:1, 2170:41, 2213:32, 2217:10, 2225:38, 2227:34, 2227:38, 2228:41, 2239:38, 2243:41, 2244:18, 2245:42, 2246:16, 2247:29, 2248:30, 2249:7, 2250:33, 2250:35, 2262:42, 2262:47, 2263:4, 2263:12, 2263:18, 2263:23,

2264:15, 2264:25,
2269:8
groups [1] - 2164:19
grown [2] - 2216:40,
2217:19
guess [2] - 2260:36,
2263:17
guided [1] - 2206:22
guilty [2] - 2197:21,
2230:38
Gunundi [1] - 2243:14
guy [5] - 2186:31,
2197:38, 2197:41,
2200:37, 2200:39

H

hair [2] - 2162:40,
2162:42
half [5] - 2169:6,
2172:40, 2172:42,
2173:5
halfway [1] - 2171:13
Halletts [2] - 2208:24,
2209:35
hand [5] - 2191:26,
2210:2, 2210:6,
2247:33, 2268:9
handed [4] - 2215:34,
2247:10, 2247:16,
2247:17
handle [5] - 2221:5,
2232:28, 2233:5,
2263:19, 2264:46
handled [1] - 2218:45
hands [3] - 2200:40,
2255:31, 2255:36
handwritten [1] -
2218:39
hang [1] - 2246:4
happy [5] - 2182:17,
2182:19, 2230:8,
2230:32, 2230:47
hard [2] - 2185:2,
2230:45
harm [2] - 2176:20,
2183:34
Harrison [52] -
2155:14, 2157:18,
2157:24, 2157:43,
2163:17, 2164:30,
2164:31, 2164:33,
2164:36, 2165:4,
2166:19, 2167:1,
2169:43, 2169:44,
2169:46, 2170:30,
2172:2, 2173:43,
2173:45, 2175:2,
2176:29, 2176:32,
2178:3, 2178:10,

2179:26, 2180:3,
2180:12, 2180:16,
2180:27, 2181:47,
2182:9, 2182:36,
2182:37, 2183:44,
2184:29, 2194:1,
2194:3, 2207:27,
2219:5, 2220:42,
2225:12, 2225:19,
2225:43, 2240:42,
2247:28, 2248:9,
2263:10, 2265:6,
2266:2, 2267:3,
2268:30, 2268:34
Harrison's [4] -
2155:7, 2158:28,
2163:13, 2179:3
hate [1] - 2205:15
head [3] - 2172:41,
2204:43, 2240:36
headline [1] - 2171:6
health [3] - 2198:42,
2239:32, 2239:35
healthy [2] - 2215:4,
2215:9
hear [4] - 2178:36,
2178:38, 2208:38,
2230:2
heard [12] - 2157:4,
2175:45, 2196:41,
2199:37, 2205:2,
2234:46, 2235:18,
2245:11, 2262:45,
2264:13, 2264:20,
2268:27
Hearing [1] - 2154:17
hearing [3] - 2157:4,
2260:20, 2268:28
heart [2] - 2230:5,
2230:42
heavy [1] - 2248:12
heck [1] - 2205:40
height [1] - 2185:47
held [2] - 2217:33,
2251:33
help [8] - 2162:36,
2166:15, 2169:37,
2170:9, 2170:27,
2170:39, 2185:2,
2215:12
helped [2] - 2229:29,
2230:7
helpful [1] - 2268:27
helping [1] - 2169:34
herself [1] - 2262:23
high [4] - 2182:8,
2187:8, 2203:1,
2266:26
higher [5] - 2183:38,
2207:5, 2234:7,

2239:28, 2242:33
highly [3] - 2156:5,
2201:7, 2203:5
Hill [1] - 2251:45
himself [7] - 2195:39,
2198:15, 2203:7,
2204:3, 2237:34,
2262:23, 2262:37
hindsight [2] -
2184:27, 2200:1
hint [1] - 2250:19
history [3] - 2162:29,
2266:10, 2266:11
hmm [3] - 2255:23,
2263:46, 2267:6
hoc [1] - 2232:21
hold [2] - 2203:7,
2251:41
holding [1] - 2204:3
holds [1] - 2168:33
holy [3] - 2238:6,
2251:2, 2251:3
home [32] - 2160:3,
2160:20, 2160:37,
2160:41, 2161:33,
2163:40, 2164:1,
2164:9, 2164:25,
2165:21, 2165:32,
2165:42, 2165:45,
2167:10, 2167:32,
2167:43, 2171:28,
2195:28, 2209:9,
2209:12, 2223:35,
2234:34, 2234:38,
2234:39, 2234:44,
2235:23, 2235:35,
2262:32, 2265:38,
2265:43, 2265:45,
2266:35
HOME [1] - 2210:14
Home [17] - 2166:28,
2197:8, 2201:29,
2210:7, 2217:4,
2217:27, 2217:45,
2220:24, 2223:10,
2223:27, 2225:21,
2259:1, 2259:14,
2266:5, 2266:30,
2266:36, 2266:40
Home' [1] - 2167:27
honestly [3] -
2180:33, 2180:36,
2237:41
honour [1] - 2244:38
Honour [17] - 2161:6,
2161:11, 2171:1,
2171:9, 2184:27,
2194:31, 2195:7,
2211:7, 2211:43,
2212:15, 2215:30,

2234:12, 2237:44,
2250:23, 2250:28,
2256:40, 2260:41
Honour's [1] -
2164:10
hope [9] - 2182:5,
2182:12, 2184:4,
2206:31, 2230:37,
2232:8, 2232:12,
2240:37, 2260:26
hoped [2] - 2170:32,
2173:32
horizon [1] - 2240:4
hosted [1] - 2184:44
hours [2] - 2233:28,
2242:37
huge [2] - 2184:31,
2242:30
human [1] - 2230:2
hurdle [1] - 2177:38
hurdles [1] - 2159:40
hurt [1] - 2185:29

I

idea [8] - 2164:34,
2176:16, 2192:2,
2192:20, 2203:24,
2205:18, 2224:18,
2249:41
identify [1] - 2171:38
ilk [1] - 2231:33
illness [2] - 2156:33,
2239:35
imagined [1] -
2263:31
immediately [6] -
2177:14, 2178:5,
2182:28, 2243:30,
2254:24, 2257:30
impact [1] - 2240:2
impacted [1] -
2218:35
importance [1] -
2179:30
important [1] -
2249:13
impractical [1] -
2233:20
improvements [1] -
2214:35
IN [1] - 2224:38
inappropriate [2] -
2202:32, 2203:6
incident [1] - 2197:24
include [9] - 2172:25,
2174:15, 2175:30,
2194:38, 2200:7,
2205:34, 2254:11,
2254:12, 2254:32

included [7] -
2167:31, 2211:44,
2212:12, 2256:4,
2260:16, 2261:16,
2261:26
includes [3] -
2176:43, 2215:1,
2216:6
including [5] -
2177:26, 2179:43,
2181:10, 2205:4,
2254:18
inclusion [1] - 2228:5
inclusive [1] - 2204:21
income [4] - 2211:45,
2215:14, 2215:18,
2216:23
inconsistent [1] -
2175:28
inconvenience [4] -
2176:10, 2176:14,
2176:19, 2176:34
incorporated [1] -
2244:7
incorrect [1] - 2210:37
incorrectly [1] -
2212:10
increase [5] - 2205:18,
2214:3, 2214:11,
2215:47, 2248:21
increased [3] -
2183:4, 2214:23,
2214:40
increasingly [1] -
2161:22
indecent [1] - 2201:36
indeed [6] - 2165:30,
2174:47, 2180:4,
2201:14, 2263:21,
2267:34
indicate [7] - 2179:42,
2180:16, 2180:26,
2204:23, 2228:40,
2249:25, 2262:36
indicated [7] - 2162:7,
2178:13, 2185:15,
2224:25, 2230:40,
2251:1, 2263:11
indicates [1] -
2262:28
indicating [1] - 2219:5
indication [2] -
2182:43, 2227:12
individual [5] -
2183:8, 2183:28,
2184:2, 2260:17,
2265:5
individuals [9] -
2163:37, 2163:47,
2164:9, 2189:11,

2191:37, 2192:11, 2192:34, 2208:22, 2244:28

influenced [2] - 2267:21, 2269:12

inform [5] - 2190:5, 2190:7, 2200:28, 2249:26, 2249:42

informal [1] - 2188:10

informally [1] - 2239:26

information [20] - 2157:41, 2157:44, 2158:1, 2187:44, 2188:6, 2192:11, 2192:18, 2198:2, 2203:29, 2233:26, 2233:47, 2236:42, 2237:17, 2237:28, 2237:32, 2237:38, 2239:24, 2254:6, 2254:10, 2268:44

informed [5] - 2190:26, 2223:36, 2244:27, 2250:16, 2264:34

informing [3] - 2193:44, 2194:10, 2268:33

initial [3] - 2252:11, 2263:34, 2269:8

injunctive [2] - 2164:36, 2164:38

injured [1] - 2236:7

input [2] - 2208:10, 2234:9

inquiries [2] - 2220:11, 2234:26

inquiry [1] - 2244:37

Inspector [2] - 2198:3, 2198:7

instance [2] - 2244:46, 2246:3

INSTITUTIONAL [1] - 2154:12

instruct [1] - 2263:27

instructed [5] - 2176:28, 2205:14, 2206:45, 2219:40, 2244:8

instructing [1] - 2171:1

instruction [2] - 2207:4, 2220:6

instructions [20] - 2175:2, 2175:46, 2179:21, 2183:41, 2184:9, 2184:10, 2205:4, 2205:23, 2206:7, 2219:21, 2220:27, 2220:31, 2221:5, 2225:26, 2227:26, 2227:29, 2245:43, 2250:37, 2259:21, 2263:22

instrument [1] - 2251:8

insurance [3] - 2215:40, 2215:44, 2216:2

intelligence [1] - 2190:47

interacted [1] - 2232:20

interest [4] - 2194:13, 2227:42, 2237:39, 2244:46

interested [1] - 2209:43

interesting [1] - 2242:34

interfere [1] - 2196:5

interfering [1] - 2185:1

internal [3] - 2186:11, 2186:22, 2254:46

interpret [1] - 2162:12

interpretation [1] - 2181:5

intervention [1] - 2268:25

interview [1] - 2158:36

intimately [4] - 2206:14, 2206:20, 2238:42, 2238:43

INTO [1] - 2154:12

invariably [1] - 2187:43

investigate [5] - 2192:8, 2192:32, 2192:33, 2196:5, 2200:33

investigated [2] - 2198:13, 2200:4

investigating [1] - 2199:11

investigation [15] - 2187:45, 2187:47, 2188:7, 2196:6, 2196:45, 2198:8, 2198:29, 2199:5, 2199:17, 2200:3, 2200:6, 2200:15, 2200:22, 2200:26, 2240:6

investigations [1] - 2200:36

Investment [1] - 2215:31

inviting [1] - 2174:24

involve [1] - 2236:24

involved [21] - 2162:30, 2172:43, 2172:46, 2178:46, 2184:30, 2184:34, 2206:14, 2206:20, 2206:40, 2224:46, 2228:13, 2236:20, 2244:29, 2245:9, 2248:27, 2249:4, 2249:47, 2252:3, 2255:42, 2260:40, 2265:21

involvement [4] - 2250:32, 2252:6, 2253:6, 2265:20

involves [1] - 2176:4

involving [1] - 2172:42

irrespective [3] - 2169:27, 2187:15, 2203:45

issue [20] - 2160:30, 2161:10, 2167:17, 2174:43, 2177:19, 2180:17, 2180:28, 2184:39, 2185:9, 2202:12, 2203:12, 2224:45, 2234:44, 2235:22, 2235:24, 2236:7, 2259:40, 2260:44, 2265:3, 2265:25

issues [7] - 2177:25, 2197:11, 2230:20, 2234:38, 2240:44, 2244:12, 2265:46

it" [1] - 2184:11

item [11] - 2211:5, 2211:7, 2211:8, 2211:10, 2211:12, 2211:21, 2211:22, 2211:27, 2211:29, 2211:45, 2223:9

J

January [17] - 2158:28, 2196:12, 2196:35, 2197:46, 2200:19, 2200:24, 2200:33, 2201:9, 2209:35, 2225:31, 2226:13, 2226:39, 2263:10, 2263:28, 2264:30, 2265:13, 2266:8

Jeffrey [1] - 2206:47

Jennifer [1] - 2154:33

job [14] - 2164:2, 2165:11, 2165:20, 2165:21, 2173:3, 2182:22, 2197:4, 2197:5, 2200:45, 2203:35, 2233:2, 2238:11, 2246:39, 2250:12

joined [1] - 2170:14

joint [1] - 2227:28

joke [1] - 2246:43

juggle [1] - 2203:36

July [1] - 2224:45

jump [1] - 2216:13

jumped [2] - 2213:44, 2215:33

June [8] - 2171:3, 2171:4, 2208:45, 2223:23, 2223:25, 2224:29, 2227:9, 2227:23

jurisdiction [1] - 2202:42

Justice [2] - 2154:32, 2154:33

K

keen [1] - 2224:46

keep [4] - 2163:18, 2192:38, 2241:6, 2267:31

keeping [3] - 2157:26, 2163:14, 2214:24

Keith [2] - 2251:21, 2251:29

KEITH [1] - 2251:23

Ken [3] - 2218:27, 2218:37, 2219:9

ken [1] - 2218:38

kept [11] - 2165:25, 2178:47, 2185:1, 2193:7, 2232:16, 2243:27, 2244:38, 2250:16, 2250:21, 2264:34

kerosene [1] - 2162:39

key [1] - 2253:8

kilometres [1] - 2233:29

kinds [2] - 2256:4, 2257:16

Kitchingman [9] - 2201:23, 2201:35, 2201:44, 2202:3, 2202:18, 2202:24, 2202:37, 2202:43, 2203:17

Kitchingman's [2] - 2202:27, 2203:29

knowledge [11] - 2200:2, 2217:13, 2232:29, 2239:1, 2239:9, 2240:19, 2240:33, 2245:35, 2256:18, 2258:43, 2268:10

known [5] - 2170:13, 2179:25, 2202:2, 2246:9, 2266:35

L

laid [1] - 2260:47

land [10] - 2211:30, 2214:12, 2214:22, 2214:31, 2214:33, 2214:34, 2214:35, 2215:2, 2239:46, 2243:14

large [5] - 2215:31, 2217:7, 2218:38, 2222:39, 2263:18

last [8] - 2185:38, 2229:27, 2229:32, 2238:7, 2251:1, 2252:32, 2256:35, 2262:28

late [10] - 2156:45, 2182:27, 2201:39, 2202:13, 2202:16, 2231:17, 2243:39, 2256:45, 2262:32, 2262:41

Law [3] - 2167:24, 2225:13, 2247:20

law [9] - 2157:26, 2161:12, 2161:14, 2169:28, 2177:14, 2180:39, 2181:2, 2181:20, 2181:25

Lawton [2] - 2198:45, 2250:15

lawyer [9] - 2180:38, 2180:43, 2181:36, 2233:10, 2263:33, 2263:34, 2264:18

lawyers [9] - 2170:26, 2181:27, 2233:33, 2263:27, 2264:15, 2265:16, 2265:28, 2269:16, 2269:17

lay [2] - 2184:39, 2204:6

lead [1] - 2239:5

leader [1] - 2223:29

leading [2] - 2198:24, 2267:35

learning [1] - 2240:19

least [25] - 2155:12,

2158:7, 2158:43,
2169:29, 2175:12,
2179:25, 2180:7,
2180:19, 2180:30,
2186:11, 2191:11,
2194:20, 2194:21,
2195:26, 2195:33,
2195:41, 2196:44,
2199:11, 2204:2,
2214:44, 2226:2,
2236:6, 2246:45,
2249:35, 2260:27
Leave [1] - 2250:8
leave [6] - 2182:25,
2184:33, 2211:3,
2212:45, 2265:3,
2268:17
leaving [2] - 2187:31,
2242:20
led [3] - 2222:10,
2241:22, 2268:9
left [14] - 2155:5,
2182:22, 2182:30,
2188:40, 2193:37,
2203:1, 2204:19,
2240:18, 2242:5,
2242:12, 2250:4,
2268:39
legal [24] - 2159:32,
2159:39, 2163:36,
2166:16, 2167:43,
2169:10, 2169:14,
2169:35, 2170:1,
2170:2, 2170:17,
2175:25, 2176:9,
2177:21, 2182:2,
2204:41, 2205:34,
2219:45, 2225:35,
2255:26, 2265:30,
2265:32, 2265:45
legalistics [1] -
2183:33
legislation [4] -
2252:27, 2252:31,
2253:3, 2253:4
legs [1] - 2178:36
length [5] - 2243:27,
2244:38, 2250:17,
2267:19, 2267:32
lengthy [2] - 2240:42,
2241:3
letter [85] - 2155:8,
2155:25, 2155:35,
2155:40, 2158:28,
2164:29, 2164:37,
2164:39, 2167:24,
2167:25, 2171:26,
2173:26, 2173:30,
2174:9, 2174:14,
2174:15, 2174:21,
2174:22, 2174:29,
2174:45, 2175:1,
2176:4, 2176:24,
2176:29, 2177:7,
2177:43, 2185:14,
2185:23, 2185:28,
2186:34, 2189:41,
2196:3, 2197:40,
2200:14, 2207:21,
2209:34, 2219:14,
2219:18, 2224:12,
2225:16, 2225:30,
2225:34, 2226:7,
2226:13, 2226:28,
2226:38, 2226:39,
2227:27, 2227:43,
2228:10, 2229:15,
2230:15, 2230:17,
2230:25, 2230:30,
2234:24, 2234:25,
2240:42, 2248:8,
2249:3, 2249:8,
2253:41, 2253:42,
2254:15, 2256:43,
2256:44, 2257:2,
2257:3, 2257:7,
2257:8, 2257:37,
2257:38, 2257:45,
2258:2, 2258:12,
2258:14, 2258:46,
2259:2, 2259:3,
2259:6, 2263:15,
2263:21, 2263:24,
2267:8, 2268:30
letters [17] - 2189:46,
2190:34, 2191:16,
2194:4, 2194:26,
2205:38, 2229:28,
2233:44, 2238:5,
2248:31, 2248:32,
2248:34, 2248:39,
2248:41, 2248:45,
2249:11, 2249:13
Level [1] - 2154:21
level [17] - 2161:12,
2166:35, 2175:42,
2176:32, 2177:14,
2184:12, 2198:16,
2220:45, 2233:26,
2239:15, 2239:27,
2239:28, 2252:30,
2257:28, 2265:45,
2265:46
levels [2] - 2181:13,
2239:26
liabilities [1] - 2212:36
liability [18] - 2166:17,
2174:7, 2174:15,
2174:23, 2174:30,
2174:44, 2177:19,
2177:21, 2177:25,
2178:33, 2179:32,
2180:17, 2180:28,
2181:2, 2182:10,
2183:37, 2218:3,
2219:22
liable [2] - 2174:19,
2206:2
lib [1] - 2243:34
licence [1] - 2189:32
lied [1] - 2230:46
lies [1] - 2269:26
life [2] - 2226:6,
2249:45
likely [14] - 2156:7,
2157:13, 2161:31,
2173:5, 2181:46,
2208:21, 2208:23,
2223:44, 2224:8,
2231:17, 2241:2,
2241:17, 2241:19,
2241:41
limitations [3] -
2167:17, 2173:23,
2175:31
limited [1] - 2219:6
line [3] - 2185:38,
2206:6, 2255:14
liners [1] - 2237:18
linkage [1] - 2169:7
linkages [1] - 2265:44
links [1] - 2169:2
liquidated [1] -
2217:37
Lismore [6] - 2160:37,
2161:24, 2161:42,
2163:30, 2233:11,
2266:15
list [3] - 2189:4,
2197:28, 2207:28
listened [1] - 2169:18
listening [1] - 2179:33
listing [1] - 2214:24
literally [1] - 2203:27
lived [1] - 2242:40
living [2] - 2160:10,
2229:21
loan [1] - 2222:33
local [6] - 2163:25,
2163:32, 2163:34,
2186:37, 2195:34,
2266:35
locate [3] - 2171:2,
2171:35, 2208:14
located [1] - 2266:30
location [1] - 2266:24
lodged [1] - 2262:42
logistics [1] - 2248:30
look [20] - 2170:1,
2170:25, 2170:32,
2188:7, 2188:12,
2190:45, 2197:16,
2206:37, 2208:25,
2216:21, 2216:44,
2222:13, 2223:6,
2236:39, 2246:41,
2246:46, 2252:47,
2253:3, 2255:14,
2266:11
looked [11] - 2155:36,
2180:34, 2180:36,
2184:16, 2192:26,
2202:24, 2220:38,
2223:1, 2247:3,
2250:34, 2251:8
looking [13] - 2161:13,
2171:7, 2175:34,
2186:22, 2197:28,
2202:21, 2202:24,
2202:44, 2203:28,
2211:17, 2253:3,
2263:31, 2265:8
looks [3] - 2161:5,
2211:13, 2212:25
looming [1] - 2240:4
loss [7] - 2211:4,
2211:16, 2211:20,
2211:32, 2213:1,
2215:32, 2239:12
losses [1] - 2211:31
lost [5] - 2214:27,
2242:27, 2242:43,
2267:47, 2268:14
low [4] - 2187:8,
2198:16, 2233:26,
2239:27
low-level [2] -
2198:16, 2233:26
lower [2] - 2177:15,
2216:2
lucky [1] - 2232:14
lump [3] - 2206:25,
2206:26, 2227:46
lumped [1] - 2163:15
lunch [3] - 2221:14,
2222:3, 2241:13
luncheon [1] -
2221:11

M

Macquarie [3] -
2154:21, 2218:38,
2218:40
maintained [1] -
2201:46
maintaining [2] -
2177:18, 2177:21
major [2] - 2200:3,
2246:33
majority [1] - 2209:39
majorly [1] - 2252:9
male [1] - 2192:23
man [5] - 2195:33,
2197:4, 2198:36,
2236:20, 2240:15
managed [2] -
2215:45, 2232:4
management [6] -
2160:21, 2168:8,
2168:12, 2168:38,
2238:12, 2252:3
manager [1] - 2256:11
March [3] - 2187:35,
2224:13, 2226:28
March/April [1] -
2243:5
margin [4] - 2163:2,
2163:11, 2163:31,
2164:10
marginal [1] - 2163:15
mark [3] - 2190:15,
2190:17, 2224:35
MARKED [1] - 2195:4
marked [2] - 2189:23,
2191:22
MARKED-UP [1] -
2195:4
market [1] - 2215:32
markets [1] - 2215:35
Martin [1] - 2171:19
Mary [3] - 2247:12,
2247:16, 2247:19
material [18] -
2155:13, 2157:42,
2158:6, 2159:17,
2160:20, 2166:1,
2167:25, 2187:32,
2193:42, 2197:9,
2198:14, 2202:22,
2236:11, 2249:1,
2266:1, 2266:45,
2266:47, 2267:15
materialise [1] -
2170:11
Matron [1] - 2171:19
matter [39] - 2155:33,
2157:25, 2165:6,
2178:4, 2179:22,
2179:31, 2179:44,
2179:46, 2181:41,
2187:14, 2187:23,
2190:26, 2193:43,
2194:16, 2198:12,
2199:35, 2199:45,
2201:8, 2202:42,
2202:46, 2203:32,
2204:1, 2204:21,
2222:22, 2223:29,
2230:40, 2230:42,

2234:43, 2237:7,
2246:7, 2249:12,
2250:5, 2250:15,
2250:47, 2259:22,
2261:43, 2262:11,
2265:8, 2265:40

matters [93] - 2155:33,
2156:11, 2161:22,
2162:1, 2162:7,
2162:8, 2162:16,
2162:19, 2162:25,
2162:38, 2163:2,
2163:30, 2163:31,
2172:9, 2172:16,
2172:19, 2172:25,
2172:26, 2172:37,
2172:42, 2173:23,
2174:16, 2176:14,
2176:35, 2177:26,
2178:4, 2178:8,
2178:17, 2183:44,
2186:10, 2186:25,
2186:32, 2187:9,
2187:42, 2187:43,
2189:47, 2190:16,
2190:21, 2191:6,
2191:12, 2191:13,
2191:47, 2192:7,
2192:10, 2193:1,
2196:45, 2198:41,
2199:1, 2199:6,
2199:13, 2199:47,
2201:2, 2201:22,
2203:37, 2204:11,
2209:28, 2221:6,
2222:40, 2227:2,
2233:3, 2233:6,
2233:32, 2233:35,
2233:40, 2233:46,
2237:4, 2238:10,
2238:16, 2239:1,
2239:9, 2239:24,
2242:18, 2243:18,
2244:38, 2245:30,
2245:42, 2247:21,
2248:36, 2249:44,
2250:27, 2250:35,
2252:7, 2252:9,
2252:38, 2254:11,
2254:22, 2256:5,
2258:35, 2260:28,
2261:35, 2267:21,
2268:42, 2269:20

matters" [1] - 2176:11

maximum [2] -
2204:30, 2248:5

McAteer [1] - 2240:17

McClellan [1] -
2154:32

McGlinchey [5] -
2234:14, 2234:16,
2234:20, 2234:22,
2236:29

McLary [16] - 2166:20,
2166:23, 2166:27,
2166:31, 2166:46,
2167:42, 2168:22,
2171:43, 2171:47,
2173:9, 2178:13,
2236:34, 2236:47,
2237:9, 2237:17,
2237:31

McLary's [1] - 2172:27

mean [8] - 2164:17,
2164:23, 2169:33,
2180:36, 2202:29,
2230:5, 2232:44,
2257:8

means [7] - 2162:8,
2166:32, 2168:32,
2192:29, 2196:44,
2243:35, 2257:45

meant [7] - 2230:3,
2231:25, 2232:25,
2243:36, 2253:41,
2264:44, 2268:45

media [24] - 2158:19,
2158:24, 2158:46,
2159:2, 2159:5,
2159:18, 2159:23,
2159:25, 2159:29,
2160:28, 2165:43,
2171:33, 2171:34,
2195:28, 2195:34,
2195:39, 2241:21,
2243:7, 2243:8,
2243:15, 2243:17,
2243:19, 2243:22

medical [1] - 2176:9

Medicare [1] - 2228:2

meet [3] - 2169:41,
2170:45, 2223:37

meeting [30] -
2156:19, 2156:24,
2156:29, 2173:42,
2173:44, 2174:3,
2174:4, 2178:2,
2179:30, 2182:5,
2188:47, 2189:2,
2189:19, 2190:18,
2191:16, 2192:40,
2194:1, 2194:19,
2220:33, 2222:17,
2223:7, 2224:4,
2224:13, 2224:15,
2229:9, 2229:12,
2249:17, 2259:35,
2259:36, 2259:41

meetings [9] -
2156:31, 2184:24,
2222:14, 2223:22,
2229:4, 2238:24,
2245:15, 2245:37,
2265:21

member [7] - 2156:36,
2184:21, 2201:3,
2203:6, 2203:7,
2229:34, 2245:5

members [15] -
2156:17, 2160:3,
2165:12, 2168:13,
2168:38, 2169:24,
2189:29, 2196:36,
2203:39, 2222:23,
2223:36, 2233:9,
2239:16, 2245:16,
2261:1

memorandum [1] -
2261:38

memory [2] - 2240:20,
2260:24

men [1] - 2196:2

mention [3] - 2171:25,
2174:42, 2223:17

mentioned [8] -
2160:1, 2174:23,
2182:36, 2185:35,
2185:40, 2185:43,
2186:12, 2234:33

mentioning [1] -
2165:40

met [3] - 2186:38,
2194:21, 2229:10

mettle [1] - 2230:34

Michael [1] - 2193:11

mid [2] - 2171:17,
2240:14

mid-70s [1] - 2238:31

mid-year [1] - 2240:14

middle [3] - 2181:47,
2184:18, 2239:42

might [31] - 2162:1,
2163:11, 2163:31,
2176:23, 2178:44,
2179:5, 2179:35,
2181:17, 2184:38,
2187:44, 2191:15,
2192:14, 2195:34,
2203:40, 2203:43,
2209:27, 2211:13,
2214:14, 2217:24,
2218:41, 2222:43,
2239:39, 2244:36,
2246:10, 2248:35,
2248:37, 2256:4,
2263:18, 2269:1,
2269:30

million [30] - 2204:20,
2210:29, 2213:15,
2213:20, 2213:44,
2214:23, 2214:33,
2214:40, 2214:41,
2214:45, 2215:20,
2215:27, 2215:28,
2215:37, 2216:17,
2216:22, 2216:40,
2217:20, 2218:15,
2218:16, 2218:24,
2218:40, 2218:42,
2247:30

mind [19] - 2162:37,
2163:36, 2169:27,
2169:33, 2169:38,
2181:41, 2183:35,
2183:36, 2192:41,
2197:21, 2204:41,
2206:37, 2218:46,
2233:36, 2237:5,
2242:44, 2247:40,
2252:26, 2265:29

minded [1] - 2242:28

mindful [1] - 2164:11

minds [1] - 2161:10

mine [2] - 2246:36,
2246:38

minimise [1] - 2206:7

minor [3] - 2201:25,
2246:30, 2250:47

minutes [9] - 2204:23,
2221:9, 2222:38,
2223:25, 2224:28,
2249:17, 2249:37,
2249:42, 2259:42

MINUTES [1] -
2224:38

misleading [1] -
2163:12

misquoted [1] -
2243:32

missed [2] - 2174:18,
2185:30

mmm-hmm [3] -
2255:23, 2263:46,
2267:6

model [3] - 2252:22,
2252:24, 2252:33

modest [3] - 2176:10,
2176:16, 2176:30

moment [12] -
2155:38, 2158:5,
2173:31, 2182:12,
2185:15, 2186:2,
2187:19, 2198:20,
2203:11, 2208:24,
2227:3, 2265:4

moments [1] -
2182:21

Monday [1] - 2154:27

monetary [1] -
2181:14

money [28] - 2164:1,
2165:8, 2165:13,
2170:44, 2183:12,
2183:22, 2183:25,
2184:13, 2184:30,
2184:34, 2185:4,
2185:5, 2205:40,
2206:3, 2206:4,
2208:26, 2209:44,
2210:44, 2214:10,
2215:34, 2216:28,
2216:30, 2239:27,
2239:43, 2239:45,
2240:2, 2240:3,
2248:1

moneys [1] - 2240:7

month [2] - 2184:13,
2222:22

months [5] - 2180:9,
2231:16, 2240:1,
2262:16, 2266:34

moral [3] - 2255:18,
2255:30, 2255:35

Morgan [8] - 2185:16,
2185:31, 2186:4,
2189:25, 2193:20,
2195:45, 2198:33,
2198:34

morning [6] - 2195:9,
2237:1, 2238:7,
2240:40, 2248:13,
2269:31

most [5] - 2164:23,
2184:42, 2213:6,
2239:16, 2243:33

motion [2] - 2204:30,
2205:38

motions [2] - 2245:20,
2252:25

move [3] - 2174:33,
2188:18, 2241:21

moved [2] - 2190:31,
2245:41

moving [2] - 2252:9,
2260:12

Mr" [1] - 2238:7

multiple [1] - 2189:12

must [6] - 2169:29,
2183:8, 2216:28,
2226:8, 2252:35,
2268:13

N

name [10] - 2189:6,
2195:33, 2196:31,
2202:31, 2202:32,
2203:29, 2222:5,
2236:33, 2251:28,
2253:15

named [5] - 2160:10, 2191:37, 2192:17, 2193:38, 2194:14
namely [2] - 2219:41, 2226:29
names [1] - 2191:41
national [4] - 2184:38, 2184:42, 2185:6, 2252:29
nature [4] - 2179:3, 2197:2, 2240:8, 2246:6
necessarily [1] - 2255:25
necessary [1] - 2169:7
need [9] - 2191:6, 2203:21, 2243:27, 2249:22, 2251:34, 2254:46, 2256:21, 2267:17, 2269:4
needed [5] - 2157:33, 2231:28, 2233:38, 2233:40, 2269:17
needing [1] - 2217:14
needs [2] - 2183:39, 2231:37
negatives [1] - 2214:14
negotiating [3] - 2179:8, 2179:31, 2179:44
negotiation [2] - 2174:16, 2206:25
negotiations [21] - 2166:47, 2173:42, 2177:27, 2177:44, 2178:10, 2178:19, 2178:24, 2178:42, 2178:45, 2179:5, 2204:18, 2204:33, 2219:13, 2220:2, 2220:17, 2223:12, 2239:37, 2249:6, 2262:10, 2262:37, 2265:14
net [5] - 2210:24, 2210:28, 2210:43, 2211:10, 2211:20
never [23] - 2158:13, 2160:2, 2163:34, 2164:26, 2168:23, 2168:26, 2169:8, 2179:37, 2183:36, 2197:24, 2200:44, 2215:44, 2219:37, 2231:26, 2231:46, 2234:46, 2235:18, 2239:17, 2243:35, 2245:11, 2245:39, 2246:13, 2251:9
nevertheless [1] - 2181:28
New [1] - 2225:36
new [10] - 2214:24, 2226:29, 2226:45, 2239:15, 2239:19, 2253:3, 2263:37, 2263:42, 2264:6, 2265:21
Newcastle [13] - 2186:43, 2187:16, 2190:26, 2190:31, 2198:13, 2199:8, 2200:36, 2202:34, 2202:35, 2202:36, 2203:1, 2203:31, 2233:21
newspapers [1] - 2159:15
next [20] - 2171:11, 2171:13, 2174:29, 2183:24, 2186:40, 2191:35, 2191:38, 2193:25, 2195:22, 2197:43, 2204:25, 2214:9, 2222:46, 2223:4, 2223:6, 2238:32, 2242:40, 2254:25, 2256:23
Nicol [2] - 2208:24, 2209:34
night [1] - 2252:32
nine [2] - 2237:8, 2266:34
nits [1] - 2162:40
no [1] - 2187:5
no-one [4] - 2204:16, 2209:31, 2231:23, 2244:15
no-one's [1] - 2217:28
non [5] - 2191:28, 2212:36, 2212:41, 2267:23, 2268:24
non-adherence [1] - 2268:24
non-current [2] - 2212:36, 2212:41
non-publication [1] - 2191:28
non-responses [1] - 2267:23
none [3] - 2198:5, 2242:11, 2247:41
nonetheless [1] - 2192:6
nonplussed [1] - 2225:45
NOR [1] - 2196:25
normal [2] - 2156:21, 2253:2
normally [5] - 2156:5, 2176:36, 2243:30, 2245:31, 2245:33
NORTH [1] - 2210:14
North [17] - 2166:27, 2197:8, 2201:29, 2210:7, 2217:4, 2217:26, 2217:44, 2220:23, 2223:9, 2223:26, 2225:20, 2259:1, 2259:13, 2266:4, 2266:29, 2266:36, 2266:40
Northern [6] - 2158:37, 2158:45, 2159:17, 2241:23, 2241:24, 2243:29
nos [1] - 2245:27
Note [1] - 2214:21
note [17] - 2166:38, 2167:23, 2175:16, 2175:44, 2187:1, 2187:6, 2187:9, 2197:40, 2206:44, 2211:24, 2211:43, 2212:37, 2212:43, 2213:23, 2213:28, 2214:29, 2268:32
noted [1] - 2190:30
notes [2] - 2156:26, 2206:9
nothing [12] - 2169:43, 2175:26, 2182:31, 2202:5, 2202:7, 2204:7, 2235:4, 2235:10, 2235:15, 2235:19, 2242:6, 2250:23
notice [4] - 2179:7, 2179:11, 2219:1, 2225:47
noticed [4] - 2172:29, 2176:34, 2183:7, 2185:31
notification [1] - 2263:8
notoriety [2] - 2198:12, 2243:15
notwithstanding [3] - 2180:16, 2180:27, 2244:32
NOVEMBER [1] - 2269:33
November [17] - 2154:27, 2156:24, 2166:19, 2166:23, 2167:5, 2173:10, 2188:47, 2194:20, 2231:10, 2232:37, 2232:38, 2240:14, 2249:18, 2252:15, 2259:41, 2259:44, 2261:29
NSW [2] - 2198:3, 2200:28
number [34] - 2158:44, 2160:1, 2165:34, 2165:41, 2167:8, 2169:5, 2172:16, 2173:18, 2182:20, 2187:20, 2189:10, 2190:34, 2191:35, 2192:14, 2192:17, 2192:24, 2193:25, 2195:18, 2195:19, 2195:34, 2201:24, 2205:28, 2206:1, 2206:9, 2210:5, 2213:5, 2213:38, 2217:3, 2237:2, 2244:20, 2254:28, 2263:11, 2267:9, 2268:46
Number [1] - 2213:28
numbers [1] - 2227:31
numerous [1] - 2254:11

O

O'Neill [1] - 2171:15
oath [1] - 2155:1
obligation [11] - 2157:47, 2168:12, 2169:41, 2170:15, 2170:24, 2170:26, 2170:38, 2170:45, 2179:41, 2179:45, 2180:47
obligations [2] - 2170:33, 2201:44
observer [1] - 2230:14
obtained [1] - 2255:16
obviously [6] - 2160:42, 2222:21, 2252:35, 2257:27, 2260:23, 2260:32
occasion [6] - 2180:15, 2180:26, 2186:38, 2223:44, 2248:16, 2248:35
occasionally [1] - 2225:7
occasions [1] - 2169:5
occupation [1] - 2251:28
occur [4] - 2160:44, 2170:9, 2192:4, 2209:14
occurred [15] - 2163:34, 2179:37, 2180:17, 2180:28, 2192:9, 2197:46, 2201:29, 2205:9, 2220:34, 2232:23, 2247:15, 2255:31, 2255:36, 2259:13, 2265:43
occurring [4] - 2190:41, 2203:37, 2223:47, 2264:15
occurs [2] - 2187:21, 2200:47
October [10] - 2167:24, 2186:34, 2225:12, 2225:16, 2225:19, 2226:4, 2226:38, 2234:25, 2252:25, 2261:29
odd [1] - 2183:11
OF [6] - 2195:4, 2195:5, 2210:15, 2224:38
offence [1] - 2236:15
offer [12] - 2183:4, 2205:18, 2205:23, 2206:45, 2208:23, 2219:23, 2227:16, 2229:12, 2244:47, 2247:28, 2248:21, 2248:27
offered [9] - 2183:16, 2204:20, 2219:36, 2227:37, 2257:30, 2257:34, 2258:3, 2258:20
offering [1] - 2258:24
offers [8] - 2205:4, 2205:28, 2205:44, 2206:15, 2247:23, 2247:43, 2247:45, 2248:17
office [8] - 2156:4, 2157:29, 2157:32, 2184:44, 2203:31, 2246:43, 2248:39, 2250:40
officer [6] - 2186:37, 2186:45, 2187:37, 2188:11, 2189:14, 2191:23
offices [2] - 2251:32, 2251:40
often [3] - 2239:28, 2246:40, 2267:22
old [2] - 2192:6, 2203:28
older [1] - 2192:23
once [6] - 2161:4,

2185:29, 2187:32,
2197:3, 2241:27,
2244:20
one [93] - 2155:33,
2161:20, 2162:19,
2162:38, 2165:6,
2166:10, 2170:24,
2171:30, 2173:20,
2174:7, 2174:16,
2174:36, 2175:16,
2175:24, 2177:15,
2177:21, 2177:25,
2177:37, 2178:4,
2178:21, 2184:1,
2184:28, 2185:43,
2186:11, 2186:20,
2186:21, 2187:10,
2187:23, 2189:28,
2191:27, 2193:25,
2194:3, 2194:22,
2197:6, 2197:15,
2197:23, 2197:29,
2199:11, 2199:35,
2200:3, 2201:44,
2203:34, 2204:16,
2205:5, 2205:43,
2205:44, 2208:31,
2209:31, 2212:28,
2213:4, 2214:10,
2215:1, 2215:42,
2216:5, 2219:23,
2219:35, 2219:37,
2223:4, 2223:6,
2224:5, 2224:9,
2224:35, 2225:47,
2226:7, 2226:28,
2227:33, 2229:27,
2231:23, 2232:12,
2233:8, 2233:21,
2233:24, 2234:29,
2237:18, 2239:26,
2240:11, 2240:36,
2241:39, 2243:44,
2244:15, 2248:16,
2248:47, 2250:47,
2251:46, 2257:38,
2262:21, 2263:29,
2265:3
one's [1] - 2217:28
one-liners [1] -
2237:18
one-off [1] - 2219:23
ones [7] - 2164:10,
2164:11, 2222:42,
2237:22, 2248:12,
2248:13, 2248:36
ongoing [3] - 2199:13,
2200:3, 2269:8
onus [1] - 2204:15
open [5] - 2165:41,
2175:35, 2178:9,
2178:14, 2178:17
open-endedness [1] -
2175:35
opened [2] - 2182:9,
2257:46
operate [2] - 2168:3,
2182:17
operating [1] -
2231:11
operation [1] - 2262:1
opinion [10] -
2238:47, 2239:4,
2239:32, 2265:42,
2267:34, 2267:42,
2268:3, 2268:19,
2268:37
opinions [1] - 2239:34
opportunities [1] -
2267:20
opportunity [2] -
2181:33, 2209:38
opposed [3] -
2186:15, 2215:27,
2258:36
opposing [1] - 2172:1
option [1] - 2247:19
options [2] - 2176:3,
2222:25
ordained [4] -
2168:18, 2169:24,
2251:34, 2251:37
order [7] - 2191:28,
2191:31, 2191:32,
2211:31, 2231:28,
2234:7, 2242:32
orders [4] - 2189:8,
2238:6, 2251:2,
2251:3
ordinance [22] -
2157:36, 2160:15,
2201:45, 2231:14,
2231:15, 2231:25,
2231:37, 2232:32,
2234:2, 2241:5,
2245:32, 2252:22,
2252:24, 2252:33,
2253:31, 2254:6,
2254:11, 2259:26,
2265:27, 2267:28,
2268:21
Ordinance [6] -
2199:32, 2252:18,
2253:7, 2253:9,
2254:2, 2254:19
ordinand [1] - 2238:32
organisation [1] -
2169:1
origin [1] - 2206:25
original [1] - 2155:40
originally [3] - 2169:3,
2232:17, 2257:3
otherwise [1] -
2245:36
ourselves [1] -
2232:29
outcome [1] - 2170:35
outcomes [1] -
2232:33
outside [4] - 2238:6,
2242:38, 2262:2,
2262:4
overreach [1] -
2239:10
oversight [1] -
2267:31
overwhelming [1] -
2209:38
owe [1] - 2170:33
own [11] - 2161:15,
2181:10, 2183:36,
2187:45, 2195:39,
2204:43, 2208:9,
2211:38, 2228:23,
2249:44, 2251:4
owned [3] - 2167:46,
2168:23, 2168:26
owner [2] - 2169:4
owners [1] - 2168:29

P

package [11] -
2259:31, 2259:47,
2260:7, 2260:13,
2261:8, 2261:16,
2262:1, 2262:8,
2263:37, 2263:38,
2263:44
page [52] - 2155:22,
2155:25, 2163:43,
2174:23, 2174:29,
2174:33, 2175:9,
2175:10, 2189:19,
2189:24, 2190:3,
2190:30, 2191:35,
2195:18, 2196:8,
2204:25, 2208:6,
2210:23, 2210:24,
2210:32, 2210:36,
2210:42, 2211:3,
2211:43, 2212:1,
2212:3, 2212:43,
2213:1, 2213:14,
2213:24, 2213:26,
2214:17, 2215:19,
2215:26, 2216:14,
2216:44, 2218:17,
2218:19, 2218:22,
2219:33, 2222:16,
2223:8, 2223:9,
2223:24, 2223:25,
2254:25, 2255:47,
2256:5, 2260:6,
2261:41, 2261:42
pages [2] - 2155:9,
2266:47
paid [4] - 2213:6,
2216:31, 2216:32,
2220:29
pains [1] - 2160:29
panel [2] - 2262:4,
2262:5
papers [1] - 2213:36
paragraph [16] -
2159:30, 2159:43,
2163:42, 2171:12,
2175:20, 2185:38,
2208:35, 2220:9,
2226:12, 2229:27,
2229:32, 2229:46,
2230:11, 2261:42,
2262:3, 2262:28
paragraphs [3] -
2237:13, 2237:16,
2237:18
paraphrase [1] -
2241:3
parish [8] - 2215:36,
2215:37, 2215:40,
2215:41, 2218:40,
2238:32, 2239:10,
2251:44
parishes [3] - 2216:7,
2216:31, 2239:14
parsimonious [1] -
2217:25
part [20] - 2175:12,
2176:38, 2177:26,
2178:32, 2178:38,
2199:13, 2207:12,
2232:12, 2232:17,
2238:15, 2238:32,
2243:4, 2243:26,
2244:5, 2246:39,
2252:13, 2255:5,
2260:19, 2264:41,
2264:42
participate [1] -
2174:25
particular [34] -
2156:19, 2157:14,
2157:43, 2158:14,
2164:31, 2164:37,
2173:8, 2175:46,
2179:22, 2183:29,
2188:36, 2191:28,
2192:43, 2199:45,
2200:15, 2200:42,
2201:2, 2203:12,
2204:21, 2208:13,
2209:9, 2227:27,
2230:17, 2230:25,
2230:30, 2233:44,
2235:24, 2246:7,
2252:21, 2258:9,
2259:22, 2261:17,
2261:25, 2262:46
particularly [9] -
2157:37, 2162:38,
2175:20, 2177:13,
2179:43, 2223:23,
2230:10, 2256:35,
2267:35
particulars [1] -
2248:10
parties [5] - 2174:17,
2179:43, 2182:34,
2187:46, 2242:41
partly [1] - 2222:32
partner [1] - 2199:12
partnership [1] -
2242:18
parts [1] - 2195:14
party [2] - 2178:42,
2183:5
pass [1] - 2189:5
passage [1] - 2208:13
passed [6] - 2220:11,
2231:37, 2245:20,
2252:25, 2252:27,
2260:33
passing [1] - 2237:34
past [6] - 2176:9,
2216:29, 2228:33,
2239:20, 2239:47,
2243:16
pastoral [6] - 2161:12,
2174:25, 2176:5,
2209:41, 2226:30,
2254:40
pastorally [3] -
2220:16, 2220:26,
2248:11
Pat [2] - 2189:37,
2190:5
PATRICK [1] - 2155:1
Patrick [1] - 2196:31
patrickc@nor.com.
au [2] - 2196:23,
2196:27
pay [4] - 2183:40,
2220:40, 2255:19,
2255:26
paying [1] - 2206:3
payment [7] -
2176:10, 2176:17,
2176:31, 2213:4,
2213:32, 2219:23,
2228:2

payments [2] - 2206:7, 2213:5
penny [1] - 2206:46
Penny [1] - 2207:1
penultimate [1] - 2163:42
people [48] - 2160:1, 2160:29, 2160:37, 2160:46, 2161:34, 2161:40, 2163:17, 2163:31, 2165:8, 2165:19, 2168:18, 2168:42, 2169:30, 2169:37, 2170:4, 2170:9, 2170:15, 2170:28, 2170:39, 2181:30, 2181:39, 2182:20, 2184:45, 2185:1, 2191:12, 2191:42, 2192:17, 2194:14, 2195:26, 2195:27, 2195:32, 2197:24, 2197:29, 2206:1, 2208:15, 2217:3, 2217:9, 2220:42, 2223:34, 2223:46, 2224:3, 2226:44, 2234:29, 2240:24, 2246:11, 2246:43, 2263:12, 2268:46
per [3] - 2183:5, 2245:25
perceive [1] - 2161:44
perform [1] - 2242:38
performance [1] - 2242:10
perhaps [17] - 2156:31, 2157:28, 2160:44, 2163:10, 2188:34, 2189:8, 2191:7, 2199:40, 2202:44, 2214:29, 2228:26, 2233:8, 2239:44, 2240:10, 2240:18, 2253:15, 2260:7
period [25] - 2165:32, 2165:33, 2171:15, 2184:43, 2199:45, 2217:45, 2218:36, 2228:41, 2229:5, 2232:15, 2232:17, 2232:25, 2232:30, 2235:13, 2238:41, 2240:31, 2264:16, 2265:13, 2266:3, 2266:6, 2266:14, 2266:34, 2267:40, 2267:42
perpetrator [2] - 2192:29, 2192:31
perpetrators [3] - 2160:2, 2160:11, 2188:40
perplexed [1] - 2155:36
Person [1] - 2255:16
person [20] - 2165:28, 2165:32, 2165:41, 2178:41, 2186:22, 2193:21, 2194:22, 2195:37, 2195:38, 2232:15, 2233:8, 2235:41, 2236:14, 2238:19, 2254:36, 2254:40, 2255:9, 2262:31, 2262:33, 2264:6
personal [6] - 2166:32, 2200:4, 2207:33, 2226:6, 2247:12, 2249:44
personalities [1] - 2247:6
persons [2] - 2220:23, 2220:30
Peter [4] - 2154:32, 2189:28, 2268:32
PG-13 [1] - 2257:37
PG-18 [2] - 2185:33, 2257:44
PG-20 [1] - 2259:1
PG-35 [1] - 2189:17
PG-36 [2] - 2190:34, 2194:4
PG-37 [1] - 2194:4
PG-38 [1] - 2194:4
PG-39 [2] - 2191:5, 2196:8
Philip [6] - 2189:41, 2190:25, 2190:35, 2190:46, 2191:11, 2191:15
phone [5] - 2189:14, 2197:41, 2200:25, 2233:38, 2248:16
phoned [7] - 2197:3, 2197:15, 2197:38, 2202:35, 2203:31
phrase [4] - 2161:41, 2162:8, 2162:24, 2209:4
physical [6] - 2162:20, 2163:7, 2186:3, 2186:15, 2186:24, 2225:21
physically [1] - 2209:31
pick [1] - 2213:23
picked [3] - 2186:20, 2232:29, 2252:30
piece [6] - 2201:6, 2202:13, 2202:16, 2214:12, 2215:29, 2243:14
pieces [1] - 2243:19
Place [1] - 2154:22
place [14] - 2161:35, 2178:25, 2186:26, 2198:41, 2202:41, 2211:37, 2229:21, 2233:24, 2239:37, 2240:1, 2252:10, 2253:4, 2268:35
plain [1] - 2169:17
plan [1] - 2263:7
Plant [5] - 2214:21, 2214:26, 2214:30, 2218:22, 2219:1
playing [1] - 2163:25
plead [1] - 2230:38
plenty [1] - 2242:40
plural [1] - 2185:40
plus [2] - 2192:24, 2211:28
point [14] - 2167:14, 2174:18, 2181:17, 2184:46, 2230:36, 2232:22, 2242:20, 2257:10, 2257:28, 2257:46, 2257:47, 2263:40, 2266:42, 2268:40
pointed [1] - 2212:32
points [7] - 2167:8, 2173:20, 2236:39, 2237:8, 2244:1, 2244:6, 2250:14
police [51] - 2185:10, 2186:36, 2187:15, 2187:31, 2187:42, 2187:47, 2188:5, 2188:45, 2189:13, 2189:14, 2189:40, 2189:46, 2189:47, 2190:47, 2191:12, 2191:14, 2191:42, 2191:43, 2192:1, 2192:7, 2192:18, 2192:27, 2192:30, 2192:37, 2193:11, 2193:37, 2193:42, 2194:5, 2194:16, 2194:21, 2194:28, 2195:42, 2196:6, 2196:43, 2197:33, 2198:28, 2199:4, 2199:10, 2199:17, 2199:44, 2200:3, 2200:6, 2200:14, 2200:32, 2200:35, 2233:41, 2233:46, 2249:27, 2254:32, 2265:1, 2265:3
Police [2] - 2198:3, 2200:28
policies [1] - 2252:10
policy [1] - 2226:45
politics [4] - 2163:26, 2163:33, 2163:35
pool [1] - 2185:6
poor [4] - 2215:7, 2219:6, 2219:7, 2239:40
poorly [1] - 2179:5
Port [2] - 2218:38, 2218:40
portion [1] - 2251:45
portions [1] - 2185:14
posed [1] - 2230:16
position [29] - 2167:4, 2169:28, 2170:1, 2170:2, 2170:16, 2171:47, 2174:5, 2175:31, 2177:18, 2177:21, 2180:38, 2180:40, 2180:44, 2181:25, 2192:36, 2201:34, 2209:15, 2210:1, 2211:11, 2215:5, 2215:9, 2225:34, 2225:37, 2226:27, 2234:45, 2235:6, 2253:20, 2265:35, 2267:22
possession [4] - 2157:42, 2187:44, 2192:16, 2192:47
possibility [3] - 2226:34, 2261:17, 2263:18
possible [6] - 2156:27, 2156:30, 2162:11, 2162:25, 2208:21, 2247:15
potential [7] - 2163:46, 2196:5, 2217:6, 2218:2, 2222:24, 2269:5, 2269:7
potentially [4] - 2183:22, 2203:18, 2243:32, 2262:8
power [1] - 2199:31
powerful [1] - 2161:14
powers [1] - 2190:16
practical [1] - 2169:16
practice [9] - 2156:21, 2162:2, 2162:28, 2162:29, 2162:37, 2162:41, 2214:4, 2249:35, 2253:2
prayers [1] - 2246:41
pre [1] - 2224:13
pre-dates [1] - 2224:13
precisely [3] - 2158:10, 2165:33, 2197:22
predecessor [1] - 2204:7
prejudice [2] - 2174:24, 2174:45
preparation [1] - 2240:41
prepared [9] - 2155:17, 2155:22, 2155:30, 2167:26, 2172:16, 2181:28, 2238:23, 2246:34, 2262:33
presence [1] - 2179:29
present [4] - 2156:25, 2222:18, 2224:15, 2249:18
presented [1] - 2228:44
presiding [1] - 2260:6
press [9] - 2158:31, 2160:45, 2164:31, 2165:7, 2165:24, 2165:37, 2165:39, 2165:47, 2262:40
pressure [6] - 2158:24, 2177:37, 2178:20, 2205:19, 2262:46, 2263:1
presume [11] - 2189:28, 2189:37, 2192:29, 2193:29, 2196:43, 2223:31, 2253:45, 2254:5, 2259:9, 2266:14, 2266:24
pretty [7] - 2182:9, 2185:2, 2215:4, 2232:14, 2242:46, 2260:38, 2268:7
previous [5] - 2190:30, 2216:3, 2216:47, 2224:4, 2228:15
previously [5] - 2173:21, 2215:39, 2216:6, 2216:26, 2225:35
priest [5] - 2204:14, 2233:4, 2239:11,

2250:16
priests [7] - 2170:33,
 2191:19, 2198:16,
 2199:8, 2199:11,
 2200:4, 2232:2
primary [3] - 2201:10,
 2202:42, 2265:14
primate [4] - 2166:22,
 2166:26, 2175:12,
 2268:24
primate's [1] - 2175:1
prime [1] - 2242:29
principle [1] - 2175:38
principles [5] -
 2173:31, 2175:9,
 2175:10, 2175:24,
 2268:27
private [4] - 2178:46,
 2178:47, 2214:7,
 2260:20
proactive [1] -
 2252:28
problem [3] - 2184:34,
 2202:16, 2244:29
problems [2] -
 2181:27, 2237:35
procedure [2] -
 2243:28, 2245:5
procedures [2] -
 2252:10, 2260:27
proceed [2] - 2225:11,
 2226:22
proceedings [15] -
 2164:37, 2164:38,
 2177:34, 2182:44,
 2184:5, 2199:21,
 2199:25, 2199:32,
 2200:32, 2202:32,
 2203:47, 2206:32,
 2219:45, 2231:8,
 2231:26
process [19] -
 2158:13, 2174:37,
 2183:47, 2184:5,
 2196:2, 2201:1,
 2206:25, 2206:33,
 2256:8, 2256:43,
 2258:28, 2260:33,
 2260:39, 2261:31,
 2261:47, 2262:2,
 2262:21, 2263:42,
 2264:34
processes [6] -
 2175:17, 2175:25,
 2181:9, 2185:10,
 2187:45, 2260:47
processing [2] -
 2155:45, 2249:5
produced [1] -
 2240:41

Professional [9] -
 2199:31, 2213:2,
 2213:24, 2213:26,
 2252:18, 2253:7,
 2253:8, 2254:1,
 2254:19
professional [73] -
 2156:6, 2156:12,
 2156:17, 2156:24,
 2156:26, 2156:28,
 2156:32, 2156:36,
 2157:30, 2157:33,
 2158:1, 2158:6,
 2158:12, 2166:20,
 2188:46, 2189:29,
 2191:17, 2192:39,
 2192:45, 2193:8,
 2193:12, 2203:19,
 2203:33, 2216:46,
 2231:11, 2231:19,
 2231:32, 2231:44,
 2232:9, 2233:27,
 2237:40, 2249:17,
 2252:7, 2253:9,
 2253:10, 2253:11,
 2253:15, 2253:23,
 2253:32, 2253:38,
 2253:42, 2253:47,
 2254:7, 2254:17,
 2254:26, 2254:27,
 2254:44, 2254:45,
 2255:6, 2255:10,
 2255:42, 2255:44,
 2256:9, 2257:18,
 2257:20, 2257:27,
 2258:30, 2259:24,
 2259:35, 2260:6,
 2261:35, 2262:12,
 2262:15, 2262:25,
 2263:44, 2264:1,
 2264:2, 2264:33,
 2264:37, 2264:45,
 2265:10, 2265:19,
 2265:20
profit [5] - 2211:4,
 2211:16, 2211:32,
 2213:1, 2239:11
program [5] - 2260:25,
 2261:19, 2261:23,
 2261:25, 2262:4
progress [1] - 2186:10
progressing [1] -
 2244:34
prominent [1] -
 2165:43
promote [1] - 2268:36
proper [4] - 2181:41,
 2217:43, 2226:20,
 2226:21
properly [5] - 2170:9,

2184:41, 2192:7,
 2218:2, 2269:21
property [4] - 2167:46,
 2214:8, 2214:44,
 2218:22
Property [6] - 2168:5,
 2214:21, 2214:29,
 2217:39, 2218:28,
 2219:1
proposal [3] -
 2259:30, 2259:40,
 2263:44
propose [1] - 2200:28
proposed [4] -
 2226:19, 2248:6,
 2248:7, 2257:13
proposing [1] -
 2255:43
proposition [3] -
 2217:33, 2240:23,
 2246:28
propositions [1] -
 2184:28
prosecute [2] -
 2202:42, 2203:14
prosecuted [1] -
 2173:44
prosecution [1] -
 2172:2
prospect [2] -
 2260:17, 2262:41
prospective [1] -
 2268:45
prospects [1] -
 2176:46
protect [1] - 2175:34
protocol [24] -
 2183:47, 2231:25,
 2231:38, 2232:33,
 2250:14, 2252:38,
 2252:43, 2252:44,
 2253:1, 2253:34,
 2254:22, 2256:19,
 2258:28, 2259:27,
 2264:39, 2265:27,
 2267:18, 2267:36,
 2267:43, 2268:3,
 2268:20, 2268:34,
 2268:41, 2269:22
proved [2] - 2232:16,
 2233:40
provide [17] - 2156:2,
 2156:11, 2156:28,
 2157:13, 2158:1,
 2177:39, 2180:19,
 2180:29, 2181:13,
 2181:29, 2187:32,
 2188:5, 2192:18,
 2205:45, 2232:21,
 2241:11, 2257:13

provided [27] -
 2155:14, 2155:26,
 2155:44, 2157:19,
 2157:42, 2158:6,
 2174:22, 2176:3,
 2181:3, 2182:11,
 2189:41, 2194:6,
 2205:36, 2206:15,
 2208:15, 2217:8,
 2227:16, 2227:26,
 2236:41, 2237:17,
 2237:28, 2241:1,
 2258:8, 2261:7,
 2266:2, 2266:46,
 2267:8
providing [7] -
 2157:10, 2179:21,
 2253:22, 2258:18,
 2261:23, 2263:22,
 2267:4
provision [7] -
 2212:44, 2217:4,
 2217:40, 2231:31,
 2231:41, 2233:26,
 2254:40
provisioned [3] -
 2217:8, 2217:47,
 2218:2
provisioning [2] -
 2216:44, 2217:43
Provisions [2] -
 2212:36, 2213:28
provisions [5] -
 2212:44, 2213:23,
 2216:45, 2217:11,
 2217:14
proximity [1] -
 2250:43
PSC [9] - 2189:15,
 2189:17, 2190:25,
 2194:20, 2258:38,
 2264:40, 2264:42,
 2264:44, 2265:7
pseudonyms [2] -
 2189:5, 2197:28
psychological [4] -
 2162:20, 2186:3,
 2186:15, 2225:22
Public [1] - 2154:17
public [3] - 2203:40,
 2207:36, 2214:6
publication [1] -
 2191:28
published [1] -
 2241:23
pull [1] - 2217:16
purport [1] - 2173:36
purporting [1] -
 2209:17
purpose [1] - 2253:46

purposes [1] -
 2174:36
pursue [10] - 2191:19,
 2198:44, 2199:4,
 2199:40, 2199:47,
 2200:32, 2202:3,
 2203:12, 2204:12,
 2242:22
pursued [3] - 2198:37,
 2204:11, 2204:13
pursuing [1] - 2203:44
pushing [1] - 2191:19
put [57] - 2159:25,
 2164:8, 2167:38,
 2168:47, 2169:1,
 2169:35, 2170:24,
 2171:33, 2171:47,
 2175:33, 2175:46,
 2176:32, 2178:4,
 2178:20, 2179:45,
 2181:21, 2183:43,
 2184:28, 2184:41,
 2187:13, 2187:18,
 2188:11, 2195:37,
 2201:14, 2201:40,
 2202:13, 2203:32,
 2204:15, 2205:15,
 2206:45, 2207:4,
 2208:9, 2209:23,
 2211:40, 2214:10,
 2214:11, 2216:25,
 2224:23, 2225:46,
 2225:47, 2226:28,
 2230:16, 2230:34,
 2232:47, 2234:7,
 2235:9, 2235:17,
 2236:14, 2241:46,
 2242:4, 2242:33,
 2244:47, 2245:2,
 2245:19, 2245:20,
 2248:8, 2248:16
putting [5] - 2169:19,
 2177:25, 2182:8,
 2192:36, 2252:10
puzzled [1] - 2234:1

Q

qualification [2] -
 2230:15, 2230:24
qualifications [1] -
 2254:24
quantum [4] - 2174:7,
 2178:34, 2182:11,
 2218:43
queried [1] - 2168:34
questioning [4] -
 2177:18, 2183:24,
 2184:19, 2190:47
questions [15] -

2155:6, 2159:33,
2178:33, 2178:34,
2185:9, 2217:28,
2231:3, 2231:9,
2234:14, 2234:16,
2237:40, 2238:9,
2245:4, 2251:12,
2261:24
quick [1] - 2246:46
quickly [4] - 2174:33,
2214:29, 2215:13,
2239:43
quietly [1] - 2250:16
quite [11] - 2158:23,
2177:30, 2178:9,
2192:6, 2196:19,
2219:37, 2232:5,
2239:26, 2241:19,
2264:38, 2267:22
quote [1] - 2161:15
quotes [1] - 2158:44

R

raft [1] - 2252:24
rag [1] - 2209:7
raise [5] - 2169:27,
2187:41, 2202:12,
2265:25, 2269:4
raised [20] - 2160:41,
2161:11, 2163:45,
2167:17, 2173:21,
2173:23, 2193:47,
2194:13, 2197:24,
2197:25, 2215:29,
2215:30, 2217:28,
2220:45, 2220:46,
2242:42, 2244:2,
2244:11, 2265:40
ramp [8] - 2236:3,
2236:8, 2236:14,
2236:16, 2236:18,
2236:22, 2236:24,
2236:26
ramped [1] - 2240:33
rang [1] - 2262:31
range [2] - 2163:17,
2245:12
rapists [1] - 2194:14
rarely [1] - 2243:34
ratcheted [1] -
2175:41
rather [14] - 2159:18,
2172:10, 2183:39,
2219:7, 2224:18,
2235:18, 2236:9,
2238:12, 2240:42,
2241:3, 2242:34,
2247:4, 2258:30,
2260:29

RC-90 [1] - 2227:15
RC-91 [1] - 2228:9
RC-93 [1] - 2228:35
reaching [1] - 2182:12
read [17] - 2155:12,
2155:15, 2155:32,
2157:37, 2158:40,
2166:43, 2175:6,
2178:29, 2185:28,
2185:29, 2188:25,
2207:1, 2237:12,
2239:11, 2256:34,
2256:36, 2260:8
reader [3] - 2230:14,
2230:17, 2230:29
reading [3] - 2176:23,
2178:28, 2261:6
ready [1] - 2233:14
Real [1] - 2218:27
real [4] - 2218:36,
2231:24, 2231:36,
2256:30
realised [4] - 2165:2,
2165:4, 2182:12,
2202:37
reality [3] - 2190:12,
2233:19, 2233:37
really [8] - 2159:17,
2193:42, 2202:15,
2208:26, 2228:41,
2240:2, 2260:29,
2268:33
reason [7] - 2156:23,
2156:31, 2187:13,
2198:9, 2198:11,
2242:29, 2252:31
reasonable [17] -
2176:9, 2176:33,
2177:28, 2180:18,
2180:19, 2180:21,
2180:29, 2180:30,
2180:32, 2180:33,
2182:6, 2193:41,
2212:31, 2230:14,
2230:17, 2230:29,
2258:7
reasonably [3] -
2166:21, 2181:26,
2188:10
reasons [1] - 2192:14
rebuttal [1] - 2182:46
recalcitrant [1] -
2232:2
recalled [1] - 2247:18
recalling [1] - 2257:16
receipt [2] - 2234:24,
2240:42
receive [5] - 2157:5,
2157:17, 2237:38,
2259:3, 2264:25

received [16] -
2157:23, 2164:30,
2174:9, 2175:45,
2185:23, 2187:16,
2196:43, 2219:28,
2225:35, 2234:37,
2235:13, 2245:44,
2249:10, 2256:45,
2258:47, 2259:18
receiving [4] - 2157:7,
2219:30, 2259:2,
2268:44
recollect [4] - 2157:7,
2247:10, 2260:26
recollected [20] -
2156:20, 2157:6,
2158:9, 2182:39,
2186:16, 2187:28,
2187:29, 2222:43,
2235:39, 2235:42,
2236:9, 2236:11,
2241:10, 2241:14,
2241:37, 2241:39,
2246:35, 2249:33,
2253:40
recommend [1] -
2256:9
recommendation [2] -
2174:37, 2177:2
recommendations [1]
- 2254:45
recommending [1] -
2252:34
recompense [3] -
2180:19, 2180:30,
2180:33
reconstruct [1] -
2260:26
record [1] - 2194:38
recorded [1] - 2215:45
records [1] - 2168:22
RECORDS [1] -
2210:15
Records" [1] - 2210:8
recourse [1] - 2175:25
recover [1] - 2170:39
rector [3] - 2168:38,
2251:44, 2266:39
rectory [3] - 2214:12,
2266:21, 2266:22
red [4] - 2155:35,
2155:37, 2209:7,
2242:41
redacted [3] -
2194:38, 2195:1,
2231:14
REDACTED [1] -
2195:4
redacting [1] - 2173:3
redress [3] - 2255:43,

2256:4, 2256:10
reduce [1] - 2242:37
reduced [1] - 2210:36
refer [11] - 2186:35,
2188:44, 2189:13,
2191:12, 2191:13,
2191:15, 2209:34,
2225:47, 2226:8,
2264:6, 2264:31
reference [9] -
2155:39, 2157:30,
2171:12, 2176:15,
2176:19, 2189:24,
2189:36, 2223:27,
2264:47
references [1] -
2264:26
referral [2] - 2264:37,
2264:47
referred [19] -
2187:14, 2191:11,
2191:42, 2191:43,
2192:1, 2192:10,
2192:47, 2193:22,
2194:4, 2194:16,
2195:42, 2200:7,
2203:13, 2221:8,
2225:25, 2233:40,
2257:20, 2265:9,
2266:46
referring [14] -
2165:12, 2173:30,
2175:36, 2192:27,
2196:13, 2222:4,
2225:7, 2226:4,
2226:41, 2233:43,
2233:46, 2237:3,
2257:26, 2264:22
refers [3] - 2172:18,
2195:23, 2226:7
reflect [3] - 2179:5,
2210:37, 2222:38
reflected [2] -
2216:33, 2241:13
reflecting [1] -
2252:23
reflection [4] -
2161:17, 2183:27,
2241:14, 2263:30
refused [1] - 2169:5
regis [1] - 2213:2
registrar [19] -
2179:17, 2182:27,
2182:30, 2198:25,
2199:39, 2201:34,
2202:9, 2227:4,
2238:11, 2238:15,
2238:29, 2238:36,
2238:38, 2239:31,
2240:32, 2245:6,

2256:11, 2256:14,
2262:9
registrar's [2] -
2203:35, 2233:2
registrars [2] -
2166:34, 2184:43
Registry [1] - 2213:28
regular [2] - 2238:24,
2245:15
reinstated [1] -
2205:23
reject [1] - 2247:33
rejected [1] - 2205:29
relate [2] - 2172:9,
2237:2
related [3] - 2172:19,
2173:6, 2252:38
relating [2] - 2172:27,
2240:44
relation [10] - 2215:13,
2223:35, 2235:44,
2238:24, 2242:2,
2243:40, 2245:36,
2245:42, 2246:15,
2249:27
relationship [1] -
2265:37
relatively [1] - 2225:4
release [15] - 2158:47,
2159:2, 2159:5,
2159:19, 2159:26,
2159:29, 2164:32,
2164:45, 2165:3,
2165:7, 2207:13,
2219:30, 2241:21,
2243:7, 2243:22
released [2] - 2159:12,
2159:21
releases [1] - 2219:28
relevant [4] - 2168:4,
2201:8, 2207:21,
2222:47
relied [6] - 2167:20,
2239:23, 2240:24,
2242:2, 2242:17
relinquished [1] -
2251:3
relinquishment [2] -
2238:6, 2251:2
reluctant [1] - 2219:35
rely [3] - 2225:34,
2242:15, 2244:41
remain [1] - 2159:33
remainder [2] -
2207:39, 2225:3
remember [22] -
2157:10, 2164:38,
2165:33, 2166:29,
2167:28, 2167:35,
2173:4, 2183:10,

2185:36, 2190:11,
2190:17, 2202:25,
2205:6, 2206:26,
2206:46, 2207:40,
2222:44, 2223:14,
2247:25, 2249:16,
2249:19, 2253:27
remembering [1] -
2173:19
remind [1] - 2264:22
remove [1] - 2205:18
rents [1] - 2216:32
repeat [1] - 2253:17
repeating [1] - 2235:8
report [4] - 2171:37,
2210:18, 2215:14,
2254:6
reporting [3] -
2249:27, 2254:25,
2254:32
reports [1] - 2238:23
represent [1] -
2263:23
representations [1] -
2164:30
representative [1] -
2262:31
representatives [1] -
2182:2
representing [2] -
2194:15, 2263:11
represents [1] -
2209:37
request [2] - 2196:4,
2251:6
requested [1] -
2246:31
require [1] - 2223:37
required [3] - 2168:3,
2217:41, 2254:6
requires [1] - 2234:2
reserves [1] - 2222:32
residence [1] -
2211:14
resident [9] - 2165:25,
2165:42, 2165:45,
2192:23, 2203:22,
2204:3, 2220:23,
2233:9, 2233:10
residents [2] -
2165:23, 2225:20
resigned [2] -
2182:27, 2238:38
resolution [5] -
2182:16, 2182:21,
2221:1, 2221:7,
2260:32
resolutions [2] -
2245:19, 2245:20
resolved [1] - 2161:10

resolving [1] -
2184:38
resources [1] - 2219:6
respect [33] - 2158:20,
2164:37, 2166:16,
2167:8, 2175:16,
2185:16, 2185:33,
2186:4, 2186:5,
2191:28, 2192:24,
2193:19, 2196:2,
2197:29, 2198:32,
2201:28, 2202:43,
2219:41, 2222:7,
2225:38, 2227:11,
2229:19, 2233:34,
2239:38, 2240:43,
2244:11, 2252:38,
2255:47, 2261:24,
2262:41, 2262:47,
2263:23, 2264:14
respond [4] - 2161:9,
2163:38, 2220:16,
2269:17
responded [3] -
2161:2, 2187:38,
2224:21
responding [6] -
2159:16, 2160:47,
2163:10, 2163:13,
2163:22, 2171:27
response [25] -
2155:7, 2159:17,
2159:24, 2159:26,
2160:12, 2163:23,
2164:12, 2170:29,
2170:35, 2176:5,
2180:7, 2196:14,
2197:37, 2199:36,
2200:29, 2240:47,
2241:27, 2257:12,
2263:15, 2263:16,
2263:34, 2265:5,
2265:30, 2267:44,
2269:22
Response [1] -
2167:26
responses [4] -
2241:25, 2243:30,
2267:23
RESPONSES [1] -
2154:13
responsibility [16] -
2159:33, 2163:38,
2167:10, 2168:34,
2168:37, 2168:46,
2169:16, 2169:29,
2170:3, 2181:2,
2204:9, 2204:15,
2204:16, 2265:32,
2265:42, 2265:45

responsible [4] -
2181:29, 2181:40,
2267:26, 2267:27
rest [1] - 2200:31
restricting [1] - 2185:9
result [12] - 2157:42,
2158:24, 2165:3,
2174:47, 2181:42,
2186:26, 2245:23,
2245:43, 2246:6,
2250:43, 2258:17,
2258:42
RESUMPTION [1] -
2222:1
retired [1] - 2251:29
return [2] - 2171:42,
2204:18
returned [1] - 2244:27
returning [2] - 2199:8,
2257:39
reevaluation [1] -
2210:33
Reverend [37] -
2185:16, 2185:17,
2185:31, 2186:4,
2186:5, 2186:36,
2189:25, 2189:31,
2190:31, 2193:20,
2193:21, 2195:45,
2196:47, 2197:33,
2197:46, 2198:20,
2198:29, 2198:33,
2198:34, 2198:44,
2198:45, 2199:22,
2199:41, 2200:7,
2201:9, 2201:23,
2201:35, 2201:44,
2202:2, 2202:17,
2202:18, 2204:13,
2234:35, 2238:4,
2240:16
reverend [2] - 2238:5,
2249:46
reversal [1] - 2188:9
reverse [1] - 2188:4
review [1] - 2262:4
rich [2] - 2215:6,
2239:39
Richard [2] - 2229:18,
2230:7
rid [2] - 2162:40,
2178:21
Ringtail [7] - 2195:18,
2210:23, 2213:37,
2216:38, 2218:14,
2223:8, 2223:23
rise [1] - 2180:7
risk [1] - 2194:47
RM-2 [3] - 2166:39,
2171:42, 2236:35

RM-3 [1] - 2237:12
Robert [1] - 2154:34
Robinson [4] -
2193:26, 2193:29,
2208:24, 2209:35
robust [1] - 2233:5
Rod [1] - 2166:31
Roland [48] - 2155:27,
2155:44, 2164:45,
2166:14, 2168:30,
2175:2, 2175:44,
2176:28, 2178:32,
2179:21, 2179:32,
2184:15, 2188:29,
2205:2, 2205:13,
2205:14, 2205:15,
2205:22, 2206:11,
2206:22, 2206:44,
2219:21, 2219:40,
2219:42, 2220:6,
2220:38, 2222:22,
2223:11, 2224:13,
2224:23, 2225:13,
2225:19, 2225:30,
2225:42, 2226:8,
2226:39, 2227:16,
2227:26, 2227:29,
2244:8, 2248:8,
2248:31, 2250:32,
2250:34, 2263:21,
2263:22, 2267:4,
2268:29
Roland's [1] - 2268:32
role [9] - 2233:34,
2236:2, 2244:21,
2253:47, 2255:5,
2255:9, 2255:10,
2256:14, 2264:41
room [3] - 2178:24,
2182:22, 2182:23
rough [1] - 2200:40
roughly [1] - 2162:43
ROYAL [1] - 2154:12
Royal [6] - 2191:23,
2191:26, 2226:40,
2235:40, 2251:28,
2264:21
rules [1] - 2214:7
running [1] - 2211:28

S

safety [1] - 2236:7
salaries [1] - 2216:18
salary [2] - 2242:31,
2242:33
sat [3] - 2180:12,
2198:5, 2200:40
satisfactory [2] -
2181:42, 2182:16

satisfied [1] - 2237:7
save [5] - 2227:2,
2249:3, 2249:8,
2265:20, 2265:22
saw [5] - 2155:38,
2163:21, 2231:47,
2245:39, 2257:10
SC [3] - 2154:38,
2174:9, 2174:19
scene [4] - 2202:38,
2203:17, 2203:21,
2203:24
sceptical [1] - 2265:42
schedule [22] -
2155:17, 2155:22,
2155:26, 2155:30,
2155:44, 2156:2,
2156:12, 2156:28,
2157:3, 2157:5,
2157:14, 2172:15,
2172:30, 2188:20,
2188:29, 2188:33,
2191:5, 2192:44,
2195:14, 2240:41,
2241:1, 2261:26
scheme [3] - 2174:25,
2184:29, 2260:19
schemes [1] - 2211:30
school [1] - 2239:47
scratching [1] -
2240:36
screen [2] - 2222:15,
2256:8
scroll [12] - 2166:40,
2171:11, 2191:37,
2196:17, 2204:25,
2213:41, 2219:17,
2222:16, 2255:2,
2255:45, 2260:5,
2261:37
scuttlebutt [2] -
2198:16, 2233:22
search [1] - 2221:11
searched [1] - 2187:8
seated [1] - 2178:35
seating [1] - 2178:34
second [13] - 2155:22,
2169:22, 2176:38,
2177:22, 2183:15,
2191:42, 2200:37,
2220:9, 2222:16,
2224:9, 2224:13,
2234:24, 2235:22
secondly [5] -
2178:21, 2183:35,
2184:32, 2197:11,
2198:14
secretary [1] -
2234:33
Secretary [1] -

2240:16
secular [1] - 2238:31
see [94] - 2159:36,
2160:23, 2161:22,
2164:4, 2166:11,
2170:13, 2172:12,
2174:26, 2174:36,
2174:39, 2175:20,
2175:28, 2176:11,
2176:23, 2176:43,
2177:4, 2182:47,
2185:38, 2188:39,
2188:41, 2189:24,
2190:23, 2191:35,
2191:37, 2191:43,
2192:22, 2192:24,
2192:46, 2193:22,
2193:26, 2194:26,
2195:19, 2197:6,
2199:4, 2209:16,
2210:23, 2210:29,
2210:36, 2210:39,
2211:5, 2212:36,
2212:37, 2212:45,
2213:3, 2213:14,
2213:15, 2213:26,
2213:42, 2214:21,
2215:15, 2215:19,
2215:23, 2216:17,
2216:39, 2216:41,
2216:45, 2216:46,
2217:18, 2217:20,
2218:14, 2218:16,
2218:23, 2219:24,
2220:19, 2222:21,
2222:25, 2222:33,
2223:9, 2223:13,
2223:17, 2223:27,
2223:41, 2224:1,
2225:30, 2226:24,
2227:12, 2229:39,
2232:34, 2246:45,
2249:22, 2253:4,
2255:22, 2258:2,
2258:5, 2258:31,
2259:47, 2260:4,
2260:13, 2260:14,
2261:43, 2262:19,
2262:28, 2268:45
seeing [4] - 2209:44,
2258:14, 2263:32,
2264:41
seek [2] - 2170:15,
2242:37
seeking [3] - 2237:31,
2237:33, 2243:29
seem [4] - 2172:25,
2186:29, 2191:10,
2200:13
send [3] - 2248:32,
2248:34
senior [2] - 2186:37,
2199:8
sense [11] - 2157:44,
2169:16, 2182:4,
2182:34, 2199:31,
2219:28, 2252:28,
2263:1, 2267:24,
2267:30, 2268:37
sensible [2] - 2181:40,
2264:6
sent [12] - 2174:10,
2190:35, 2194:29,
2196:14, 2196:17,
2208:17, 2208:22,
2248:32, 2248:37,
2249:11, 2249:14,
2258:13
sentence [1] - 2220:9
separately [1] -
2170:34
separating [1] -
2190:16
September [28] -
2155:8, 2155:26,
2155:31, 2156:2,
2156:27, 2157:23,
2158:37, 2158:45,
2159:8, 2188:18,
2188:24, 2188:29,
2188:33, 2188:44,
2189:13, 2189:15,
2240:43, 2256:45,
2257:38, 2259:35,
2259:37, 2260:12,
2264:16, 2264:31,
2265:14, 2266:2,
2266:8, 2267:3
serious [10] - 2164:24,
2172:26, 2179:14,
2187:42, 2192:5,
2192:16, 2198:47,
2203:4
seriously [1] - 2170:4
seriousness [1] -
2172:38
services [1] - 2253:22
serving [2] - 2251:42,
2253:14
session [1] - 2222:45
set [20] - 2167:4,
2173:20, 2173:31,
2175:10, 2176:5,
2188:19, 2188:40,
2200:42, 2211:40,
2227:17, 2231:34,
2236:46, 2237:8,
2254:24, 2256:5,
2262:21, 2264:38,
2267:18, 2267:19,
2268:7
sets [3] - 2167:8,
2210:24, 2268:26
setting [1] - 2206:15
settle [10] - 2182:47,
2183:16, 2204:21,
2204:46, 2205:19,
2205:41, 2205:45,
2209:38, 2223:1,
2261:43
settled [8] - 2204:34,
2204:36, 2206:38,
2218:6, 2222:22,
2223:33, 2231:39,
2246:30
settlement [45] -
2173:41, 2177:22,
2177:24, 2177:27,
2177:28, 2177:34,
2177:40, 2177:44,
2178:9, 2178:18,
2178:41, 2178:43,
2179:5, 2179:42,
2180:18, 2180:29,
2180:32, 2181:32,
2181:39, 2182:6,
2182:13, 2182:33,
2183:3, 2204:24,
2209:45, 2219:22,
2219:29, 2219:36,
2220:2, 2220:17,
2220:29, 2220:36,
2222:28, 2224:42,
2224:47, 2227:11,
2227:17, 2227:38,
2242:27, 2244:18,
2247:24, 2247:45,
2249:6, 2261:17
settlements [5] -
2183:37, 2219:11,
2226:34, 2231:47,
2260:17
settling [3] - 2206:21,
2217:10, 2217:25
Sex [2] - 2189:37,
2190:38
sexual [39] - 2161:33,
2162:12, 2162:13,
2162:21, 2162:22,
2162:26, 2162:30,
2163:7, 2163:16,
2172:10, 2172:16,
2172:26, 2172:37,
2172:41, 2172:42,
2172:46, 2176:20,
2185:17, 2186:4,
2186:14, 2186:21,
2186:32, 2186:40,
2188:45, 2189:10,
2190:16, 2191:10,
2191:47, 2192:5,
2192:16, 2195:23,
2201:25, 2203:4,
2220:25, 2252:39,
2254:12, 2254:18,
2264:7
SEXUAL [1] - 2154:13
sexually [2] - 2189:11,
2191:38
share [2] - 2215:32,
2215:35
shared [1] - 2260:20
sharing [1] - 2197:12
Sheaffe [1] - 2166:15
sheet [13] - 2210:22,
2210:24, 2210:45,
2212:21, 2212:35,
2213:10, 2213:37,
2214:5, 2214:14,
2216:37, 2217:17,
2218:10, 2239:11
shock [1] - 2202:25
shop [1] - 2181:45
short [3] - 2203:34,
2232:15, 2232:17
short-failings [1] -
2203:34
shortcomings [1] -
2203:34
Shorten [2] - 2220:37,
2223:1
shorten [2] - 2220:46,
2224:2
shortly [4] - 2166:14,
2188:15, 2207:27,
2222:3
shoulders [1] -
2220:39
show [8] - 2155:20,
2166:38, 2191:21,
2201:39, 2207:46,
2257:6, 2258:12,
2259:6
showed [2] - 2155:34,
2257:1
showing [1] - 2241:37
shown [7] - 2216:2,
2236:35, 2237:12,
2241:46, 2242:26,
2249:16, 2256:44
shows [1] - 2253:33
shrugged [1] -
2220:39
siblings [1] - 2165:41
sick [1] - 2198:36
side [15] - 2161:2,
2163:22, 2170:24,
2174:10, 2177:25,
2180:34, 2180:37,
2195:38, 2209:21,
2209:22, 2214:10,
2244:35, 2249:6,
2262:21, 2265:3
sides [2] - 2160:30,
2160:38
signed [3] - 2208:14,
2238:5, 2247:11
significant [3] -
2211:22, 2268:46,
2269:26
Simeon [1] - 2154:39
similar [1] - 2204:42
Simon [4] - 2178:3,
2248:9, 2265:6,
2268:30
simple [3] - 2183:23,
2218:45, 2236:22
simply [4] - 2205:43,
2217:43, 2230:40,
2244:35
sincerely [1] - 2229:17
sit [3] - 2169:36,
2170:8, 2170:26
sitting [3] - 2178:42,
2240:35, 2241:10
situation [15] -
2169:35, 2190:12,
2198:32, 2226:21,
2232:36, 2233:43,
2238:23, 2239:13,
2241:33, 2242:21,
2245:9, 2245:41,
2246:24, 2247:28,
2250:8
six [3] - 2173:31,
2180:9, 2201:18
sixth [3] - 2159:43,
2188:39, 2195:22
size [1] - 2218:1
SJH-15 [2] - 2158:17,
2158:35
SJH-19 [1] - 2167:25
SJH-28 [1] - 2173:26
SJH-31 [1] - 2175:6
SJH-74 [1] - 2225:11
skateboard [8] -
2236:3, 2236:8,
2236:14, 2236:16,
2236:18, 2236:22,
2236:24, 2236:26
Slater [42] - 2156:3,
2156:8, 2173:9,
2173:16, 2173:27,
2173:35, 2173:37,
2202:12, 2206:11,
2206:19, 2208:44,
2223:36, 2228:19,
2238:4, 2238:28,
2238:41, 2238:47,
2240:11, 2240:24,

2241:2, 2241:12,
2241:28, 2241:38,
2242:9, 2243:38,
2243:47, 2244:11,
2244:21, 2244:27,
2244:33, 2245:30,
2246:3, 2246:25,
2248:16, 2248:20,
2248:43, 2249:4,
2249:10, 2249:26,
2249:42, 2251:21,
2251:29
SLATER [1] - 2251:23
Slater's [1] - 2228:10
social [1] - 2262:8
social [1] - 2186:38
solely [2] - 2233:32,
2265:27
solicitor [3] - 2167:38,
2171:1, 2178:46
solicitors [12] -
2158:25, 2161:1,
2161:15, 2170:14,
2177:13, 2179:8,
2188:14, 2191:2,
2192:10, 2193:46,
2226:19, 2233:47
someone [15] -
2162:42, 2166:5,
2166:9, 2189:5,
2197:24, 2200:5,
2200:38, 2203:26,
2220:38, 2231:28,
2231:33, 2232:13,
2232:15, 2233:23,
2242:33
sometimes [1] -
2239:5
somewhere [9] -
2165:47, 2172:29,
2203:17, 2203:27,
2216:29, 2219:2,
2224:31, 2239:44,
2243:13
sophisticated [1] -
2269:16
sorry [31] - 2156:43,
2159:43, 2165:16,
2172:36, 2173:2,
2173:16, 2182:35,
2188:31, 2194:46,
2206:19, 2206:20,
2208:38, 2212:1,
2214:26, 2214:29,
2218:19, 2225:14,
2225:17, 2230:16,
2238:46, 2245:19,
2254:47, 2255:2,
2255:33, 2260:4,
2260:5, 2262:17,
2262:19, 2267:38,
2267:47, 2268:14
sort [14] - 2155:36,
2160:35, 2179:35,
2182:28, 2183:37,
2184:5, 2194:44,
2206:32, 2229:2,
2231:24, 2243:1,
2245:36, 2246:12,
2255:30
sorts [6] - 2161:9,
2178:41, 2187:9,
2199:47, 2216:11,
2231:26
sought [2] - 2169:15,
2207:31
sounds [2] - 2180:1,
2196:28
South [1] - 2225:37
sparring [2] - 2180:16,
2180:27
speaking [3] -
2167:42, 2219:27,
2243:18
specific [7] - 2157:28,
2173:20, 2187:27,
2199:46, 2220:33,
2245:35, 2264:25
specifically [6] -
2197:15, 2199:17,
2222:44, 2225:8,
2260:29, 2265:4
specifics [2] -
2166:29, 2243:23
speculation [1] -
2239:46
spending [2] - 2206:1,
2206:2
spiritual [2] - 2242:17,
2247:3
spoken [4] - 2156:8,
2160:40, 2166:20,
2201:18
Squad [2] - 2189:37,
2190:38
squirrelled [1] -
2240:8
St [4] - 2238:30,
2251:44, 2266:18,
2266:30
staff [2] - 2160:3,
2195:37
Stafford [1] - 2251:45
stage [46] - 2160:36,
2160:40, 2161:13,
2163:25, 2173:40,
2181:8, 2187:34,
2190:20, 2194:3,
2196:34, 2196:44,
2202:45, 2204:33,
2206:5, 2206:9,
2209:20, 2218:6,
2219:33, 2222:36,
2231:38, 2233:21,
2233:24, 2242:15,
2243:38, 2247:36,
2249:37, 2249:40,
2251:35, 2258:9,
2258:27, 2258:46,
2260:21, 2260:47,
2262:12, 2262:37,
2262:47, 2263:7,
2263:28, 2266:25,
2266:27, 2266:37,
2267:35, 2268:25,
2268:33, 2268:43,
2269:4
stages [1] - 2252:11
stand [2] - 2175:26,
2175:30
standard [6] - 2162:2,
2162:27, 2162:29,
2162:41, 2189:40,
2249:34
Standards [6] -
2199:32, 2252:18,
2253:7, 2253:9,
2254:1, 2254:19
standards [75] -
2156:6, 2156:12,
2156:17, 2156:24,
2156:26, 2156:29,
2156:32, 2156:36,
2157:30, 2157:33,
2158:1, 2158:6,
2158:12, 2166:20,
2188:46, 2189:29,
2191:17, 2192:39,
2192:45, 2193:8,
2193:12, 2203:19,
2203:33, 2213:2,
2213:24, 2216:46,
2231:11, 2231:19,
2231:32, 2231:44,
2232:10, 2233:28,
2237:41, 2249:17,
2252:7, 2253:9,
2253:10, 2253:11,
2253:15, 2253:23,
2253:32, 2253:38,
2253:43, 2253:47,
2254:7, 2254:18,
2254:26, 2254:27,
2254:44, 2254:45,
2255:6, 2255:10,
2255:42, 2255:44,
2256:9, 2257:18,
2257:21, 2257:28,
2258:31, 2259:24,
2259:35, 2260:7,
2261:35, 2262:12,
2262:15, 2262:26,
2263:45, 2264:1,
2264:2, 2264:33,
2264:37, 2264:45,
2265:10, 2265:19,
2265:21
standards" [1] -
2213:26
standing [1] - 2227:30
Star [6] - 2158:37,
2158:45, 2159:17,
2241:23, 2241:24,
2243:29
start [14] - 2171:6,
2180:43, 2181:26,
2181:39, 2182:16,
2185:10, 2189:18,
2191:35, 2213:19,
2214:9, 2215:15,
2228:41, 2239:21,
2256:42
started [3] - 2181:33,
2228:22, 2240:10
starting [1] - 2181:17
starts [1] - 2180:38
stat [2] - 2236:12,
2236:17
state [8] - 2160:11,
2166:47, 2193:4,
2212:31, 2214:36,
2225:43, 2251:27,
2267:17
State [1] - 2190:38
statement [9] -
2158:44, 2182:46,
2197:21, 2197:32,
2211:46, 2214:18,
2215:14, 2230:10,
2235:40
statements [4] -
2187:22, 2188:12,
2217:5
states [1] - 2212:8
stating [1] - 2230:25
status [7] - 2198:8,
2198:29, 2199:4,
2200:26, 2234:38,
2235:22, 2248:17
statute [1] - 2167:17
statutory [3] - 2194:5,
2201:10, 2267:4
stay [3] - 2182:28,
2243:1, 2243:3
stayed [1] - 2161:4
step [6] - 2169:22,
2190:44, 2200:13,
2244:30, 2251:14
stepped [2] - 2163:32,
2178:35
steps [10] - 2166:14,
2186:34, 2188:44,
2196:1, 2198:2,
2200:24, 2202:2,
2264:30, 2265:8,
2268:21
still [29] - 2160:10,
2160:37, 2161:10,
2161:13, 2168:24,
2168:45, 2169:7,
2177:12, 2184:12,
2190:47, 2192:9,
2193:6, 2202:18,
2202:27, 2202:44,
2203:7, 2203:18,
2203:32, 2206:6,
2209:11, 2212:17,
2223:33, 2223:39,
2232:3, 2234:1,
2242:4, 2244:19,
2248:9, 2263:7
stop [1] - 2176:17
story [1] - 2237:42
straddle [1] - 2209:20
straight [3] - 2203:30,
2223:2, 2247:20
straightaway [1] -
2204:43
strength [2] - 2160:27,
2160:33
stressed [1] - 2242:44
strictly [1] - 2219:27
strip [1] - 2170:33
strong [4] - 2161:28,
2179:1, 2183:24,
2239:6
strongly [4] - 2173:44,
2250:2, 2252:30,
2267:22
structure [3] -
2167:43, 2168:8,
2254:17
structures [1] -
2256:24
stud [3] - 2202:19,
2202:27, 2202:29
student [1] - 2238:31
studies [2] - 2242:23,
2242:38
study [1] - 2242:28
stuff [6] - 2182:11,
2187:24, 2187:36,
2187:38, 2188:13,
2239:46
subclause [1] -
2157:47
subject [2] - 2174:16,
2250:36
subsequent [1] -
2199:26

substance [4] - 2182:31, 2236:1, 2236:18, 2247:4

substantial [18] - 2155:8, 2155:13, 2157:23, 2159:32, 2160:19, 2165:24, 2166:33, 2171:34, 2179:30, 2210:33, 2210:43, 2214:3, 2215:7, 2216:30, 2218:10, 2218:15, 2218:29, 2237:22

substantially [3] - 2210:25, 2215:44, 2228:15

success [1] - 2176:46

successor [3] - 2201:17, 2201:19

suddenly [1] - 2232:23

suffered [4] - 2162:26, 2220:25, 2225:21, 2229:20

sufficient [1] - 2247:36

suggest [1] - 2168:45

suggested [7] - 2175:12, 2176:39, 2177:8, 2222:32, 2236:19, 2245:2, 2248:20

suggesting [6] - 2224:17, 2224:23, 2225:42, 2226:2, 2226:5, 2247:2

suggestion [2] - 2223:34, 2250:20

suggests [2] - 2211:20, 2262:3

suit [1] - 2239:6

suitable [1] - 2194:31

sum [6] - 2204:24, 2205:27, 2206:25, 2206:26, 2227:46, 2247:6

summarise [1] - 2268:40

summary [3] - 2236:46, 2237:16, 2237:27

summed [1] - 2161:6

sums [1] - 2227:24

superintendent [1] - 2236:3

support [4] - 2181:13, 2232:26, 2233:39, 2254:40

supported [2] - 2161:36, 2225:37

suppose [3] - 2159:18, 2184:45, 2239:12

supposed [2] - 2187:34, 2190:46

surname [2] - 2195:29, 2195:38

surplus [1] - 2211:23

surprised [1] - 2158:27

suspect [5] - 2184:29, 2218:43, 2257:14, 2257:22, 2268:36

suspended [2] - 2196:44, 2199:6

sworn [1] - 2251:23

Sydney [20] - 2154:22, 2184:29, 2189:37, 2257:4, 2257:10, 2259:31, 2259:47, 2260:13, 2260:19, 2261:8, 2261:18, 2262:1, 2262:4, 2262:7, 2262:22, 2263:36, 2263:39, 2263:43, 2264:2, 2268:42

synod [6] - 2217:40, 2231:13, 2231:35, 2231:36, 2240:14, 2252:30

Synod [4] - 2252:21, 2252:25, 2252:28, 2252:34

system [2] - 2178:35, 2232:31

talks [1] - 2261:42

tap [1] - 2232:4

tasked [2] - 2249:25, 2249:26

tasks [1] - 2264:38

Taylor [1] - 2251:1

TAYLOR [3] - 2238:1, 2238:3, 2250:23

TB-66 [1] - 2204:21

teach [1] - 2234:9

teacher [1] - 2165:25

technical [1] - 2217:47

teleconferences [1] - 2206:10

telephone [3] - 2196:14, 2200:18, 2243:31

telephoned [2] - 2200:16, 2200:20

TENDER [1] - 2195:5

tender [13] - 2155:20, 2157:3, 2174:21, 2188:23, 2188:34, 2191:21, 2194:35, 2207:46, 2210:10, 2210:12, 2224:28, 2227:8, 2259:45

tenure [1] - 2242:9

term [6] - 2172:30, 2209:3, 2229:27, 2238:39, 2253:21, 2254:10

terminal [1] - 2156:33

terminology [1] - 2176:27

terms [25] - 2157:26, 2175:11, 2177:24, 2182:30, 2186:24, 2187:42, 2190:46, 2197:7, 2201:7, 2201:45, 2203:24, 2208:13, 2214:44, 2227:17, 2227:20, 2232:2, 2232:5, 2232:47, 2235:9, 2242:6, 2242:21, 2249:35, 2255:10, 2256:18, 2256:23

Terry [3] - 2220:37, 2223:1, 2224:2

tested [1] - 2230:34

thankful [1] - 2268:24

thankfully [1] - 2232:15

that" [1] - 2250:9

themselves [1] - 2216:7

Theological [1] - 2238:30

thereafter [1] - 2244:32

therefore [3] - 2185:1, 2192:31, 2239:40

they've [1] - 2188:13

thinking [7] - 2184:39, 2233:39, 2240:1, 2245:12, 2252:33, 2257:16, 2269:17

third [5] - 2174:33, 2193:21, 2195:26, 2219:37, 2230:10

thread [1] - 2268:14

threatening [3] - 2161:14, 2164:36, 2164:38

three [16] - 2172:41, 2191:12, 2191:26, 2191:37, 2191:41, 2192:47, 2194:4, 2206:10, 2207:32, 2224:6, 2225:20, 2226:40, 2226:44, 2227:15, 2253:8

three-way [1] - 2206:10

threshold [1] - 2159:32

throughout [3] - 2158:31, 2240:31, 2250:33

thrust [3] - 2181:20, 2208:10, 2246:20

Thursday [1] - 2232:26

TO [2] - 2154:13, 2269:33

today [6] - 2178:8, 2204:19, 2206:24, 2241:11, 2244:45, 2268:28

together [8] - 2163:14, 2175:1, 2187:25, 2208:44, 2211:40, 2227:42, 2267:8, 2269:21

Tommy [1] - 2229:18

took [17] - 2155:32, 2166:14, 2188:25, 2192:39, 2192:40, 2193:12, 2209:15, 2221:5, 2225:34, 2229:26, 2230:3, 2236:14, 2239:18, 2243:32, 2245:43, 2265:8

top [4] - 2189:18, 2227:33, 2237:18, 2245:12

total [1] - 2208:9, 2213:14, 2213:19, 2213:42, 2213:43, 2214:44, 2215:18, 2216:39, 2217:19

totally [4] - 2159:34, 2184:27, 2202:32, 2242:26

towards [4] - 2186:10, 2186:11, 2186:22, 2229:42

Tower [1] - 2154:21

track [2] - 2199:6, 2268:31

trade [1] - 2240:17

trading [2] - 2211:30, 2211:35

training [1] - 2239:8

transcript [2] - 2158:43, 2158:46

transfer [1] - 2210:44

transferred [2] - 2210:39, 2212:21

transport [2] - 2257:34, 2257:35

travel [3] - 2258:18, 2258:21, 2258:30

travelling [1] - 2258:4

treat [1] - 2156:4

treated [3] - 2212:10, 2219:23, 2228:33

treating [1] - 2229:17

treatment [1] - 2210:37

tried [2] - 2178:4, 2267:21

trouble [2] - 2173:19, 2193:6

true [5] - 2161:29, 2161:31, 2201:19, 2206:21, 2267:30

Trust [2] - 2168:4, 2217:39

trust [2] - 2239:13, 2242:14

trusted [2] - 2241:46, 2242:3

trustee [3] - 2168:30, 2168:33, 2168:35

Trustees [1] - 2212:13

trustees [19] - 2167:46, 2167:47, 2168:29, 2210:39, 2210:45, 2211:1, 2211:36, 2212:22, 2212:28, 2213:10, 2213:15, 2213:35, 2213:43, 2214:17, 2215:33, 2217:17, 2217:19, 2239:14,

T

tab [20] - 2157:36, 2174:22, 2204:22, 2207:46, 2208:3, 2210:18, 2211:1, 2213:9, 2213:18, 2213:36, 2215:19, 2216:38, 2217:16, 2218:9, 2218:19, 2222:15, 2223:6, 2225:29, 2254:23, 2261:36

TAB [1] - 2195:4

table [8] - 2178:37, 2179:9, 2181:22, 2189:9, 2205:5, 2222:11, 2223:2, 2246:12

tables [1] - 2178:43

tactic [5] - 2163:19, 2163:21, 2163:23, 2205:12, 2205:14

2239:17
trusts [3] - 2217:29,
2217:34, 2217:41
truth [2] - 2181:47,
2230:42
truthful [1] - 2229:25
truthfully [3] - 2230:4,
2237:41, 2263:29
try [4] - 2202:17,
2209:27, 2211:40,
2268:31
trying [25] - 2163:16,
2163:18, 2172:38,
2176:31, 2180:9,
2181:21, 2195:37,
2199:34, 2199:37,
2202:45, 2203:35,
2203:36, 2204:12,
2206:6, 2209:20,
2212:30, 2215:13,
2232:6, 2257:9,
2257:15, 2260:26,
2260:27, 2262:11,
2265:37, 2267:31
TUESDAY [1] -
2269:33
turn [2] - 2210:22,
2210:32
turned [2] - 2178:37,
2243:13
twice [1] - 2199:19
two [41] - 2160:30,
2160:38, 2162:38,
2163:2, 2171:2,
2174:6, 2176:3,
2177:20, 2178:3,
2179:8, 2181:45,
2184:13, 2184:28,
2185:36, 2185:46,
2186:19, 2186:37,
2191:42, 2193:33,
2194:21, 2195:41,
2197:11, 2198:5,
2198:23, 2199:12,
2199:22, 2199:45,
2204:2, 2204:7,
2209:20, 2231:47,
2232:8, 2232:13,
2234:38, 2236:20,
2239:26, 2239:45,
2243:19, 2244:28,
2247:24, 2248:15
two-day [2] - 2247:24,
2248:15
type [2] - 2173:23,
2188:41

U

ultimately [2] -

2267:26, 2267:27
uncertain [1] -
2260:20
uncomfortable [1] -
2242:24
under [21] - 2157:47,
2158:23, 2178:37,
2179:41, 2179:45,
2183:47, 2199:31,
2212:36, 2213:1,
2213:28, 2213:42,
2214:21, 2214:26,
2217:33, 2218:22,
2231:46, 2236:39,
2245:32, 2265:27,
2265:31, 2266:40
undergone [1] -
2261:47
underlined [1] -
2185:15
underlining [2] -
2155:35, 2155:37
understood [7] -
2160:29, 2170:21,
2180:40, 2185:20,
2197:23, 2253:7,
2254:5
undertake [3] -
2253:47, 2254:29,
2264:38
undertaken [2] -
2210:33, 2265:15
undertook [1] -
2240:6
unduly [1] - 2217:25
unfettered [1] - 2188:1
unhappy [1] - 2242:46
unhealthy [1] -
2239:40
unit [2] - 2186:40,
2186:42
unnamed [4] -
2192:17, 2192:23,
2192:24, 2192:30
unreasonable [1] -
2180:43
unredacted [3] -
2188:35, 2191:22,
2191:29
unresolved [1] -
2159:34
unsatisfactory [1] -
2202:47
unusual [2] - 2245:26
unwitnessed [1] -
2218:39
up [90] - 2155:21,
2157:37, 2158:17,
2158:35, 2159:15,
2160:15, 2161:6,

2166:39, 2166:40,
2171:3, 2171:26,
2172:6, 2173:40,
2175:6, 2175:41,
2176:32, 2182:16,
2185:34, 2186:20,
2187:31, 2188:34,
2189:18, 2191:22,
2191:26, 2193:38,
2193:43, 2194:40,
2196:9, 2196:17,
2198:4, 2198:24,
2200:15, 2201:32,
2202:24, 2202:25,
2204:22, 2204:24,
2204:29, 2204:34,
2204:36, 2204:46,
2205:33, 2208:3,
2210:6, 2213:23,
2215:33, 2216:24,
2217:16, 2219:14,
2220:40, 2222:23,
2223:21, 2223:23,
2225:12, 2225:16,
2225:29, 2225:47,
2227:8, 2227:16,
2228:35, 2232:29,
2235:10, 2235:12,
2235:38, 2236:14,
2240:33, 2242:20,
2243:13, 2245:19,
2245:20, 2247:6,
2248:4, 2250:5,
2252:30, 2255:45,
2257:37, 2257:44,
2259:2, 2259:45,
2260:4, 2260:17,
2261:37, 2264:16,
2266:2, 2267:18,
2267:19, 2267:35,
2267:40, 2268:40,
2268:43
UP [1] - 2195:4
upkeep [1] - 2214:10
UPON [1] - 2222:1
upset [2] - 2165:4,
2182:21
usual [1] - 2245:27
utility [1] - 2229:8

V

vague [1] - 2225:6
vaguely [1] - 2231:27
valuation [11] -
2210:39, 2214:9,
2214:22, 2214:24,
2214:31, 2214:33,
2214:35, 2214:36,
2214:39, 2218:24,

2218:28
valuations [1] -
2215:3
value [4] - 2211:14,
2211:45, 2215:1,
2218:42
Valuer [2] - 2214:37,
2215:3
values [1] - 2218:36
variation [1] - 2210:43
various [10] - 2181:9,
2235:23, 2239:34,
2240:7, 2240:43,
2244:1, 2245:16,
2247:23, 2266:30
varying [1] - 2234:37
Venerable [1] - 2251:8
verbal [1] - 2229:1
VERSION [1] - 2195:4
version [2] - 2188:35,
2191:22
vested [1] - 2168:38
viable [1] - 2240:1
victim [6] - 2193:38,
2194:15, 2195:34,
2229:35, 2255:11,
2255:20
victims [3] - 2174:24,
2187:24, 2197:16
view [25] - 2160:47,
2161:1, 2163:13,
2169:19, 2187:37,
2209:30, 2209:43,
2216:8, 2228:33,
2229:26, 2229:29,
2230:4, 2230:7,
2231:20, 2233:32,
2235:37, 2236:6,
2239:38, 2239:42,
2239:44, 2240:9,
2240:11, 2243:32,
2243:39
views [4] - 2178:46,
2179:1, 2234:37,
2236:20
vigorous [1] - 2199:40
violence [1] - 2163:7
volume [1] - 2223:7
voluntary [1] - 2197:5
vote [8] - 2223:10,
2245:23, 2245:30,
2245:31, 2245:32,
2245:33, 2245:36,
2245:39

W

wages [2] - 2216:19,
2216:31
wait [3] - 2187:24,

2196:3, 2219:45
waited [2] - 2188:46,
2189:15
waiting [4] - 2188:12,
2188:15, 2197:9,
2246:11
Wales [1] - 2225:37
walked [2] - 2203:30,
2239:47
walking [1] - 2202:26
Walls [1] - 2184:47
warranted [1] -
2196:36
WASS [3] - 2231:5,
2231:7, 2234:12
ways [1] - 2240:19
wedding [1] - 2242:12
week [6] - 2200:35,
2205:22, 2216:31,
2232:13, 2251:1
week-to-week [1] -
2200:35
whatsoever [2] -
2242:11, 2247:41
whereabouts [1] -
2254:47
whereas [2] - 2163:17,
2216:26
whilst [3] - 2169:1,
2244:19, 2245:6
whole [2] - 2235:12,
2239:15
wide [1] - 2163:17
wife [10] - 2156:33,
2156:38, 2156:41,
2156:44, 2156:45,
2201:20, 2235:10,
2235:12, 2242:27,
2242:44
willing [4] - 2180:18,
2180:28, 2182:43,
2234:9
willingly [1] - 2163:47
wine [1] - 2242:41
winging [1] - 2194:27
Winston [1] - 2189:25
wished [1] - 2182:44
withdraw [2] -
2164:39, 2230:16
withdrawn [1] -
2164:46
WITHDREW [1] -
2251:17
withdrew [1] - 2205:4
witness [4] - 2191:27,
2236:35, 2237:12,
2241:11
WITNESS [4] - 2171:9,
2212:5, 2212:27,
2251:17

woman's ^[1] - 2162:39
wonder ^[10] - 2157:36,
 2158:17, 2158:35,
 2189:2, 2209:32,
 2210:17, 2222:14,
 2228:39, 2251:27,
 2259:1
word ^[10] - 2162:22,
 2176:36, 2181:5,
 2191:38, 2195:22,
 2238:46, 2246:19,
 2260:24, 2260:25,
 2267:17
wording ^[1] - 2208:47
words ^[27] - 2161:14,
 2161:28, 2161:29,
 2164:11, 2164:15,
 2175:30, 2175:47,
 2176:14, 2176:32,
 2182:39, 2201:6,
 2201:18, 2229:47,
 2230:2, 2230:3,
 2230:29, 2235:1,
 2235:3, 2235:8,
 2241:29, 2246:4,
 2246:36, 2246:38,
 2249:37, 2257:15
workers ^[3] - 2160:4,
 2216:9, 2255:39
works ^[1] - 2166:21
world ^[1] - 2163:32
worried ^[1] - 2263:17
worse ^[2] - 2209:28,
 2232:1
worth ^[1] - 2266:47
write ^[13] - 2171:37,
 2175:2, 2176:29,
 2177:8, 2189:40,
 2189:45, 2191:16,
 2218:10, 2218:15,
 2218:30, 2233:44,
 2243:33, 2244:8
write-down ^[2] -
 2218:10, 2218:15
writing ^[9] - 2187:10,
 2187:18, 2194:21,
 2200:14, 2200:25,
 2200:42, 2201:14,
 2228:46, 2246:44
written ^[10] - 2176:35,
 2185:11, 2207:31,
 2208:16, 2208:18,
 2218:39, 2229:30,
 2230:8, 2258:46
wrote ^[14] - 2189:46,
 2202:36, 2207:27,
 2219:13, 2225:13,
 2225:19, 2228:36,
 2229:47, 2231:14,
 2253:34, 2261:22,
 2263:10, 2267:3,
 2267:41

Y

year ^[18] - 2201:39,
 2201:41, 2211:4,
 2211:6, 2211:21,
 2215:32, 2216:3,
 2216:34, 2216:47,
 2231:34, 2231:40,
 2240:14, 2243:4,
 2252:39, 2252:41,
 2266:43, 2267:45,
 2268:32
years ^[20] - 2161:34,
 2198:5, 2198:24,
 2199:12, 2199:22,
 2199:45, 2204:2,
 2204:8, 2210:1,
 2211:40, 2212:11,
 2212:29, 2228:33,
 2232:25, 2235:24,
 2238:34, 2239:45,
 2251:35, 2251:37,
 2253:16
young ^[1] - 2236:20
yourself ^[5] - 2157:38,
 2182:38, 2237:13,
 2260:8, 2267:15