

This is an edited version of the report.
A full copy may be purchased from
the Diocesan Office, GPO Box 748, Hobart TAS. 7001

Not the Way of Christ

*The Report of the Independent Pastoral Inquiry into Sexual Misconduct
by Clergy or Officers of the Anglican Diocese of Tasmania
with particular reference to Paedophilia*

March 1998

Tonia Kohl
Barrister

Michael Crowley
Psychologist

*Context of the Independent Pastoral Inquiry
into Sexual Misconduct by Clergy or Officers
of the Anglican Diocese of Tasmania
with particular reference to Paedophilia*

The exploitation of the vulnerable for sexual purposes by those in positions of power, has been a major issue in the late twentieth century. This has been highlighted recently in Australia with the release of the findings of Justice James Woods' Royal Commission into paedophilia in N.S.W. in August 1997.

Considerable prominence has also been given to the large numbers of clergy, priests and religious brothers who have faced allegations or charges of sexual abuse in recent years. The Catholic Church has recently responded with a document entitled "Towards healing: Principles and procedures in responding to complaints of sexual abuse against personnel of the Catholic Church in Australia" and a more recent draft document "Integrity in Ministry" which seeks to prescribe to Catholic Clergy a minimal set of ethical standards with which they should comply.

A Code of Ethics for clergy and pastoral care workers (*Appendix 5*) has recently been accepted by the Anglican Church in Tasmania and a Sexual Harassment Response Group has been established with a clear statement on Principles and Procedures for dealing with Sexual Harassment (*Appendix 6*). A draft document entitled "A code of practice for the protection of children within our churches" (*Appendix 8*) has also been circulated throughout parishes, institutions and organisations of the Diocese of Tasmania.

In Tasmania, on 30 August 1997, The "Mercury" newspaper featured the story of "Simon", who told of the abuse and betrayal of trust he said he had experienced at the hands of a number of Anglican priests in Tasmania. The Anglican Bishop of Tasmania, Right Reverend Philip Newell, in replying to that article said that the Anglican Church sought to secure a commitment to the highest moral and ethical standards from its clergy.

Out of concern for the continued integrity of the Church in Tasmania and to establish a forum for victims of sexual abuse and misconduct to be heard, Bishop Newell commissioned the present Inquiry.

The Inquiry was established as a pastoral inquiry in that its function was not investigative or quasi-judicial. Survivors of sexual abuse who wished to bring allegations to the attention of the Police would be expected to take that action independently of any submission they may make to the present Inquiry.

Those conducting the Inquiry were also to be clearly independent of any involvement or relationship with the Anglican Church.

On 30 October 1997, Bishop Newell announced to the Media that Ms. Tonia Kohl, Barrister, and Dr. Michael Crowley, Clinical Psychologist, had accepted the Bishop's invitation to conduct the Inquiry, with the expectation that their report would be complete within about three months.

Terms of Reference

The terms of reference of the Inquiry were as follows:

The Inquiry is charged with the responsibility to:

Receive oral and/or written submissions from any person who alleges paedophilia or sexual misconduct by a member of the Clergy or Officer of the Anglican Church.

Receive oral and/or written submissions from Clergy or Officers of the Anglican Church relevant to the issues of paedophilia or sexual misconduct.

Receive oral and/or written submissions from any person with professional expertise in responding to allegations of paedophilia or sexual misconduct.

Present a report to the Bishop in relation to paedophilia or sexual misconduct within the life of the Anglican Church in Tasmania together with any recommendations on the life, structure, policy and practice of the Church.

Liaise closely with the Diocesan Sexual Harassment response group who shall be responsible for arranging post-submission counselling for any person and be the reference point for any person who wishes to have their allegation considered further by the Church.

Liaise with the Bishop on any matter.

To facilitate the community's ability to make immediate contact with the Inquiry, a post office box, P.O. Box 40 Lower Longley, and a toll-free telephone number, 1800 629 209, both of which were independent of the Anglican Church administration were established for the duration of the Inquiry.

As well as wide coverage in the media, prominent advertisements were placed in each of the major regional newspapers in Tasmania to announce the formation of the Inquiry and details of how to make contact with those conducting the Inquiry. Further, more than 300 letters were sent in early November to all Anglican Clergy, registered psychologists, psychiatrists, and sexual assault support services in Tasmania (*see Appendices 1 & 2*) informing them that the inquiry had been established and that in the context of the terms of reference their submissions would be welcomed.

By early January 1998, the Inquiry had received very little contact from young people in the Anglican Church, and it was felt that youth may not have been aware of the existence of the Inquiry. Therefore the Church administration was requested to provide the names and

addresses of all young people who had been involved in Church activities in the past six years or thereabouts.

About 500 letters were sent in mid-January 1998 to the parents of those young people, with an invitation to parents to pass on to their children an enclosed letter which informed the young people of the purpose of the Inquiry. Parents were also invited to discuss the issues dealt with by the Inquiry with their children, provided they felt sufficiently comfortable to do so (*refer to Appendix 3*).

A network of support persons was also linked in to the Inquiry through the Anglican Church's Sexual Harassment Response Group. This was very soon augmented by a list of qualified psychologists, social workers and counsellors in all regions of Tasmania who were experienced in dealing with survivors of sexual abuse and who were willing and available to take on referrals for continuing post-submission counselling if required.

The recommendations set down by the Inquiry are designed to not only set the Church towards new directions but to facilitate the expansion of initiatives already undertaken. The objectives are to build into the Anglican Church in Tasmania two essential preventative elements, which are characterised by Ray Wyre, an English expert in the area of sexual abuse and the treatment of offenders, as:

- a) a "*culture of awareness*" which involves increased education and understanding for both clergy and laity, so that the code of silence or "head in the sand" mentality, which has often allowed sexual misconduct to continue, is broken down. In a culture of awareness, knowledge of any inappropriate sexual behaviour is acted upon expeditiously and not covered up, and suspicions of inappropriate sexual behaviour are not ignored.
- b) an "*arena of safety*" wherein all possible safeguards are employed to ensure that children and young people can engage in Youth activities in the Church, or interact with Clergy or Officers of the Church, in safety, and any situations which are not safe are recognised, defined and proscribed.

However, as well as encouraging the Church towards becoming a "culture of awareness" and an "arena of safety", the Inquiry's recommendations are broader in that they address Bishop Newell's vision of a clergy committed to the highest moral and ethical standards. Ultimately, this is the best protection against sexual misconduct or any abuse of clerical power.

The Inquiry's recommendations encompass a number of aspects of personal and professional development for clergy, all of which would help to make Bishop Newell's aspirations for his clergy a reality throughout the Anglican Church in Tasmania.

The findings of the Inquiry on the basis of the submissions received

After the Inquiry was announced and the 1800 phone number was established, approximately 160 phone calls were received. Some of these calls were found after discussion to relate to sexual abuse by clergy who were not Anglican clergy. Other calls were outside the terms of reference in that they alleged misconduct by Anglican ministers but not of a sexual nature. Complaints against Anglican clergy or employees or officers of the Anglican Church accounted for slightly in excess of 50 % of the complaints received.

Phone calls received

Approximately 80 of the phone calls received related to Anglican clergy, staff, teachers or volunteers. Matter disclosed in phone calls varied considerably. Some people merely stated the name of a person whom they alleged had behaved improperly towards them. More frequently people talked about behaviour to which they had been subjected. Child abuse ranged from once-off genital touching to relationships of approximately three years. Two males disclosed that they were raped while children. One woman disclosed child rape. One male indicated that he and his sister had both been sexually abused by the same minister over a period of approximately five years. Eight women discussed relationships which they had entered into with their ministers as adults.

Eleven people indicated that they had suffered sexual abuse whilst boarders at Anglican schools. One woman telephoned and said that she was aware that her husband (now deceased) had sexually abused minors and she was concerned that his name not be released as it would damage their adult children.

Some calls were abusive in nature. Most callers indicated that they thought the Church should be congratulated on establishing the Inquiry and being prepared to listen to what had happened. Other callers expressed concern as to the Inquiry's confidentiality, whether the Inquiry would result in a "whitewash", and whether the Inquiry would forward information to the Police.

During the phone calls, the complainants were asked to outline the behaviour of which they complained, when such behaviour had occurred, and whether they were prepared to attend and have a personal interview with the Inquiry panel. It was explained to them that face to face contact was preferable. Whenever a person declined this invitation to make face-to-face contact, the information has not been disclosed other than in this section of the report. It follows that the only names attached to this report are those disclosed in face-to-face submissions. Those people who did accept the invitation to talk directly to the Inquiry were then asked if they were prepared to give their name and a contact number. Subsequently people were interviewed in detail at various locations throughout Tasmania. These interviews resulted in further persons making allegations against a number of Anglican Clergy or officials.

Face - to -face submissions

Every face-to-face submission received by the Inquiry is detailed in Appendix 4. To protect the confidentiality of witnesses, the specific details of times and places of alleged offences and sexual misconduct are not shown.

A number of incidents were reported to us where parents and/or church ministers or staff raised concerns about what appeared to them to be a complete “lack of action” after they had made complaints or raised concerns with the church hierarchy, including Bishop Stone. There is no reason to disbelieve those accounts.

One woman said she had approached Bishop Newell after her son had returned from a Camp with a report of having been sexually interfered with. She expressed very considerable concern that the Bishop’s focus was on forgiveness for the perpetrator rather than on what she and her son were suffering.

From the submissions received the Inquiry concluded that it is possible that there have been significant breakdowns in communication up and down the line with regard to what occurred after a report of sexual misconduct or abuse was made to the Church. However, if the recommendations in the report are adopted such systemic breakdowns should not occur in the future.

Information was put before the inquiry which enabled us to conclude that at times action was taken, albeit behind the scenes. The perpetrator was cautioned, required to undergo counselling and other steps were taken. On other occasions matters were not dealt with at all. It is clear that at some times concerns were ignored by those to whom they were presented or alternatively the prime emphasis was placed on the harmed person being prepared to forgive the perpetrator, and no, or inadequate, concern or support appears to have been given to the victim or his or her family.

Incidents described by parents of unrelated children clearly shows that the system had failed. Some parents on raising concerns were told that the matter would be forwarded to Bishop Newell for action. When they heard nothing and observed no changes to the situation they believed that Bishop Newell had taken no action and had ignored their concerns. From material put before the Inquiry the ministers to whom the concerns were taken profess to have little if any recollection of the incidents referred to. They do not maintain that they took any action nor do they state that they referred the matter to Bishop Newell. In our opinion this may well represent cases of selective and convenient memory but it does show the need for a clear policy and implementation of such a policy. The policy needs to be readily accessible to all parishioners in all parishes. It should be available without the need to request it from church staff.

What occurred in these incidents was potentially harmful for all concerned. The church may have become legally liable for negligence had children been harmed in the interim and a claim for exemplary damages may well have succeeded. In pastoral terms the incidents were unfortunate and led to families leaving the Church because they felt devalued and believed their concerns had been effectively ignored and brushed under the carpet.

All adults who had formerly been child victims and who spoke to the Inquiry expressed a view that people within the church and the church community "knew" what was happening but chose to ignore what had been heard. To some extent this was substantiated by other people (not victims) who told the inquiry of behaviour they had observed on earlier dates which they felt uncomfortable about, but about which they did nothing because absent proof, it was merely a conclusion they had drawn as a result of circumstantial evidence. They recognised that to make this allegation was serious and had no idea what to do with their suspicions.

It was also stated on numerous occasions that people did not voice their concerns as they believed that the matter had already been referred to the Bishop at the relevant time by other persons. When they saw no sign of any investigation taking place they concluded that the matter had been ignored by the Bishop and believed it was pointless for them to raise their concerns.

Those who had been child victims stated that they had been told by the perpetrator that this was a secret and that if they told anyone what had occurred they would be punished and furthermore they would not in any event be believed. Some children accepted the "secret" and did not disclose until much later in life. For some when they spoke to the Inquiry it was the first time they had discussed the abuse with anyone.

Other child victims broke the secret almost immediately to their parents either explicitly or told their parents that they did not wish to have anything to do with the perpetrator again as they did not like him. These victims reported that after they broke the silence their parents in most cases did not force them to spend any time with the perpetrator and consequently they were not abused by him on any other occasions. Many of the persons who were harmed in this way reported that although they were not a victim they saw signs that another child was. They stated that many parents did not tell authorities what their child had alleged. There are no doubt a variety of reasons as to why parents took the matter no further.

Some people reported that they felt unable to disclose to their parents precisely what had happened but nevertheless indicated they did not wish to be alone with the perpetrator again. They stated they were punished by their parents for being rude and or ungrateful to the minister and were forced to spend time alone with him. The sexual assaults then continued and the conduct to which they were subjected became worse. People reported feelings of helplessness and despair and said they then had no idea how to prevent the abuse. After a period of two to three years they reported that the offender moved on to a new child. On at least one occasion a person speaking to the Inquiry expressed his deep regret that when an 11-year-old tried to talk to him about what was happening he refused to take part in the conversation because of his own relief that the minister had moved on and that he himself was no longer a victim. He stated that for a period of approximately eighteen years he has felt guilt that he took no steps to assist the younger child.

The Inquiry was also told about guilt experienced by other persons who were told whilst still children by other children of what a minister was doing to them. These people as adults feel they should have done something to help but as children of those times they probably did not have any idea where to turn for help or to whom they could tell their story. The

church must recognise that it takes courage and conviction for anyone whether they be an adult parent or child to voice anxiety about the behaviour of a church employee particularly one who is a minister of the church. Anyone who wants to raise concerns must have not only the relevant information about how, where and to whom these concerns should be made but also know that the matters they raise will be viewed seriously, treated confidentially, and investigated adequately.

It was clear from the submissions that the phrase “sexual abuse” or “sexual misconduct” is seen to cover a wide variety of behaviour. It includes physical contact from the person in the ministerial role, such as sexual touch and apparent accidental touching or brushing up against sexual areas of the body; tickling and playful aggression which is uncomfortable to the parishioner. Examples of this include a variety of sexual contacts ranging from the giving of inappropriate gifts, a prolonged hug, pressing up against the parishioner’s body when hugging, kissing on the lips, and sexual intercourse. The conduct encompasses verbal behaviour initiated by a minister, examples of which include, sexual talk or innuendo, suggestive comments, tales of sexual exploits or experiences, questions about the parishioner’s sexual relationship and the seeking of sympathy for problems occurring in the minister’s own relationship with spouse or partner.

If submissions to the Inquiry give an accurate picture of not just historical events but also current events, then it seems reasonable to draw the conclusion that, while there have been a number of accounts of paedophilic and hebephilic activity historically and in recent years, there was no witness who submitted that there were any indications of current paedophilic abuse or hebephilic abuse within the Anglican Church in Tasmania.

The Inquiry feels that a similar conclusion cannot be drawn with regard to clergy sexual misconduct with adult parishioners. While it is clear that all submissions which were made to the Inquiry were historical, it should be noted that in the final days before the Inquiry was completed a psychologist approached Dr. Crowley and said that one of his clients was giving serious consideration to making a submission but was concerned about the Inquiry’s independence. The psychologist said that his client had been the recipient of sexually inappropriate behaviour from an Anglican clergyman who, the psychologist understands, has some status in the Church, and that she was just one of a number who had received such attention from this man.

The psychologist was given assurances to relay back to his client, but when the client did not make contact with the Inquiry, further communication indicated that the woman was too anxious about telling her story, and none of the other women involved were prepared to talk. This reticence to tell their stories, even when assurances of independence from the Church are sought and given, is an indication of the difficulties that must be confronted in the process of creating a culture of awareness within the Church.

The Church’s constant message must be one which encourages potential complainants to move past their anxieties and fears. The Church should not cease from providing prominent and consistent assurances that complainants will be heard fully, honestly and compassionately and that complainants need not approach the Church administration but can make contact directly with the Sexual Harassment Response group.

Of particular concern also is the submission from one minister who spoke of his conversations with a colleague who had been part of a group of clergy with sexual proclivities towards young males. The minister involved in that group had attempted to extricate himself from the group but found it difficult because, in the words of the witness the minister designated P 1 had “never let up” trying to get the reluctant minister back into that clique. The minister who was endeavouring to break away had referred to the group, in conversations with our witness, as “that grubby little circle”.

It is imperative that some process be put in place so that never again in Tasmania will any minister of the Anglican Church, no matter how much status, charisma or persuasiveness he may have, be able to preside over and protect the activities of a group of that nature.

It is also vitally important that any minister who is struggling with any aspects of his sexuality feel that he can have access to appropriate counselling. Evidently, when the minister mentioned above sought psychiatric treatment for his feelings of being trapped in a “sham marriage” and for the confusion and distress that he was experiencing, the advice he was given from the psychiatrist was to “go and take a lover.

Recommendations for changes in the life, structure, policy and practice of the Anglican Church in Tasmania

The Inquiry was impressed by the positive directions already taken by the Anglican Church in Tasmania over recent years towards building a culture of awareness among the clergy and an arena of safety for youth.

Some of the positive initiatives already completed or implemented include:

- 1) The establishment of this Pastoral Inquiry into sexual misconduct by clergy or officers of the Church,
- 2) The formation of the Diocesan Sexual Harassment Response Group,
- 3) The formulation of the “Principles and Procedures for dealing with Sexual Harassment”, which puts in place a response strategy for dealing with complaints of sexual misconduct,
- 4) The drafting of a “Code of Practice for the Protection of Children within our Churches”, which details a complaint procedure for dealing with disclosures of child abuse,

- 5) The creation of a Code of Clergy Ethics, which rests on the four basic principles of Dignity of the Human Person; Justice and Integrity; Service in Humility and Love; and Shared Responsibility,
- 6) The preparation of a Course on Pastoral Care and Ethics and the trialling of that course which has already taken place with an evaluation to come.
- 7) The revised Camping Policy adopted by Anglican Camping Tasmania, and particularly the Code of Practice which deals with potential problems associated with physical contact.
- 8) The tightening of the selection procedures for camp leadership and camp ministry generally. A memorandum from the Current Camping Program Co-ordinator, dated September 1997, makes it clear that the modified procedures now in place were “designed to meet community expectations regarding the screening of leaders who are involved in ministry with children and young people”.

The Inquiry has made a number of recommendations which are interspersed throughout the body of this Report, but all recommendations in the Report are listed here for convenience.

Recommendations with regard to the Bishop’s powers

1. That the powers of the Bishop to deal with misconduct by clergy, including sexual misconduct, be broadened considerably
2. That the matter of the powers of the Bishop be placed on the agenda at the next Diocesan Synod with a view to putting in place whatever Ordinance is required to allow the Bishop the power to suspend or terminate a minister’s licence, when such action is manifestly appropriate.
3. That the next Diocesan Synod should consider adopting the current practice of the Diocese of Melbourne, where appointments are made on a basis of limited tenure, of five or ten years duration.

Recommendations regarding the Sexual Harassment policy and Sexual Harassment response group

4. That the process of contacting the Sexual Harassment Response group be seen to be more independent of the Church administration than it is currently.
5. That the 1800 number used by the Inquiry be retained so that people can make direct contact with the Sexual Harassment Response group, and not have to go through the Bishop’s secretary.
6. That additional material be written into the document on Principles and Procedures for dealing with sexual harassment, specifically the addition of a procedure which ensures that the complainant and the respondent be kept informed of the progress of the

assessment following the making of a complaint. This would include the complainant being advised of the recommendations which the Committee makes to the Bishop.

7. That Principles and Procedures for dealing with sexual harassment be expanded to include guidelines as to what will be done by the Sexual Harassment Response Group to ensure that the parish community, including the victim's family, are adequately supported whenever a matter of sexual exploitation by the minister or other officers of the Church in that parish comes to light.

Recommendations regarding ethical, professional and personal development for clergy.

8. That discussion on the Code of Clergy Ethics should involve substantial input from the laity and opportunities should be created for clergy and laity together to discuss the Code.

9. That the present Pastoral Care and Ethics Course be extended beyond the present 17 contact hours with the focus on personal development and respect for self.

10. That the current level of funding and resources for the Pastoral Care and Ethics program be examined with a view to ensuring that the program is adequately funded and resourced.

11. That Clergy Peer Review and Support Groups be established throughout the Diocese with meetings to be about every three weeks. Each group should comprise about four or five ministers and have representation from both High and Low Church streams.

12. That the standing agenda for the Peer Review and Support groups include time for discussion of salient personal and professional issues, and also time for matters related to ethics and professional standards.

13. That the Convenors of Peer Review and Support groups take very brief minutes at meetings so that group members can feel free to discuss issues without feeling that their words are to be noted down.

14. That the Convenors of each Peer review and Support group keep in regular contact with their Archdeacon who has overall responsibility for ensuring that groups function harmoniously.

15. That, as part of their continuing professional education, all clergy should develop their counselling skills through a course on Counselling Theory and Practice, with particular reference to boundary violations, power differentials and the like.

16. That Dr. Jim Young, psychologist, be requested to investigate all aspects of how a Counselling Course, with particular reference to pastoral counselling, could be formulated and delivered to clergy throughout Tasmania.

Recommendations regarding youth activities within the Diocese

17. That activities for youth within the Diocese be maintained and expanded. It is important that the Church shows that it will not be daunted by the abusive behaviour of some clergy and others involved in youth leadership over recent years. The community needs good models of beneficial youth activities and the Church is well placed to provide those models now that procedures associated with youth ministry have been improved.
18. That the Camping Code of Practice details what action should be taken where there are concerns that any staff member at camp may be acting in breach of the Code.
19. That children involved in any youth activities within the Church should be clearly educated as to the procedures to be followed if they see or experience any inappropriate behaviour, that is, to tell an adult whom they feel they can trust, and to use the 1800 number to make direct contact with the Sexual Harassment Response group.
20. That at any venue or camp where there is a Church Youth activity, the 1800 number be prominently displayed with a clear message that the right and proper procedure is to report inappropriate sexualised behaviour to the Contact person on that number.
21. That the Camping Policy be amended to show that the final responsibility for staff selection lies with the ACT Committee. This would mean that the Camp Director rather than having responsibility for staff selection, as at present, would merely have some input regarding preferred staff.
22. That any who work in any aspect of the Church's Youth Ministry should have training in understanding fundamental issues concerning sexual abuse, especially the process of victimisation and factors associated with vulnerability. Their training should also include how to respond appropriately if a child discloses.

Recommendations regarding changes to the Code of Practice for the Protection of Children

23. That the Code make mention of the time frame within which the child or other person reporting will be notified of what steps have been taken to that point.
24. That the Code include the provisions for education of children mentioned in Chapter 9 of this report.
25. That the Code include a passage which states that where there is no evidence of abuse but there is a suspicion that something inappropriate has occurred such information should be recorded in a secure central Church register, and that the register should be checked in relevant situations such as staff selection.

Recommendations regarding the legal perspective

26. Earlier in this report recommendations have been put concerning changes to each of the policies referred to. The changes proposed relate to the investigative phase, determination of misconduct, and sanctions. As apart of those proposals it is recommended that a register be maintained by the Chair of the Sexual Harassment Response Group Committee in which any conduct which has been the subject of a complaint is noted and kept for a period of ten years.

27. In all cases of current child sexual abuse there is a moral obligation on the contact person to notify the Police. In cases of adult sexual abuse or misconduct it is a question for the complainant, but they should not be actively discouraged if this is the course they wish to pursue.

28. In the event that Church authorities become aware of sexual abuse or misconduct they must remember the legal principle of negligence and the duty of care which they owe to other members of their congregation, youth group etc.

Recommendations regarding the named minister who is still active in this Diocese.

29. This man did not appear to express any remorse. At this stage he clearly did not understand the differential in his position as a married minister and that of a girl in her late teens. He will suffer no financial penalty if he is not able to practice as a minister. The right to minister is not an automatic right - it is a privilege. It is the recommendation of the Inquiry that serious consideration be given to either:

a) suspending his licence until he has completed a course in clerical ethics with particular regard to boundary violations. He should also undertake an extended period of counselling and close supervision of his work in ministry. On satisfactory completion of these conditions his licence could be reinstated, with the provision that he is not to be involved in any ministry with children or teenagers. or

b) in the event that (a) is not a feasible option, for whatever reasons, the Inquiry recommends that the following matters be considered, in accordance with the Principles & Procedures for dealing with Sexual Harassment.

The substance of the complaint was admitted by the respondent.

The complaint clearly involved sexual misconduct and abuse of power, particularly when one takes the variation in age into account.

The complainant is receiving both supportive and therapeutic counselling.

The complainant indicated that she finds it distressing when attending church to see or hear that the perpetrator is still active in ministry.

The complainant is considering whether she will institute legal proceedings.

The respondent's version has been outlined elsewhere in this report.

Any recommendation should:

- a) meet the needs of the complainant,
- b) ensure the cessation of any harassing behaviour,
- c) provide any necessary help for the alleged respondent.

At the same time, a message of deterrence must be sent and the Church community must know that breaches of this nature are being taken seriously and will not be tolerated.

Recommendations regarding the named ministers who are in other Dioceses.

30. It is the recommendation of the Inquiry that serious consideration be given to writing a letter to the Bishops of the relevant Dioceses, advising that an Inquiry has been conducted, that the panel are satisfied that there is prima facie evidence of a case to answer, and pending the allegations being put to the person's named they would not be considered suitable candidates for ministry involving children.

Recommendations regarding the named ministers who are deceased

31. It is the recommendation of the Inquiry that there is no benefit to be served by publicly naming these persons, especially when one considers that it is not possible to give them the opportunity to answer allegations.

References

American Psychiatric Association. (1994). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (Fourth edition). Washington, D.C.: Authors.

Australian Catholic Bishops' Conference and the Australian Conference of leaders of Religious Institutes. (1996). *Towards healing: Principles and procedures in responding to complaints of sexual abuse against personnel of the Catholic Church in Australia*. Hectorville, South Australia: National Committee for Professional Standards.

Australian Catholic Bishops' Conference and the Australian Conference of leaders of Religious Institutes. (1997). *Integrity in Ministry* (draft document).

Bradshaw. S. (1977). Ministers in Trouble: A study of 140 cases evaluated at the Menninger Foundation. *Journal of Pastoral Care*, 31, 230-238.

Brown, N. (1985). Historical perspectives on child abuse. In A. Downer (Ed.), *Prevention of child sexual abuse: A trainer's manual*. Seattle: Seattle Institute for Child Advocacy Committee for Children.

Browne, A. (1991). The victim's experience : Pathways to disclosure. *Psychotherapy*, 28, 17- 23.

Cashmore, J., & Bussey, K. (1987). Disclosure of child sexual abuse: Issues from a child-oriented perspective. *Australian Journal of Social Issues*, 22, 13-26.

- Fortune, M. (1989). *Is nothing sacred?*. San Francisco: Harper.
- Gilgun, J. (1995). "We shared something special": The moral discourse of incest perpetrators. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 57, 265-281.
- Groth, A.N., Hobson, W.F., & Gary, T.S. (1982). The child molester: Clinical observations. In J. Conte & D. Shore (Eds.), *Social work and child sexual abuse*. New York: Haworth.
- Hare, Robert. (1993). *Without Conscience*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Knight, I. (1997). *Out of darkness: Growing up with the Christian Brothers*. Fremantle: Fremantle Arts Centre Press.
- Lebacqz, Karen, & Barton, Ronald. (1991). *Sex in the Parish*. Louisville: John Knox Press
- Newell, Chris. (1996). Codes of clergy ethics: A note from the trenches. *St. Mark's Review*, 165, 16-18.
- Ormerod, N., & Orrnerod, T. (1995). *When ministers sin*. Sydney.: Millennium Books.
- Parkinson, P. (1997). *Child sexual abuse and the churches*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Peck, M. Scott. (1978). *The road less travelled*. New York: Simon & Schuster
- Peck, M. Scott. (1983). *People of the lie*. London: Arrow Books.
- Pollock, N, & Hashmall, J. (1991). The excuses of child molesters. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 9, 53-59.
- Sorenson, T., & Snow, B. (1991). How children tell: The process of disclosure in child sexual abuse. *Child Welfare*, 70, 3-15.
- Wyre, R. (1997). Paper presented at Educational Intensive on Perpetrators of Sexual Abuse, Melbourne, November, 1997.

Not the Way of Christ

Supplementary Report

*A supplement to the report of the Independent Pastoral
Inquiry into Sexual Misconduct by Clergy or Officers of the
Anglican Diocese of Tasmania
with particular reference to paedophilia*

A STATEMENT FROM THE DIOCESE

Upon receiving the report of the Inquiry into Sexual Misconduct by Clergy and Officers of the Anglican Church, the Diocese of Tasmania arranged for its prompt publication as a consequence of its perceived obligation to the Church and Community. Since then the Diocese has begun the process of reforming its policies and practices as recommended in the report.

It has become apparent that page 19 of that [full] report was incorrect and has aggrieved the Right Reverend Ronald Stone who had taken all the appropriate actions. The Diocese regrets any hurt and inconvenience that this may have caused.

On behalf of the Diocese of Tasmania

Peter Stuart
Acting Diocesan Secretary

ADDENDUM

After the Inquiry report “Not the Way of Christ” was forwarded to Bishop Newell, it was agreed that the 1800 number would remain open for a further fourteen days (with the option available to extend the time if necessary.)

A number of phone calls were received. Some of these calls related to persons who had already been named before the Inquiry. No further details were sought from those callers.

Other calls were outside the terms of reference. Approximately fourteen calls were received, making allegations against a minister who currently ministers in the State of Tasmania. Of these calls, four were from women who maintained that they had been “exploited” whilst in a vulnerable position. They named the perpetrator as P18. Two of these women wanted more time to consider whether they were prepared to meet with the Inquiry panel. Time was extended, and, although the women were prepared to discuss the matter by telephone, they did not seek to meet with the panel. The women were advised that they could later access the Sexual Harassment Response Group (if they chose to take that course). Other callers indicated they were friends or family of a person who had been abused by P18.

It is difficult to draw any conclusions about the incidents referred to when the panel have not been in a position to assess the credibility of the persons who have made phone contact.

In the Initial Report, at page 19, concerns were raised about the apparent “lack of action” taken by the Church hierarchy. It is appropriate that we make reference to the conclusions drawn therein about Bishop Stone. Since the report was published, we have received further correspondence from Bishop Stone.

In his letter to the Inquiry dated December 19, 1997, Bishop Stone indicated that he had little recall of the incident referred to and no files. He offered to be of further assistance to the Inquiry although no further assistance was sought.

By letter dated April 2, 1998 Bishop Stone indicated that he had now referred to files (located in Hobart) and enclosed copies of a number of documents for our attention.

The said documents make clear that Bishop Stone did act in relation to the complaints raised with him.

It is unfortunate that this material was not forwarded to the Inquiry before the Report was compiled. We regret any inconvenience or harm caused to Bishop Stone as a result of this information not being forwarded at an earlier date. Having now received this information, we believe it is appropriate that page 19 be amended by deleting the words “including Bishop Stone.”

In the initial Report we recommended that consideration be given to limited tenure (Recommendation 3). We have perused the Ministry and Tribunal Ordinance being submitted to Synod and believe it sufficiently addresses our concerns so that limited tenure is not regarded as essential.