

Confidential

A Statement by the Right Reverend Phillip Newell, Bishop of Tasmania regarding interviews with ^{BYG} Peter Francis, and ^{BYM} during 1987.

I have done my best to recall the sequence of events and interviews which took place in 1987. Although I cannot be absolutely certain of every detail of chronology, recourse to my 1987 appointment diary shows appointments as follows:

Wednesday, 3rd June, 1987 at 3.00 p.m.:	Peter Francis and ^{BYG}
Friday, 5th June, 1987 at 9.15 a.m.:	Peter Francis and ^{BYG}
Thursday, 18th June, 1987 at 4.30 p.m.:	Peter Francis and ^{BYG}
Friday, 19th June, 1987 at 4.15 p.m.:	Miss Sue Clayton
Saturday, 27th June, 1987 at 4.15 p.m.:	^{BYM}

Early in 1987 I was approached by Miss Sue Clayton, an Anglican closely connected with youth ministry and Christian Education, and a school teacher working with the Tasmanian Education Department.

She came to me on behalf of ^{BYG}, ^{BYM} and Mr Peter Francis who had confided with her their concerns at experiences they told her had taken place at an Anglican Boys' Society camp at Montgomery Park. It was alleged that the Reverend Lou Daniels, then Rector of the Parish of Deloraine, had earlier, on a number of occasions, interfered with them during a camp or camps. They were concerned about it, wanted me to know about it, put a stop to such things and to ensure that they could not happen again.

It was alleged that there were other persons who had had similar experiences but as far as I can remember these were the only ones who were named.

I saw Miss Clayton as being the confidant of the persons concerned, exercising a counselling role towards them.

Miss Clayton indicated that she believed the young men did not want to inform their parents but desired that the priest be stopped and disciplined in some way.

As a result of Miss Clayton's representations to me I arranged a series of meetings as indicated above.

At exactly what time it was it is difficult for me now to say, but at some stage in the interviewing process I asked the boys to put in writing their account of what had happened. This was so that I could have a statement in writing, but was also necessary because they had some difficulty verbalising their allegations and were a little reluctant, perhaps embarrassed, to be specific. It was that, I think, which led to my suggestion that they write out their account and sign it. I subsequently received two accounts, the one from ^{BYM} being signed, the one from ^{BYG} not being signed. I did not receive a written statement from Peter Francis who did not seem overly concerned and, in fact, did not want to proceed any further with the matter.

- 2 -

The series of interviews enabled me to ascertain from the boys their allegations of what had occurred. It also enabled me to see the Priest concerned and inform the boys of the action which I had taken or was proposing to take. I needed to be satisfied that they were continuing to receive advice and counsel from Miss Clayton and that they were satisfied both with this and with regard to my actions about the priest.

My file shows that I wrote to ^{BYG} [redacted] and ^{BYM} [redacted] on 5th August, 1987 offering to meet with them again and asking them to arrange a mutually agreeable time. My diary does not show any further appointments with them. My recollection is that they did not further follow up that invitation.

I later saw Miss Clayton again. I do not think it was a formally arranged interview in the office, but rather took place when I saw her at some function somewhere in the diocese. My conversation with her confirmed my impression that there was general satisfaction with the outcome and that there was no desire to pursue the matter further at that time.

Recollection of action taken with regard to the Reverend Lou Daniels

I need in what follows to be sensitive to the privileged nature of what takes place between a Bishop and one of his clergy, however, because of the seriousness of the matters under consideration I list the following actions taken.

First, my diary indicates that on Thursday, 4th June, 1987, I first raised the issue with the priest in the Rectory at Deloraine and that there were a number of subsequent interviews. I confronted the priest with the allegations made by the two young boys who had made written statements and expressed their concern for others who may have found themselves in a similar position but who had not come forward.

If he did not explicitly admit responsibility and guilt he certainly acted as one who did not want to deny the allegations and who was prepared to accept my demands and discipline.

Secondly, I was at pains to state what might be regarded as obvious - that his actions were totally unacceptable and potentially could be the subject of charges. I further pointed out that such actions cannot be tolerated in those who hold positions of leadership and trust in the Church.

Thirdly, and in particular, I required the priest to resign from the Chairmanship of the Anglican Boys' Society and to discontinue any and all association with the youth work of the diocese.

Fourthly, I required that he seek the counsel and ministry of his spiritual director and counsellor and that he follow any advice given to him. He was severely rebuked by me for gross failure in a position of great responsibility in which the Church and parents

- 3 -

had trusted him with a duty of care. I placed him under discipline indicating that I would need to be satisfied as to amendment of life before he could expect preferment of any kind or even a move to another parish.

Fifthly, I consulted Dr John Morris, specialist physician with particular skills in human behaviour, and required the priest to see him.

Sixthly, I advised, and took counsel from, the Primate of the Anglican Church of Australia, the Most Reverend Sir John Grindrod concerning the course of action outlined above.

The priest accepted that which I required of him. I was satisfied in subsequent meetings and discussion that he had removed himself from all responsibility for youth ministry in the Church, had sought and accepted professional counsel, and was chastened to the point of amendment.

Finally, I further questioned him in the latter half of 1988 when his name was proposed to me for appointment as Rector as Parish of Burnie. Again in the circumstances I could see no continuing impediment to his appointment to another parish.



Phillip K. Newell
Dated 6th May, 1994