

HO04094HO S3/LL

FREEMANS AUSTRALIA

RECORD OF INTERVIEW

On 11/8/99 Hugh Robertson met Peter Stuart ("PS") for discussions. PS, born 23/1/63 is the Rector of Moonah Parish and Archdeacon of Clarence Parish. His phone no. is **REDACTED**.

PS has been an office holder with the Diocese of Tasmania since 1989.

The interview was undertaken with PS on the basis of information given to him by Bishop NEWELL and other Officers of the Diocese.

In discussions, the following emerged.

1. During Daniels' time with the Church and, as is presently the case, the Church in Tasmania had very few powers to direct or require a Rector to take certain actions, as, members of the clergy were office holders, not employees. (Details of this legal situation were provided by PS).
2. Not clear what powers the Bishop had to suspend a Rector, during Daniels' time with the Church.
3. In Daniels' time, any serious complaint about him would have been referred to the Bishop who, if he felt it appropriate, would have requested investigation by an Archdeacon who, if he felt Daniels' removal from office was necessary, would have recommended the Tribunal be convened. This did not occur.
4. Since Daniels' time, the Church in Tasmania has put in place a clearer process for dealing with ministry issues and complaints. (PS provided a copy of the Ordinance).
5. Changes made by the Church in Tasmania since Daniels' time were not only because of his actions. There were a number of other issues in procedural fairness.
6. Daniels first became involved with the Church as a member, then as a CEBS leader. This was before he was Deaconed and Priested.

7. The Diocese of Tasmania ("DOT") has limited control capacity over CEBS, a separately incorporated body.
8. It is believed Daniels was a school teacher in Tasmania before joining the Church.
9. In the past there has been little if any documentation generated regarding dealings between the Bishop and members of the clergy. This reflected the "pastoral" nature of the relationship.
10. Daniels wouldn't have applied in writing to join the Church. Daniels was appointed by Bishop Robert Davies who might know what Daniels' pre-Church profession was and/or why Daniels left his earlier profession.
11. PS had never heard Daniels may've left his earlier profession because of his inappropriate sexual conduct with children and did not know if any such allegations had ever been made.
12. While with the Church and before going to Deloraine as Rector there was one report/complaint in about 1982, of Daniels being involved in inappropriate sexual conduct with a young boy. Apparently, in or about 1981 (during Bishop Jerrim's administration of DOT), Bishop Jerrim was approached by a Minister of the Uniting Church on behalf of the parents of the boy. Apparently, the Uniting Church Minister (now deceased), advised Bishop Jerrim of Daniels' inappropriate sexual behaviour with the boy. Apparently Bishop Jerrim was never made aware of the identity of the boy or his parents, or the exact nature of the behaviour. It seems that after these discussions, Bishop Jerrim spoke to Daniels and was probably assured that it was a "one off" incident. Bishop Jerrim probably asked Daniels to amend his life. The matter probably went no further and was probably not reported to anyone else in DOT at that time. This matter did not result in any letters/reports to or about Daniels being generated or issued.
13. It appears that after Daniels started as Rector at Deloraine and before he left that Parish for Burnie, there was an occasion between 8/82 - 1/85 when Bishop Jerrim, (on his advices), warned Bishop Newell regarding Daniels. PS doesn't know the reason for the warning. Bishop Jerrim might recall this. The warning was probably to do with inappropriate sexual behaviour by Daniels. Although Bishop Jerrim remembered giving this warning to Bishop Newell, Bishop Newell does not recall this.

-
14. It appears Bishop Newell recalls an incident in or about 1987 when Daniels was still Rector at Deloraine. A school teacher approached Bishop Newell on behalf of three young boys, all alleging inappropriate sexual behaviour by Daniels at a CEBS camp(s). It appears Bishop Newell spoke to the boys who asked that the matter not be reported to Police or their parents. It appears that to Bishop Newell's mind, this was the first allegation of this type against Daniels. After the advice he received, Bishop Newell apparently spoke to the Primate of the day, Archbishop Sir John Grinrod about the matter and how it should be handled and followed his advice, with the result Bishop Newell discussed the matter with Daniels, who was referred to a Senior Priest for counselling and to a doctor. It is understood that Skipper was not one of these three boys who alleged inappropriate behaviour by Daniels.
15. It appears that in July 1994, while Daniels was Rector at Burnie, a male (one of the three boys who, in 1987, alleged inappropriate sexual behaviour by Daniels at a CEBS camp(s)) "revisited" that issue and raised it again in discussions with Bishop Newell. There was then a confidential legal settlement between Daniels and the complainant. Bishop Newell sought counsel from the then Primate Archbishop Keith Rayner and followed his advices about handling the matter. This "revisitation" resulted in further discussions between Bishop Newell and Daniels and Bishop Newell calling on Daniels to live appropriately. As a result of this "revisitation", Bishop Newell issued a letter to Daniels. This letter contained 6 principal points, namely:
- (a) Neither Bishop Newell nor the Church would seek in any way to impede any civil or criminal action taken against Daniels, arising from his alleged sexual assaults.
 - (b) The institution of any civil or criminal action against Daniels, because of his alleged sexual assaults, would require his immediate resignation. Daniels' written compliance with this was required.
 - (c) A requirement that Daniels give his written solemn assurance to Bishop Newell, that since the former's verbal admonishment by the latter in 1987, there had been no repetition or further occurrence of criminal assault by Daniels, with consequent breach of trust.
 - (d) Bishop Newell admonished Daniels to live his life beyond reproach saying "...Allegations which satisfy me that you have engaged in

conduct disgraceful in an ordained person and productive or likely to be productive of scandal or ill-report, or allegations of improper sexual or other behaviour made against you and, which satisfy me as being with foundation, will lead to your being required to resign as a licensed priest. Your acknowledgment of your responsibility in this regard is required."

- (e) If Daniels was to seek or be offered a position in another Diocese, Bishop Newell would be bound for the sake of the Church, to inform the Bishop of such other Diocese regarding the matters to which this letter referred.
 - (f) Bishop Newell required Daniels to decline any offer of episcopal appointment otherwise Bishop Newell would disclose the situation to the nominating or electing authority.
16. As far as Bishop Newell is concerned he never had any other complaint regarding Daniels between 1987 and the "revisitation".
 17. Later again in 1994 there was another complaint to Bishop Newell about Daniels being involved in inappropriate sexual behaviour with a young boy. At this stage, Daniels was still Rector at Burnie. Within a very short time of this complaint, possibly hours, Daniels resigned. Bishop Stone dealt with the issue and saw Daniels on behalf of Bishop Newell. There are some documents relating to this matter.
 18. Subsequent to Daniels resigning from the Church, Bishop Newell was approached by another male alleging Daniels had interfered with him before 1981. This complainant, (possibly David Gould), threatened legal action. This matter is still unresolved.
 19. During 1999 PS was approached by a male who alleged Daniels had sexually interfered with him before 1981. This male asked PS if the Church kept any records which would show if his parents had earlier complained to the Church about the same matter. At this stage, there are no formal proceedings in respect this matter.
 20. Robert Brandenburg was apparently the National Treasurer of CEBS at one stage. Possibly, he came to Tasmania on CEBS business, on occasions. Possibly he attended a CEBS camp(s) in the period 1982 - 84.

21. Brandenburg had no involvement with DOT. Brandenburg apparently lived in Adelaide. Maybe he had some association with the Diocese of Adelaide.
22. On no occasion was Brandenburg ever in Tasmania to do with DOT.
23. It is believed that Daniels and Brandenburg were acquainted.
24. PS doesn't know the reason for which Brandenburg may have been at Penny Royal Motel in Launceston with Skipper in the period September - October 1995. The Diocese wouldn't have any reason to know.
25. PS doesn't know if or not, Brandenburg was ever in Tasmania for personal reasons.
26. The first time DOT was aware of any possibility Brandenburg may have been involved in inappropriate sexual conduct with young boys was when Skipper's Writ issued.
27. It appears that Skipper first became involved with the Church (at St Mark's at Deloraine) following his father's death, however, this is not certain.
28. PS doesn't know:
 - (a) where Skipper lived at the time he first became involved with the Church,
 - (b) the extent of this involvement and
 - (c) who was instrumental in getting him involved.
29. Understood that Skipper's father suicided. Means not known. Not known if Skipper involved with the Church immediately before his father's death.
30. Not known when Skipper first went to Burnie and if or not his was after his High School education.
31. It is understood that Skipper was subsequently involved with the Church as a Youth Worker in Burnie.
32. Daniels was Rector and Archdeacon when Skipper first arrived in Burnie and living in the Rectory. It appears that while Daniels was in Burnie and before this, he had a shack at Meander.
33. After Skipper arrived in Burnie he went to live at the Rectory, with Daniels. Not known when he was there, for what periods or, how regularly. It would not be normal for the Diocese to know who was residing in a Rectory, which is provided rent and lease free, to clergy.
34. At and around the time Skipper and Daniels were living at the Rectory there was also another male, christian name Geoff, living there. Apparently Geoff

- was a schizophrenic and lived at the Rectory fairly permanently. Not known if Geoff was from Tasmania or Melbourne.
35. While in Burnie, Skipper was involved with St George's Church. While in Burnie, Skipper was a Youth Officer. He may also have been a Server and a lay reader. Certainly, while in Burnie, Skipper was responsible for some youth work in the Parish.
 36. Not known when Skipper ceased living at Rectory in Burnie. Daniels resigned from the Church in 11/94. Not sure if Skipper stopped living at the Rectory before or after 11/94.
 37. There is no indication that the Church first learnt of the suggestion Daniels had been involved in sexual misconduct with Skipper, before Skipper's Writ was issued.
 38. PS doesn't know if/why Skipper was at Penny Royal on 1/1/84 with Daniels.
 39. Nothing has been heard to suggest that Skipper's mother ever expressed any concern to the Church, about any type of association between her son and Daniels.
 40. It is understood that after Daniels resigned from the Church he moved to Canberra.
 41. It is believed that after Skipper left Burnie, he went to Canberra. If so, not known when.
 42. There have been suggestions that Skipper went to work for the Public Service in Canberra. It has been suggested that for some time while he was in Canberra, Skipper was living with Daniels.
 43. There are unconfirmed suggestions that at one stage there may have been four males living together in Canberra and that the males were Daniels, Skipper, the person Geoff and another.
 44. PS doesn't know if while he was living in Deloraine, Burnie or Canberra, Skipper was in an emotional/physical/sexual relationship with Daniels and/or Brandenburg.
 45. If any ongoing emotional/physical/sexual relationship between Daniels and Skipper was occurring in Canberra and then ceased, PS doesn't know when or under what circumstances it ceased and/or if another male was involved.
 46. There is nothing to suggest Skipper ever complained of sexual interference by Daniels and/or Brandenburg, before the Writ was issued.

RECORD OF INTERVIEW: PETER STUART

7

-
47. Not known if Skipper was ever warned of the risk of sexual interference by Daniels and/or Brandenburg.
 48. Brandenburg committed suicide in Adelaide in about May - June 1999. There are suggestions that at the time, there were investigations in progress regarding the possibility Brandenburg had been or was involved in inappropriate sexual conduct with children.
 49. PS hasn't heard anything to suggest the possibility Skipper was suffering emotional stress/damage prior to 2/7/95.
 50. PS hasn't heard any suggestion of the possibility that any emotional stress/damage which Skipper suffers, may have been caused by factors totally extraneous to Daniels and/or Brandenburg.
 51. PS knows of no indication Skipper ever suffered any physical damage because of the attentions by Daniels and/or Brandenburg.
 52. PS believes that during the period 1970 - 1988, the selection criteria for clergy, was largely for the decision of the Bishop.

HNR

12/8/99