

REDACTED

29th January, 2000

Dear Bishop Newell,

I vividly recall my first meeting with you after The Mercury printed my "Simon" story, which revealed to all Tasmanians the truth about Anglican clergy sexual abuse. I came with a Christian friend, an Anglican lawyer, for moral support. You refused to see us both, Bishop, because it was contrary to your legal advice.

After indicating to me that our whole conversation was "without prejudice", you listened to me and then responded. You privately and personally expressed belief in my story that I had been sexually abused by not one but four diocesan priests. Despite the fact that my faith in the Anglican Church was shattered by my abuse, you chose to pray for me — "without prejudice", of course.

Bishop, the inquiry that you claimed the credit for in being the first bishop in Christendom to call was called because of my demands — not as a spontaneous initiative of episcopal morality. This inquiry revealed far more paedophile activity than that perpetrated by those priests who raped my innocence and passed me from one to the other like a sexual toy.

You now say that you have measures in place for abuse survivors today — a phone hotline and "an open heart".

We both know that the "open heart" is, at best, private because the public face of your Church is expressed to survivors through diocesan lawyers. This message is one of profound moral injustice, namely:

- The fiction that your priests are sub-contractors of spiritual services and, as such, not related legally to the church.
- No compensation.
- No public apologies.
- No recognition that the Church knew, or ought to have known, that a significant number of its clergy were paedophiles preying on parishoners' children.
- No acceptance of any responsibility for what happened.

I received an offer of one year's counselling costs for the counselling that you claim was my "perceived need". Provided that I indemnify the Diocese and Bishop against all legal redress, you were prepared to make an "ex-gratia gift" for my "perceived need for counselling".

In The Examiner recently, you spoke of the burden you experienced as Bishop in dealing with this issue. By inference that was then, and now is now. For those of us sexually abused by priests of your Church then is **now**. We live with post-traumatic stress disorder and continue to be spiritually and legally abused by a seemingly uncaring Church.


I have, Bishop, a "perceived need" for justice for myself, for other survivors of Anglican clergy abuse and for their families. Can you honestly say that you had no knowledge and received no complaints against convicted paedophile, the former Archdeacon of Burnie, Louis Victor Daniels?

Perhaps the answer lies in the shredded files of diocesan history. Morality demands that the injustice perpetrated by paedophile priests and a hostile diocesan authority be righted now.

Not once, since I first say you have I had a genuine offer of recompense, of justice, of sorrow from the church.

Rest assured, Bishop, that I will pursue personal justice and I will pursue the truth about diocesan cover-ups, paedophile rings and the issue of whether young Anglicans are still being preyed upon with your successor until I am satisfied that truth and justice have been served.

Yours sincerely,



David Gould