

Anglican Church Diocese of Newcastle
Professional Standards Committee

CONFIDENTIAL REPORT

RE: Ian Neil Barrack

1. Mr Barrack was an ordination candidate and student at Morpeth Theological College circa. 1997 – 1999. He was married. In 1997 - 1998, whilst at the college, he perpetrated sexual abuse on a minor, ^{CKU}, who was a 14 year old son of a fellow student at the college (now Rev ^{CKR}) and who lived in college accommodation at the time of the abuse.
2. Mr Barrack was convicted on 22 September 2006 in the Local Court and is presently in jail.
3. Rev ^{CKR} has brought several issues for consideration by the PSC.

ABUSE

4. The particulars of the abuse are unknown. However the perpetrator has been convicted. There was a “sex toy – sheep with plastic male penis” given to the victim which was provided to Archdeacon Bruce Hoare (then Chair of Examining Chaplains) in Sep/Oct 1998 by the victim’s Mother in the context of her notifying the complaint to the “system”. It was subsequently returned to her one week later when she was told to tell Barrack that she was disgusted by the item. She did as requested.
5. The abuse has had a profound effect on ^{CKU} who is now a young man. He is distrustful of all but especially the church and any official from it. The criminal justice process was traumatic as was the failure of the church to act. He has some relationship and employment difficulties but with his Mother and other’s support is gradually coping with things. This description is only a summary and does not fully do justice to the effects of the abuse as described by his Mother. He is planning n overseas trip in the next little while and this is seen by his Mother as an opportunity to move forward.

PROCESS FAILURES

6. The abuse was reported to Archdeacon Hoare in Sep/Oct 1998 at the time when the “sex toy” was provided. At he time he laughed and then said he would take it up with the Bishop. Nothing more was heard from the church until Rev ^{CKR} was called to a meeting with the then Bishop in May 1999.
7. The allegations were not reported to the Police until May 2002 although it appears that the DoCS and Police were in attendance at the May 1999 meeting with the Bishop, Archdeacon Hoare and Registrar Peter Mitchell.
8. Archdeacon Hoare made sporadic contact between 2002 and 2006. In 2006 he rang to enquire as to the progress of the case because “ the Dean doesn’t know”. But no real or effective pastoral support was offered or given.

9. Rev ^{CKR} was informed by Archdeacon Hoare in 1999 that Barrack had been involved in a extra-marital homosexual relationship with another married student during a 1997 St Joseph Kincumber retreat and that the diocese was aware of this. He was not removed from college until 1999.
10. Barrack had support throughout the court process. A diocesan priest attended the hearings in full clerical dress. He gave character evidence in support of the “penitent” accused although there has been no apology or any other reconciliatory move by the perpetrator towards his victim. Paul Rosser attended the hearings apparently to look out for the diocesan interest. Rev ^{CKR} and her son the victim had no support until the last hearing when, with her permission, Rev Rosemary Gillham, contact person, represented us and stood with her. Jean Saunders gave some support as well.
11. Rev ^{CKR} has recently had an opportunity to talk with Bishop Farran and this has been satisfactory to her.

RESPONSE

12. Support needs to be given to both the victim and his Mother. Counselling has been offered to both at diocesan expense and accepted by Rev ^{CKR}. This is helpful and may need to continue for a time. It is the bare minimum which needs to be done.
13. At an appropriate time and place both the victim and his Mother deserve an apology from a representative of the church both for the abuse and for the church’s failures to deal with it appropriately and failure to support them along the way when we became aware of the abuse.
14. There is no indication that the victim or his Mother are in a frame of mind to sue the church. That is not their issue. They just wanted to be supported and cared for and for the abuser to be dealt with. Now he is convicted and imprisoned the last matter is dealt with but the first two are still outstanding.

PROPOSAL FOR CARE & ASSISTANCE

15. It is proposed that the diocese offer, on a without prejudice / act of grace basis, to give \$2,000 to the victim ^{CKU} as a contribution towards the costs of his overseas trip. This would NOT be compensation and is not to “buy him off” but simply be a gesture to say: we care, we are sorry and it’s not just words. A “bunch of flowers” if you like. The symbolism would be significant because he and his Mother are both hoping that the trip will be a healing time and it would be good for the church to contribute to the potential healing. He has indicated through his Mother that he would accept such a gift on that basis. He leaves mid December.

OTHER POSSIBLE ACTION

16. The PSC should consider what other action should be taken to express the care and concern of the church for this victim and his family. Apart from counselling it may be appropriate to offer some additional help to Rev ^{CKR} by way of holiday accommodation or some other gesture.

17. Some form of apology should also be offered. This should be negotiated with the Bishop.
18. Perhaps the story should be “told” in some way in the diocesan newspaper for public acknowledgement of the abuse and the conviction.

Philip Gerber
DPS