

**Board of Inquiry into the handling of claims of sexual abuse and misconduct in the Anglican Diocese of Adelaide.**

*Statement by Members of the Board*

1. In paragraph 185 of its report dated 26 May 2004, the Board referred to the assertions of the then CEO of Anglicare that, in mid-1997, when considering allegations made by the witness McGlennon concerning the conduct of Brandenburg, had sought legal advice both before and after the formal interview of Brandenburg conducted on 5 December 1997. It recorded that the Board had pursued that aspect of the evidence with the solicitor nominated by the then CEO. That solicitor had expressed no memory whatsoever of being consulted as asserted and had never heard the name Brandenburg.
2. The lastmentioned paragraph accurately reported what had been said to the Board at the time. This situation was specifically put to the former CEO, when he was invited to give evidence before it.
3. It should be mentioned that the exchange with the solicitor in question had been preceded by an approach to the then successor of his former legal firm, a partner of which had stated to the executive officer of the Board that there had been an amalgamation of firms and a probable destruction of files in respect of the relevant period. That partner had referred the Board to the nominated solicitor for further information.
4. Following the interview by it of the former CEO of Anglicare, the Board received no further input from him on the topic and proceeded, in due course, to draft and publish the report on the basis of the material that it then had.
5. In mid-September 2004 the Board received an assertion that objective evidence was available to indicate that, in late November 1997, the former CEO of Anglicare, did consult the solicitor in question concerning allegations made by McGlennon in relation to Brandenburg; and that there was contact by the former CEO with the solicitor subsequent to the Brandenburg interview.
6. The Board acknowledges that, on the material now made available to it, the information originally supplied, as outlined in paragraph 1 above, has been shown to be inaccurate.
7. However, as appears from paragraph 190 of its report, this does not undermine the principal points that the Board made in relation to what it conceived to be the inappropriate mode of conduct of inquiry and interview and the failure to make a report, as referred to.

- 2 -

8. The Board does, nevertheless, concede that, on the evidence now available, any adverse inferences that may arise as to the credibility of the former CEO, arising from the initial, incorrect statements made to it by the nominated solicitor, cannot be sustained.

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a series of loops and a long horizontal stroke ending in a sharp point.

8 November 2004.