

R. PICKERING.

On 16th January, 1986, I called at Gardenvale presbytery, but noone answered the door.

Fr. Ray Deal rang R. Pickering today to ask him to ~~arrange an appointment~~ come here for an appointment. Fr. Pickering indicated that he would not come unless he knew the subject matter of our meeting. Fr. Deal had indicated that the main issue was a personal matter which I would prefer to discuss at his presbytery; however, I called there to discover noone at home. I did not ~~see~~ foresee the possibility of repeating the call.

Fr. Deal then rang back to indicate that the matter was a personal one. It was a matter of deep concern to me; I did not wish to discuss it with anyone else but Fr. Pickering. In view of the friendship which I had constantly extended and which had always been directed towards Fr. Pickering's best interests, I had asked him to come. He was assured that it was entirely in Fr. Pickering's best interests that I was so acting, not in my own.

Fr. Pickering arrived, vested in caped soutane. He immediately commenced speaking of the situation of Fr. Mark Reynolds whose present situation he presumed needed explaining.

regarding  
I told him the story which I had invited him to come. (It had come from Dr. Peter Barker **REDACTED** but I did not advise Fr. P. of that fact.) He indicated that he had given drink to those whom he knew were offered it in their own homes. As regards any further activities, he completely derided them.

He told me that Bishop Kelly had always warned him that someone would misinterpret the open house which he has conducted to this stage.

He also advised that on occasions he was imprudent, but that there were no improprieties about which any legal action could be taken and which could do harm to the Church. Again and again he assured me that he would ask to be removed from his parish should he believe that he had ever acted in a way which could harm the church. His two worst and common dreams are that he could have murdered someone or that he was away from the parish of Gardenvale. I told him of the possibility of legal action and asked that he take such action that would do least harm to the Church should that possibility take place. Finally he promised that he would not admit anyone to the house unless specifically for an appointment.

We also spoke of the D.E.M.F. I told him that he was the catalyst who had changed the free giving aspect to tax. I also told him that I believed that it was quite dishonest to refuse to pay ~~tax~~ <sup>a quota</sup> and then advertise in his weekly bulletin advising that he needed money to pay the quota. We spoke in terms of diocesan and parochial interest. He volunteered to write an apology to me, but I advised him to write to the D.E.M.F. and send me a copy.

I indicated my profound sorrow that he was the one responsible for changing the procedure from quota to tax, and I gave him my assurance that I would use all in

my power to ensure that Gardenvale paid that tax.

He spoke considerably of the hurt that he had suffered at Clayton, both over the two schools and particularly of the fact that he did not receive insurance repayment in the terms in which he had been promised. He reckoned that such a procedure could have warranted going to court, but he loved the church too much to act in such a way.

There was considerable discussion on his part indicating how he had kept word according to letters previously written to me, etc. etc. etc.

14th February, 1986.