

STATEMENT TO ROYAL COMMISSION

I was ordained a bishop in March 1984. During the 1980s and early 1990s I was not a member of the committee dealing with sexual abuse, so I simply left that committee to get on with its work, though I felt an increasing unease that it did not seem to be producing the protocols the Church needed.

Then in May 1994 I was asked to be a member of the Committee for Professional Standards, and, indeed, with a special personal mandate from the leaders of the Conference to see if I could accelerate the work. My involvement began then and continued until 2003. I was a member of the committee for three years, then co-chair for six years. (The bishops were working with the leaders of religious institutes on this issue, so there was a religious co-chair.)

I was able to put myself into the position of the person responsible for drafting the response to complaints. I can claim to have been the most significant person in drafting the protocol that became known as *Towards Healing*, but I never acted alone, I owed a great debt to other individuals, and everything had to be approved by the committee and then by the entire Bishops' Conference.

THE CONTEXT OF THE PROTOCOL

It was quickly decided that we would try to refer as many complainants as possible to the police. Several provisions in *Towards Healing* cover this point, and they have been strengthened in later revisions of the document.

In addition, I knew that there was an obligation to refer all criminal offences to the police in the State in which I lived, New South Wales, whether the complainant wanted this or not. I believe that the Child Protection Unit of the NSW Police was informed of every complaint that came to the Professional Standards Office in that State. It was agreed with that unit that we would refer the name of every accused person and give an account of the substance of the complaint, though we would not include the name of the complainant without that person's consent.

I must confess, however, that I was not aware that the same legal obligation did not exist in most other States and, indeed, that legislation to that effect had actually been repealed. This knowledge has come to me only recently and I am still amazed that it should be so.

At the same time, we were aware that the police and the criminal courts were a long way short of providing a complete solution. We found that very few of

those who approached the *Towards Healing* process had any interest in going to the police. We heard many reasons for this, but the major two were the fear that everything would be public and the fear of being cross-examined by an opposing barrister.

We concluded that the police and the criminal courts would still be our primary focus and we would do our best to steer complainants in that direction, but that we also had to try to provide an alternative. Otherwise, all those people who were afraid of the criminal courts would have nowhere to go and would be denied any form of justice. We felt that the Church had an obligation to try to fill this gap.

THE CODE OF CANON LAW

We then looked at the law of the universal Church and its provisions for processing criminal cases. We quickly found that this law would be so inadequate for cases of sexual abuse that it would be a sham. It was a criminal process that was designed largely for religious offences such as heresy or breaking the seal of confession, and was of no use in cases of sexual abuse.

For example, it had a statute of limitations of a mere five years from the time of the offence, and this alone would have excluded 99% of all victims of abuse. It also required a collegiate tribunal of three judges, a promotor of justice and a notary, all five having to be priests, so that a victim of abuse would have to appear before a tribunal of five priests in black suits.

However great the faults of the Australian bishops have been over the last thirty years, it still remains true that the major obstacle to a better response from the Church has been the Vatican. However slow the Australian bishops may have been to respond, the Vatican has been far slower. It still has a long way to go.

We concluded that the criminal courts in practice excluded most complainants, but that the procedures of the Code of Canon Law were no substitute, so we would have to invent something of our own.

A SIMPLE PROCEDURE

One of the victims I was in touch with at this time worked for an organization that processed complaints against the members of a certain profession, so I spoke with him. He said very strongly that we should not do what his organization did. They had a very thick book of detailed provisions, so detailed that both those making the accusation and those defending

themselves felt lost in the system. He strongly urged me to come up with a system so simple that victims of abuse could read it and understand what it said. This greatly influenced me in the writing of *Towards Healing*.

APRIL 1996

It was at the meeting of April 1996 that our committee presented a comprehensive plan to the bishops, going well beyond the one question of a response to complaints, but also including many of the essential points of what would become the *Towards Healing* document. While it was a plan of our entire committee, I was the one presenting it and arguing for it, so a lot of the attention was focused on myself.

There was much discussion, at times heated, with some of the leaders insisting that everything had to be vetted by lawyers. One bishop called me a fanatic, another an avenging angel, and yet another accused me of "acting like Adolf Hitler in the way you harangued and bullied the bishops." We returned to the discussion again and again over an entire week.

Despite all of this, I believe it was the moment when the Australian bishops began to turn from past practices towards a new way of responding to victims of sexual abuse. Most of the opposition came from some senior members who could make a lot of noise (and who I now know would have had a history of handling matters in other ways), but the majority supported the direction our committee was proposing. Forty-one bishops were present and most motions were passed by a majority of 36 in favour to 5 against.

Needless to say, not all individuals changed in the same way and at the same pace. The following few years involved a process of education and gradual adaptation. As it turned out, a number of bishops were in favour of the proposals, but at the same time reserved their right to make their own decisions in individual cases.

The matters were also discussed by the religious leaders, with only one institute (the Jesuits) refusing to join, though they did join a few years later after a change in their leader.

In about October of that same year, 1996, however, and before *Towards Healing* had been finalized and made public, the Archbishop of Melbourne, the largest diocese in the country, suddenly and out of nowhere announced that he was setting up a different process in his diocese. This disconcerted everyone, for it would have helped us greatly if we had all worked together and been seen to be working together. The claim that the Melbourne protocol came before *Towards Healing* is, therefore, less than the full story.

STATUS OF *TOWARDS HEALING*

The Australian Conference of Catholic Bishops is not a legislative body. The only persons with the power to make binding laws in the Catholic Church are the pope for the universal Church and the bishop for his diocese. So *Towards Healing* has no legal force to compel individual bishops. This is an obvious weakness. It also explains why Archbishop Pell could ignore the rest of the bishops and set up his own process.

The only way to obtain legislative force for the process would have been to forward it to Rome and ask that it be “recognized”, that is, that it become, in effect, papal law for Australia (canon 455). We could not do this, for we knew that Rome would have insisted that our process conform to Canon Law, with its five-year statute of limitations and its provisions for a collegiate tribunal of priests etc.

We attempted to give it a more coercive power by including at the beginning the sentence: “It is a public document that establishes public criteria according to which the community may judge the resolve of Church leaders to address sexual abuse within the Church. If we do not follow the principles and procedures of this document, we will have failed according to our own criteria.”

DIFFICULTIES FOR THE BISHOPS IN *TOWARDS HEALING*

Towards Healing created two serious difficulties for the Australian bishops.

Firstly, it meant that they were acting outside, and indeed contrary to, canon law. This led to a situation where a Cardinal in Rome told an Australian bishop that *Towards Healing* was a nothing, an empty piece of paper and that he was obliged to give a certain priest a new appointment. The bishop refused to do so, cited his judgement in conscience before God alone, declared the priest an “unacceptable risk” and refused to give him an appointment. For some years there was a stand-off between the two. Had the matter been pushed further, the bishop could have been dismissed from his office.

Secondly, it created serious problems in the relationship between bishops and their priests. Some accused priests began to say that, in order to protect themselves, bishops were throwing innocent priests to the wolves and, under *Towards Healing*, finding them guilty on flimsy evidence. These claims gained significant credence among priests. Some accused priests began to claim their rights under the Code of Canon Law, which, as I have indicated, would have seen nearly all cases rejected at the outset and provided an environment hostile to victims in the rest.

I mention these points because they underline the fact that, in adopting *Towards Healing*, the Australian bishops were creating serious difficulties for themselves. They went ahead because, however timid some of them were about the new process, they were unwilling to say to victims, "Go to the police, and if you don't want to do that, then tough luck."

A CHURCH BODY

Towards Healing also had the weakness that it was a body set up by the Church and seen to be under the control of the Church. As such, it would always be accused of bias.

This situation arose because, in working with the bishops in office in 1994-1996, I made the pragmatic assessment that I was already asking for great change in those bishops and that I would not have been successful if I had asked them to set up and pay for a system over which they had no control. Everything that occurred in the subsequent debate in the Conference convinces me that my assessment at that time was correct.

Instead, we wrote into the text the requirement that the Resource Group based in each State "shall consist of at least one priest and one religious and a suitable number of other persons (no more than ten), both men and women, of diverse backgrounds,¹ skilled in the area of child protection, the social sciences, civil and church law and industrial relations."

I believe that most States followed these provisions, both in letter and in spirit. At least some of the members of the Resource Groups were not Catholics and the process was not an in-house Catholic one. In New South Wales we even had an acting police officer on this group. The media have recently sought to present this in negative terms, but in fact she was of great assistance and ensured that we were acting according to police requirements.

I have also been told that there has always been a police officer on the Victorian Professional Standards Resource Group. For most of the time it was an officer named Paul Murnane. The phrase I have heard repeated from him is that he "kept the police informed", but I do not know the details of what this might mean. I understand that he was most unhappy when the Deputy Police Commissioner in that State recently told the Victorian Parliamentary Inquiry that the Church had never referred a single case to the police.

I do not know what the relationship between the *Towards Healing* process and the police has been in other states.

¹ A later edition inserted "of diverse backgrounds and faith traditions".

I grant, however, that the public perception has been of an in-house process. I like to think that the bishops of today, 2013, would be more open to a process not controlled by the Church.

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF *TOWARDS HEALING*

The major negative in the early days was that, because *Towards Healing* had no coercive power, various bishops dispensed themselves, not from the entire document, but from this or that aspect of it. With the example of Melbourne before their eyes, they felt free to do this. Over the years this has gradually changed as pressure has mounted on bishops and they have realized that *Towards Healing* gives them a protection that they need, though I still cannot give a guarantee of complete observance.

I would be surprised if any bishop had simply moved an offender from one position to another in the years since 1997, though again I cannot give any guarantee. If any bishop has, he has no excuses at all.

In its early days *Towards Healing* worked very well. Because it heard only cases in which the complainant did not wish to go to the police (so there was no immediate threat of imprisonment), it obtained admissions of guilt from a significant percentage (perhaps 40%) of the accused, far greater than in the criminal courts. If this didn't solve all problems, it at least enabled a great amount of healing to take place.

Later this changed when the cases became more adversarial on both sides.

On the side of accused priests there were other priests who instantly believed all protestations of innocence and told the accused that bishops were throwing priests to the wolves to save themselves, and that they should say nothing, admit nothing, engage a lawyer, fight the accusation and claim their rights under Canon Law. This is what happened more and more, so that the admissions of guilt fell greatly, and the number of cases that were resolved diminished greatly.

On the side of victims, many were approached by lawyers and other victim advocates, who encouraged them to see all personnel of the *Towards Healing* process as totally insincere and dishonest, to forget everything else and concentrate on obtaining the largest possible lump sum of money.

In this, I believe, they were not helping victims. Money, generous money, has its important place, but it does not heal the wounds and for most victims it is not the major thing they seek. For most victims an admission by the offender and the Church authority that what happened was wrong, that the victim was

in no way to blame, and that everything will be done to ensure that future offences do not occur is far more important. For this to occur, some minimum rapport between victim and Church authority must exist, and an adversarial system does not encourage this. I feel that lawyers and other advocates have often been serving their own interests as much as those of the victims.

I notice that, in the most recent revision of *Towards Healing* (2010), this situation has apparently become so bad that the provision has been introduced, "If the complainant chooses to be represented by a lawyer in seeking compensation from the Church Authority, and is not seeking any form of pastoral support or other engagement with the Church, then the matter should proceed outside of *Towards Healing* by the normal means appropriate to the resolution of civil claims."

COMPENSATION

This leads to the question of compensation. This was always a field in which the bishops and religious leaders never gave any authority to our committee. It was the field above all others in which they were unwilling to allow control to pass out of their hands. One religious leader once consulted me on this subject, but that was all, though I understand that in more recent years a significantly larger number have consulted Sister Angela Ryan on this matter.

The criticism is made that Catholic Church Insurance has had too much influence on the subject of compensation. Against this, I have always believed that the bishops control the Insurance Company rather than the other way around. If there is any truth in the criticism, then it has been here in the decisions of the individual bishops or religious leaders concerning compensation rather than in any part of the process of *Towards Healing* that it has occurred.

PROFESSOR PARKINSON

In either 1997 or 1998 Professor Patrick Parkinson came to see me. He was the Dean of Law at Sydney University and had published a book on sexual abuse within the Christian churches. He is not a Catholic. He quizzed me at length concerning *Towards Healing* and found himself satisfied that we were serious about confronting abuse. The image he used was that, while some other protocols he had seen stood on the road and looked down at the victim in the ditch, we were ready to climb down into the ditch with them.

He became a wonderful helper and was the major figure in the first revision of *Towards Healing* published in 2000. Among other changes introduced was one determining that each diocesan bishop and religious leader must have, or

have access to, a Consultative Panel to advise and assist. This was a group of independent persons who would provide necessary expertise, give further guarantees that the process was not totally in-house and ensure that bishops and religious leaders did not dispense themselves from any requirements of *Towards Healing*. Hopefully, it would also assist in the question of compensation. I understand that he was also involved in the revision of 2010.

Later he became disillusioned with *Towards Healing*, but this was over what he saw as the failure of one religious leader (the Salesians) to follow essential provisions of the protocol. He sent me copious material on this dispute, but accepted that, without listening to the other side, I was in no position to make a judgement. He would be in no position to deny the entire protocol, for he had been so much part of it.

MR. DAVID LANDA

A little later we were approached by Mr David Landa, a lawyer and, indeed, the first Ombudsman of NSW. His family had arrived in this country as poor Jewish refugees and the Christian Brothers had taken the boys into their school free of all charges. He said that he had always been grateful for this and wanted to repay the debt now that the Church needed help. He was given the task of reviewing all cases in which an appeal was lodged, giving us a measure of further distance from the Church.

RESPONSES TO *TOWARDS HEALING*

I believe that there have been many complainants who went through the *Towards Healing* process and came away satisfied that they had been listened to and given the measure of healing that mere human beings are capable of giving in circumstances as terrible as those of abuse. These people have not come forward to make public statements.

Despite this, I am also aware of the anger that many people have towards the Church and its *Towards Healing* process.

I obviously cannot guarantee that all personnel have handled every case well, and yet I believe that most of the personnel were good people who tried their best in an extremely difficult field. I do not believe that their deficiencies, or even the deficiencies of the bishops and religious leaders behind them, are the total explanation of the anger that is so often directed towards the Church over *Towards Healing*. I would like to suggest two other factors that have also contributed.

In the fourth century the Church ceased to be a persecuted minority and became instead the official religion of the Roman Empire. It made the fateful mistake of following the ways of power and this has blighted its history ever since. For centuries it told everyone what to do and threatened eternal punishment if they did not. Now, through the revelations of abuse, it has been shown to have feet, not just of clay, but of slime, and an anger pent up over centuries has been unleashed against it. If the Church has been seen on this issue as lying helpless on the ground, many people have not been able to resist the temptation to “put in the boot”. It is no surprise that this anger has been fiercest in Ireland, where the Church was at its most oppressive and, not by accident, abuse was at its worst.

The second reason is that victims can feel that a church, far more than any other institution, should be able to respond to their deepest longings, and if it does not, it is to blame. However, once abuse has taken place, no one can ever restore victims to their prior integrity; no one can make what has happened un-happen. There can never be total satisfaction, for no one can ever give to victims what they most long for. Arguably the greatest harm caused by sexual abuse is a deep spiritual harm. I believe that the strong feeling that Church leaders have been complicit in a profound spiritual harm that they cannot repair has been the cause of much anger.

THE STRENGTHS OF *TOWARDS HEALING*

I would single out a few aspects of *Towards Healing* that I believe have been effective.

The first point of contact between a complainant and someone representing the Church is the Contact Person. This is not a police officer or a priest or any other person in authority, but someone like themselves who can meet them in some non-threatening place, listen sympathetically to their story and put it down in writing. Almost all complainants have spoken well of this meeting. For many it was the first time they had told their whole story, and it brought a significant beginning of healing. As a system I could recommend it to the wider society.

I believe that the number of offences by priests and religious has fallen dramatically, but I attribute this largely to a rise in the fear of being caught rather than a rise in virtue. In the wider society, too, the more fear there is of being caught, the fewer offences there will be. The first step is always that of getting victims to come forward, and the less threatening that first meeting is, the greater will be the number of victims who do come forward.

A second element I would wish to bring to your attention is the process of facilitation after it has been found that the abuse did take place. This consists

of a meeting between the victim and the relevant Church authority under the leadership and control of a competent facilitator. The aim is to determine the specific needs of the victim and the manner in which the Church can assist in meeting these needs. If conducted well, this method has brought significant healing, and I suggest that it can achieve far more than the payment of a lump sum of money.

A third element is that there is often outreach to a victim even when the abuse is not proven. This is written into *Towards Healing* at no.18 and can apply to a facilitation process at the end. There have been numerous cases where assistance has been given even when the abuse had not been proven. It has not been easy, however, to write this into the document without issuing an open invitation to people to make false accusations in order to secure money.

Furthermore, the standard of proof is that of "moral certainty", which is less than that of "beyond reasonable doubt". Moral certainty must include the objective element that proofs of guilt are more probable than proofs of innocence, and the subjective element of a conviction in the mind of the assessors.

OTHER ISSUES FROM 1996

The 1996 meetings of the Bishops' Conference did not produce only *Towards Healing*. In a nine-point plan it sought to produce a more complete response to different aspects of sexual abuse, with varying degrees of success.

a) The Needs of Victims and of Communities

Bishops and religious leaders were asked to engage professional and independent persons to make case studies of how incidents of sexual abuse had been handled in the past, both in relation to individuals and in relation to the communities in which they had occurred.

Though these requests were repeated more than once over the following few years, they produced little in the way of a response. The replies we received tended to concern cases where the response had been good, and it became obvious that bishops and leaders were not willing to put on paper details of poorer responses.

b) A Code of Conduct for Clergy and Religious

This was implemented after widespread consultation and became the document *Integrity in Ministry*. A lot of work went into it and it contains

many strengths, though I have no means of measuring the practical effect it has had in the lives of priests and religious.

I have to add that, even today, I find a number of priests and religious slow to admit that overcoming sexual abuse might involve changes in their way of living. Many tend to see themselves as victims of the whole outcry over abuse. They lament the good things that have been lost. Some seem not to have got the message concerning the new world they live in.

c) A Study of Factors Leading to Abuse in the Church

This was a failure and I must take a significant part of the blame. We engaged two social workers to do this work. They did a good review of the literature as it existed at that time. They then sought written replies to a questionnaire from a small number of psychiatrists and psychologists who had treated offenders. My problem was that they then proceeded to draw a whole series of conclusions that I believed were far too definite for the quite limited amount of research they had carried out. I felt that I could not present this document to the bishops and religious leaders and ask that they take definite action on this basis.

Together with other members of the committee (though I admit I was the major force) I met with the two researchers and asked that they be more modest in their claims and indicate areas where further research might explore their conclusions. They took umbrage at this questioning of their research, and leaked the entire document to the media, which promptly published the highlights of the document.

The bishops were none too pleased. I suggested that we simply allow the report to lie there and that we turn our attention to the more professional studies that would emerge from the treatment centre we had by then already set up.

d) Meetings of Leaders and Victims

We sought to arrange mediated meetings between bishops or religious leaders and victims, so that those authorities who had not done so might hear directly the stories of victims and come to a deeper and more immediate understanding of what abuse had done to victims.

I believe that a number of such meetings took place, but I am unable to say how effective it was as a strategy.

e) Treatment Program

Studies both here and overseas were undertaken into models of treatment, and we eventually engaged the services of two Australian psychologists who had been working at a treatment centre in the United States, Anthony Robinson and Gerardine Taylor. They came to Sydney and set up a team-based program called Encompass. I believe it offered a state-of-the-art, best practice model of treatment that produced much good. It treated many offenders and many others with various psychological needs. It offered a good process of psychological assessment that would have benefitted many priests and religious.

It ran for a number of years, but eventually had to be closed down because of a lack of sufficient clients to make it financially viable.

Doctors Robinson and Taylor continue to offer treatment, but no longer as part of the team approach of Encompass.

f) A Nine-Point Plan

The Nine-Point Plan was intended as an open letter to the Catholic People of Australia informing them of the various strategies the bishops and religious leaders were undertaking.

This document was later superseded by the Mandate of the Committee of 2002 (copy enclosed).

The major document that emerged out of this Mandate during my time on the Committee was the Memorandum of Understanding Regarding the Terms and Conditions of Work of X in the diocese of Y (copy enclosed). It attempted to deal with the question of what to do with offenders after they had come out of prison or treatment or even after they had admitted their offence.

It was felt that it was not enough to expel all of them from the priesthood and then leave them to fend for themselves. It was felt that the Church would prevent more future offences if it retained some control over them and could insist on conditions.

I do not have facts, but my impression is that many bishops considered the terms of this document as too close to house arrest and were unwilling to go that far. This means that there are probably priest-offenders out there being looked after by the Church, but with insufficient supervision.

THE MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING WITH THE POLICE

In about 2001 Professor Parkinson suggested the idea of a Memorandum of Understanding between the Church in NSW and the NSW Police, and he prepared a first draft of this memorandum. I spoke about it to the bishops of New South Wales and they agreed that the idea should be taken further. Professor Parkinson presented his draft to the Police, but unfortunately there was never any reply. At a later date he came to know that it had been referred to some senior level in the force and there had been turned down. No reasons were ever given and no dialogue ever took place between the two parties.

I always thought that this was a great pity. The police could have insisted on putting into the memorandum anything that they thought was important and this would have been of great assistance to me in getting bishops to comply with police requirements. It could have prevented problems that did in fact arise, e.g. concerning a bishop speaking to an accused priest before the police did.

I suggest that a partnership between church and police would have been more productive than treating the church as the enemy. Even now such a memorandum would be helpful.

I enclose a copy of Professor Parkinson's draft.

THREE OBJECTIVES

REDACTED

In all work in the field of sexual abuse there are three objectives: punishment of the offender, assistance to victims in seeking to regain their lives, and prevention of future abuse. It is important to be aware that these objectives can at times come into conflict with each other.

For example, one of the things our committee arranged was the setting up of a treatment centre for offenders in the hope of preventing or at least minimising future offences. Then this centre received a summons to produce any documents it had concerning one of its clients. Our fear was that, while these documents might (though by no means necessarily would) have assisted in obtaining a conviction against that one individual, the price to be paid was that no one else would ever come for treatment again because of the fear that anything they said would immediately be placed in the hands of the police or the courts. For reasons unknown to me the matter was resolved by the summons being withdrawn.

The priority of both society at large and the media is often that of punishment, both of the individual and of the institution the offender represents, through imprisonment of the individual and the payment of a lump sum of money by the institution.

I have never protected offenders and I never will, for they have committed despicable crimes and deserve imprisonment. And I have already said that significant amounts of money have their important place in compensating victims. REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

I ask that the more punitive priorities of society and the media, however legitimate they may be, not be allowed to actually get in the way of the priorities of the victims themselves. Sensitivity to the real needs of victims must always be an important part of society's response to abuse, and punishment alone should not be allowed to hinder assistance to victims and prevention of future abuse.

In particular, there is a place for the treatment of offenders. If you send one offender for treatment, I can give no guarantee that he will not offend again. But if you send one hundred offenders for treatment, I can give a strong guarantee that the number of future offences will be drastically lower. So treatment should be encouraged and defended.

END OF MY TERM OF OFFICE

Bishops are appointed to committees for a term of three years. They may be reappointed twice, to a total of nine years. I served the whole nine years, so there is nothing noteworthy about my time on that committee coming to an end.

Had some move been made to dispense from the normal rules and extend my time, I would have opposed it, for I had reached a point of exhaustion. REDAC

REDACTED

REDACTED

I could not take any more and I had some psychosomatic responses to the prolonged exposure.

Since then I find that I can still listen to victims, but otherwise I cannot read books about abuse or watch films or documentaries. Preparing this

submission has been difficult, because it has put me back in a field I had no desire to return to.

A year after I left the committee I retired from my work as a bishop. There were several reasons, and the whole issue of sexual abuse was one of them.

PREVENTION

Since then I have turned my attention to the other crucial issue of prevention of future abuse, and I enclose a copy of a book I have published on this topic entitled *For Christ's Sake*.

Much of the work in this field must be done by the Church itself, and there is great difficulty in getting the Church to move on issues that have been in place for centuries (e.g. obligatory celibacy) or on which papal authority and prestige have been heavily involved (e.g. the absence of women from any position of influence or the idea that priests are in some manner taken to a higher level of being). I am not sure what influence a Royal Commission in one single country could have on such matters, and anything it could do would be a bonus.

There is one field, however, in which I feel more confident that the Commission could have an influence, directly in Australia and indirectly in other countries. In one chapter I speak of an absence of professionalism among priests and religious. I call for the making obligatory of things that are by now taken for granted in many other professions, e.g. psychological assessments in the selection of all candidates, training for human development, training for leadership, regular professional appraisal, the presence of a regular supervisor, obligatory in-service training, a code of conduct, specific provisions for child protection and the permanent removal of those who show a radical unsuitability for the responsibilities of priesthood and religious life.

Such measures would not solve all problems, but they would assist in bringing danger signs to light much sooner. There is a code of conduct, but none of the other provisions is obligatory. To me it is a scandal that they do not already exist. If the Commission could exert some pressure in this field, I, for one, would be grateful.