

JC - 050

**File Location:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Box Number:** \_\_\_\_\_

**File Number:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Details:**

File note of a meeting between John Cleary  
and Bishop Farran dated 23/8/12.

CONFIDENTIAL FILE NOTE

MEETING – BISHOP BRIAN FARRAN (BISHOP OF NEWCASTLE) / JOHN CLEARY (DIOCESAN BUSINESS MANAGER)

HELD IN BISHOP BRIAN FARRAN'S OFFICE (Level 3, 134 King Street Newcastle NSW 2300)

27 <sup>h</sup> 23 August 2012 2.00pm

Bishop called writer in for a meeting at 2pm on Monday 27/8/12. Meeting commenced approximately 2.05pm.

Bishop advised writer how disappointed he was at the writer to receive the email earlier today and felt that the writer was somewhat disloyal. He proceeded to advise that I have an administrative function and am duty bound to action his requests.

Writer advised that he was disappointed that the Bishop had contemplated asking the writer to participate in the process to announce reasons why the Bishop was not going to act on the Professional Standards Board's recommendations regarding STURT, LAWRENCE, GOYETTE, DUNCAN and HOARE

Writer advised the Bishop that "should these wrongdoers have been staff of the diocesan office, I would have shown them the door as their behaviour is clearly gross misconduct"

Bishop advised the following

- 1) That acting on the recommendations would be "catastrophic" for the diocese
- 2) That he needs to take into account the needs of "tertiary victims". He highlighted an examples of tertiary victims as the Reverend COJ 's daughter (COJ was the respondent in a previous board matter) or the Late Reverend Peter Rushton's sister (RUSHTON was a known paedophile and former clergyman in the Diocese of Newcastle)
- 3) That he has overarching powers that require him to take "care of the diocese" and that he has a responsibility to take care of the diocese into consideration when acting or not acting on recommendations
- 4) That he understands that LAWRENCE had a sexual relationship with the complainant from the age of 16.
- 5) That he understands that DUNCAN had a sexual relationship with the complainant when the complainant was a much younger age (approximately 14 years of age)
- 6) The LAWRENCE had served in the diocese for 25 years and exercised fine ministry in this time

- 7) That LAWRENCE'S "networks" and "sphere of influence" in the diocese was extremely large (he appeared fearful of this sphere of influence
- 8) That "he knew what LAWRENCE was like". I presumed this to mean that he has had a long term, detailed knowledge of LAWRENCE'S behaviours and that the current professional standards matters were no surprise to FARRAN)
- 9) That the role of the Ordinance was not to be punitive but rather protective
- 10) That Michael Elliott (Director of Professional Standards) and I were "in each other's pocket" and that all of the current professional standards matters have come about because of this (I took offence to this and made the point that Mr Elliott and I didn't have the same view on the meetings relating to the Reverend <sup>COJ</sup> at REDACTED).

Writer advised that he was a witness in the Supreme Court proceedings initiated by LAWRENCE and STURT and that the office had invested a great deal of cost, time and energy in defending the matter for the Diocese.

BISHOP asked what my role was as a witness (perhaps thinking that I could not have possibly been present at the conference in 1984 and confusing the role of witness in the Professional Standards Board hearings with being a witness in the Supreme Court). I replied that I signed an affidavit confirming many of the diocesan processes."

BISHOP interjected and said "that's exactly right , processes"

WRITER "and our defence was successful"

BISHOP "Yes, but the court confirmed our processes were valid but I, as the Bishop, have the absolute right to act or not act on the recommendations before me even after the processes were validated by the court"

WRITER still couldn't accept the explanation

The conversation turned in context

With respect to LAWRENCE, Bishop advised that he was somewhat intimidated by LAWRENCE and the two had lived together as curates in the Riverina Diocese in the same small residence.

FARRAN proceeded to advise that he (FARRAN) was "always fearful to take a shower in the same house as LAWRENCE" and that (FARRAN) had not even told his own wife this. FARRAN felt intimidated by LAWRENCE and always felt like LAWRENCE's "house guest"

When asked about the concept of "tertiary victims", the writer asked whether he had considered that the writer and the Director of Professional Standards could be "tertiary victims" due to the fact that the writer had received death threats and the DPS had been the victim of other suspicious activity?. FARRAN replied that he had not considered this but accepted the point.

WRITER also asked "Bishop, you have always told me that I am your most senior adviser, more senior than anyone else in the office including the Assistant Bishop"

FARRAN "Yes, John I have and that is correct. I always look to you as my most senior adviser and value your advice"

WRITER "why then Bishop are you not following the recommendations of the Professional standards board against LAWRENCE, GOYETTE, STURT, HOARE and DUNCAN?"

FARRAN replied "John, because of my role of Bishop and the need to act out of care for the Diocese"

WRITER also advised that the matter had nothing to do with HOMOPHOBIC views and that this was a distortion

BISHOP advised that he would be happy to proceed with his plan without the WRITER and that he would pursue assistance from the ASSISTANT BISHOP and Mr Chris Day of ENIGMA media. He advised that part of the strategy would to "keep the matter extremely confidential" and he would hope that Mr Day could ensure as little media coverage as possible"

WRITER assumed the Bishops explanation was so that no more "tertiary victims" were hurt but felt that this was clearly a cover-up and the intent was to minimise coverage knowing that the decision to not follow the Board's recommendations would almost certainly be controversial

In summary

WRITER advised that he would hope that his views expressed today to the Bishop would not in any way impact on almost 6 years of good service to the Bishop and the Diocese as the Business Manager.

FARRAN replied "absolutely not" and asked "why did I think that?"

WRITER "because of the severity of the matter, the gravity of the complaints and my fundamental disagreement with your actions I feel it has the potential to"

FARRAN replied "Yes, It does have the potential to but it won't"

FARRAN asked if there were any other matters that we needed to catch up on.

WRITER replied "no, there is nothing urgent or of importance"

FARRAN made the parting comment "I look forward to being able to catch up with you in a more social environment once I retire as the Bishop"

Meeting ended on an amicable note at 2.25pm

Signed



John Patrick Cleary

Diocesan Business Manager

27<sup>th</sup> 28<sup>th</sup> August 2012



Post script 30/8/12 5.15pm writer, apart from one group email regarding a meeting on Monday 3/9/12, has not received any emails from FARRAN since the meeting. Using the past 5-6 years as Business Manager as a guide, this is extremely unusual and I wonder whether FARRAN is now treating me with contempt.

**John Cleary**

---

**Subject:** Meeting with Bishop, Bishop Peter, DBM  
**Location:** +Brian Office

**Start:** Mon 27/08/2012 2:00 PM  
**End:** Mon 27/08/2012 3:00 PM

**Recurrence:** (none)

**Organizer:** Bishop Brian

**Categories:** Important