

To Reverend <sup>CKR</sup> Confidential. 18<sup>th</sup> June 2009

Dear <sup>CKR</sup> i.

The following report of what is in the Diocesan files concerning the case of Ian Barrack's abuse against your son was prepared in response to your letter of 20<sup>th</sup> October 2006. We acknowledge that as the mother of the abuse victim and as someone who has suffered secondarily to this abuse, that the fullest possible information will be helpful to you. It is not always possible to reconstruct events fully but this is the best version available from the files, I have tried to summarise the material accurately, but obviously working from documentary sources is not the same as firsthand knowledge and there may be events or conversations which I have misunderstood. Where your question cannot be fully answered, the PSC will consider the need for further enquiries, if you wish.

I have changed the order of your questions so that the information can be reported chronologically. I have referred to you and your son and others by your initials.

**Were the examining chaplains aware of Ian Barrack's sexual orientation?**

In 1990 IB applied to be accepted for training for Ordination. At this time he was studying computer science and his degree was sponsored by the navy. He had been head server at the Cathedral and may have thought himself to be bi-sexual. He had a girlfriend and in light of their intended marriage, she was invited to the selection conference.

He reported that he had experienced sexual abuse as a minor but he said that his involvement at the Cathedral had helped him to resolve these issues and move forward. In addition he felt that although he had followed his elder brother into the navy, he was uncertain about this as a career and felt that he might be intended to be a priest so that he could help others. His referees say that he was a devoted member of the congregation who attended twice on Sunday and usually twice during the week.

The selection conference found that he should not be accepted at that point; rather he should finish his studies and apply when he had more time to mature. His sexuality was not raised as an issue in this decision.

1993. IB made contact with the then chair of the examining chaplains. He had a degree, was married and was living in Sydney serving in the navy. He expressed a desire to apply once more when he was free of obligation to the navy. The examining chaplain felt that this was an appropriate unfolding of his vocation.

1995 He applied late and was asked to defer for a year.

1996. IB applied for ordination training once more as he had intended. His naval superior spoke highly of him. He was described as a parishioner of St James, but had only a limited involvement with this parish, because of the distance from his work. He preferred not to worship at Christchurch St Laurence which he found too dramatic. It seems that he did not find a convenient place of worship in the Sydney diocese. He was described as very liberal in his attitude to homosexuality.

His application on this occasion minimised the sexual abuse. He was accepted for training in 1997. I did not record who was on the selection panel and I do not know how much of the information which was in the file they would have considered but this information might be obtained by further enquiries.

**Why was IB allowed to remain at the College when he was known to have a relationship with another male student in 1997?**

Having achieved his ambition to train for the priesthood, IB's first year at Morpeth seems to have been very difficult. He was living in a close knit community and this seems to have brought up a lot of personal issues, which impacted on his ability to work. In the course of the year another couple were having marital difficulties – this impacted on his relationship with his wife, especially because the issue involved the husband's homosexuality. It is alleged in later documents that he had sexual relations with this man during a retreat but there are few written records from this year relating to his problems.

The situation at the end of 1997 seems to have been that the other couple broke up – the husband came out as homosexual, left the Anglican Church and I have been told was ordained by the Metropolitan Community Church. IB stayed with his wife and continued with his training, despite his rather adverse record during the year. While acting on his bisexuality while married is a moral issue, his relationship with another man was not illegal. Homosexuality and bisexuality do not necessarily correlate with abuse of minors. It is not clear why his candidacy was not reviewed at the end of what seems to have been a turbulent year in which his performance fell very short of satisfactory and he was described as being preoccupied with personal problems. There do not seem to have been any written complaints and the formal review for ordination was not until the end of the second year. It is not clear whether the college authorities were concerned or what action they took as none of this material is in the file.

There is correspondence in the file concerning IB being asked to leave Beresfield Parish but no account of why this action was necessary. There are people who were concerned with the Parish at this time and they may be willing to put on record what happened if approached by the Director of Professional Standards.

1997 was the year in which IB befriended two teenage boys, one of them CKI who lived around the campus and they went to his house to play computer games. Given that this was his area of expertise and he probably had better computer equipment than they would have had access to elsewhere, this may not have seemed surprising. The second boy left at the end of that year. It is not recorded whether this boy has ever made complaints or whether he has ever been interviewed in connection with this case. This is also something which could be further investigated.

**Why wasn't IB removed from College after he had given CK the sex toy?**

On November 16<sup>th</sup> 1998 Rev. Bruce Hoare was informed about the accounts of pornography use and given the sheep toy. BH is said to have laughed about it and to have told CKF to give it back to IB and tell him she was disgusted and to stay away from her son. It seems that CKF was asked to put what she knew in writing and to get statements from other 'witnesses', but these statements were not

REDACTED

has to be before the ordination date?

20 Valentines was 13th Nov

Nov + Selection was already finished with by the

(2 weeks) before my ordination / priesthood He had it before 16/11

wrote statements straight away I also did.

made until February and March 1999 because CKF and CK went overseas during the Christmas holidays.

In early December IB was informed that the selection conference had decided he should not proceed to ordination. BH was the chair of the examining chaplains and was very clear about this decision. People from the Parish of Kotara were surprised and upset by this rejection of someone they saw as a good candidate and wrote to the Bishop complaining about it. IB reacted to this sudden change of life plan by apparently getting an assurance from Bishop Roger that he could continue his degree and go on renting accommodation at the college until November 1999. Given his current obsession with CKF he may have been trying to maintain access to him and it is recorded that he bothered him with emails while he was overseas. + other times too.

Who decided to allow IB to remain at the College?

The letter offering accommodation at the College at a reduced rent is from Bishop Roger dated late December. It is not clear why the Bishop agreed to this request. It is possible that he felt unable to act because he did not have a written complaint or he may not have been given all the facts, or he did not want to alert IB to his suspicions in case there was to be a further investigation. CKL was overseas and not resident at the college over this summer but the dates are not in the file.

The order of events is not clear in the file, but it appears that at the beginning of February, IB was asked to leave the College very suddenly. He wrote to Charles Sturt to defer his studies because he was moving to Sydney. Action may have been precipitated because the Diocese received the statement dated February 11th from CKF's son-in-law. In April, IB wrote to the Bishop complaining about the short notice to leave and his distress about the handling of the marriage breakdown in 1997. He makes no reference to CK nor appears to relate the decision to his sexual abuse. If there was a complaint of child abuse considered, it was appropriate that he did not know, as telling him about the allegations might interfere with the police investigation.

Why did it take eight months to arrange the meeting with DOCS?

It was six and a half months between the November complaint and the May meeting. The gap between the first allegation and IB being informed that he had been refused ordination training was two weeks. Written statements from CKF's daughter and herself were dated March 3rd and March 16th 1999. March 16th was the date of CK's meeting with Bruce Hoare at which they discussed the statements. There seems to have been a delay then until after Easter, which was on April 4th. It was two months between the first written complaint in February and the Bishop writing to all Diocesan Bishops warning them not to employ IB and this period spanned Holy Week and Easter.

On April 7th, the Bishop met with Robert Caddies, Peter Mitchell, and Bruce Hoare. They believed that IB was aware of CK's concerns but they were obviously concerned about whether or not he should be informed of the allegations or not, in case there needed to be a police investigation. On 8th April 1999, the Bishop wrote to all Diocesan Bishops under qualified privilege, advising them that IB had been refused ordination and that they should not consider him for any position without reference to the Newcastle Diocese.

Handwritten note: "Bishop Casillo"

Handwritten note: "dates wrong"

Handwritten notes: "April 1999", "met to CKU", "see who was in", "with REDAC", "Indicate at St Johns College"

Handwritten note: "Complaint to Bruce Hoare was early"

Handwritten note: "Rubbish"

Handwritten note: "This I do not recall"

Handwritten mark: "||"

On 6<sup>th</sup> May, the Bishop contacted DOCS who advised that the matter of the complaints was not a criminal offence but that IB should not be informed of the complaint. On 13<sup>th</sup> May the Bishop wrote to CKF offering counselling and updating the situation including not informing IB of the complaint. This was presumably in case a police enquiry would be made in future.

*1. Needs !!*

On 27<sup>th</sup> May the Bishop met with police and DOCS to examine the complaint with CKF and Peter Mitchell present. They read the notes and concluded that the Church had gone as far as possible on the basis of the material they had and that there was no need to discuss the complaint with IB. Any further process would need to be initiated by CKI and they did not want to disturb his settling in at his new school. There was some concern that IB had friends at the school and that he would try to contact CKI there. The Bishop offered to phone the school and CKF would contact housemaster and specify who CKI should have contact with and ask whether IB had tried to make contact. She would keep in touch with DOCS.

*?*

Why was CKF not contacted during this time and why was nothing done after the meeting with DOCS?

According to the notes in the file, CKF was contacted by letter on May 13<sup>th</sup> and the matter was thought to be concluded as far as possible after the May 27<sup>th</sup> meeting. It seems to have been agreed that it would be counterproductive to interview CKI and that it was better to leave him to settle in his new school. The position seems to have been that unless CKI made a complaint, everything that could have been done had been done. This is presumably why the Committee for Allegations of Sexual Misconduct was not involved. *Not even on records*

Why was no counselling offered to JF or CKF?

According to the file, the letter of May 13<sup>th</sup> contained an offer of counselling but it is not clear whether any counselling was arranged for CKU. It appears that he would not have been willing to accept any at this time. It is not clear whether the Bishop's offer of counselling was ever received or accepted by CKR.

*No home only offered one*

*[*

*This is a lie!! This was never stated*

It appears that intermittent support for CKI was provided by BH at the Bishop's request. Reverend CKR maintains that this was inadequate and it certainly appears that BH was too close to the events to provide proper support even if he had been a trained counsellor.

*not true*

Why was the matter kept 'in house' instead of being managed effectively and transparently?

It isn't clear from the file what the process at the time was supposed to be or, if there was a process, why it wasn't followed. The advice of DOCS and the police was not to inform IB of the allegations – presumably in case more evidence came to light and a further investigation was undertaken. Such serious allegations must be handled confidentially. However, it is obvious now that IB's behaviour constituted 'grooming' and the level of awareness is much greater now than it was even 10 years ago. The new PSC process means that complaints are investigated at arm's length from the Bishop because of his duty of care to all parties. The PSC is also responsible for making sure that all parties have appropriate support and counselling when required. *- Did not happen.*

*Modesty of care*

*What duty of care?*

**Who had a duty of care for children in the rental property at Closebourne?**

In May 2002 when the abuse was revealed, the Bishop received legal advice that the diocese was not obliged to report the case to the ombudsman for two reasons, firstly that the situation was not a residential home or childcare centre in which they were responsible for CK's welfare and secondly that they had only become aware of the abuse after IB had left their 'employment'. In 2003 there was again debate about whether the case should have been referred to the ombudsman. The legal advisor said not on the same grounds as before, but the Bishop did so refer in September 2003. I did not record anything in the files referring to action by the ombudsman.

*We  
was not  
employed*

**In what capacity was Mr Paul Rosser attending the court during the trial of IB?**

I phoned Mr Rosser who told me that he had been asked to attend the trial by the Bishop (then Brian Farran) who wanted to be informed about the conduct of the case. He spoke to the Crown Prosecutor but had no contact with IB. He learned subsequently that IB had pleaded guilty and he did not attend the sentencing. He was not officially representing the Diocese or any other person, but had attended at the Bishop's request.

*then he was representing the Diocese  
Bishop  
Brian  
denied  
he asked  
him*

I am sorry that this response comes more than two and a half years after the original date of your letter. There have been two changes of professional standards director since then, including a lengthy interregnum. I undertook to search the files at the end of 2008 but it has taken until now to bring these questions to a meeting. I am aware that the information I have been able to discover may not answer all your questions.

It seems that there is scope for further investigation of some issues of concern:

1. What was the nature of the complaint which led IB to leave Beresfield Parish? Why is there no record of this in the file?
2. What was the role of Bruce Hoare in the case? Did he act appropriately and if not, has his conduct ever been investigated and has any disciplinary action been taken against him?
3. Was the other boy who was resident at Morpeth in 1997 interviewed and has he ever made a complaint of sexual abuse?

Bishop Brian has had a memo from me in which I detailed the contents of the file on which I have based this letter. If it would be helpful to you to have a meeting with Bishop Brian and an apology from the Diocese in some form either immediately or after further investigation, the PSC can certainly facilitate that. The material from the file cannot really address your perception that your treatment by the Diocese was in itself hurtful and abusive but this can be covered in the apology.

If there is anything else you would like to know concerning our current procedures and the measure which the Diocese is putting in place to provide safe ministry practice, we would be happy to answer your questions.

At the conclusion of the process, whenever that may be, if you feel that a service of reconciliation and healing would be useful to you, that is also something which can be discussed and an appropriate liturgy developed. A member of the PSC has suggested that it might be appropriate, if

at some time you can find yourself able to do so, for you to preside at a service where you absolve the Diocese for its past ignorance and mistakes.

Please be assured that the current PSC wishes to provide you and <sup>CKU</sup> with whatever support is needed and I encourage you to let your needs be made known.

Yours sincerely,

Ann Taylor