



Royal Commission  
into Institutional Responses  
to Child Sexual Abuse

## Statement

---

<b>Name</b>	Professor Patrick Parkinson AM
<b>Address</b>	Known to the Royal Commission
<b>Date</b>	25 July 2016

---

1. This statement made by me accurately sets out the evidence that I am prepared to give to the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. The statement is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.
2. In preparing this statement, I have been shown documents by officers of the Royal Commission. Where I refer to a document in this statement, I have used the document reference number, which appears in the top right hand corner of the document to which I refer.
3. This statement has been prepared on the basis that the Commission will issue a Notice to Produce under *Royal Commissions Act 1923 (NSW)* s 8 for the production of a signed copy.

### Background

4. My name is Patrick N. Parkinson.
5. I am a professor of law at the University of Sydney and an expert in the field of child sexual assault policy and procedures, including within religious institutions. I have been involved in researching and providing policy advice in relation to child sexual assault within institutions associated with most denominations in Australia since the 1990s.
6. In or about 2007 Emeritus Professor Kim Oates and I (hereafter referred to collectively as "we") were engaged by the Professional Standards Commission ("PSC") of the Anglican Church of Australia ("the Church") to review and report on the nature and extent of reported child sexual abuse ("CSA") within the Australian Anglican Church since 1990 ("the study"). The objective of the study was to identify patterns in the incidence of CSA across each Australian dioceses to see

Signature: .....

*P.N.P.*

Witness: .....

*[Handwritten Signature]*

...

...

what could be learned about incidents of CSA within the Anglican parish context exclusively (i.e. not within schools or other related contexts). The ultimate purpose and focus of the study was always intended to be on prevention of CSA and improving child practices and procedures within the Church. We agreed to do the study on a 'shoestring' budget.

7. Each of the 23 dioceses of the Church were invited to participate in the study and of these only three dioceses - Ballarat, The Murray and Willochra - declined to participate. To the best of my recollection, I do not think these three dioceses gave reasons for not participating, but I think it may have been that they did not have the capacity, particularly as they were small, rural dioceses with very limited administrative resources.
8. The process that we adopted to obtain the relevant data to conduct the study was that we developed a detailed questionnaire seeking specific information about a reported incident of CSA, including details about the disclosure, the alleged perpetrator and the victim. A questionnaire was then completed for each case of reported CSA by each of the participating dioceses from the available information maintained on their records. This exercise in completing the questionnaires was predominantly undertaken by the diocese staff, however in limited circumstances the questionnaires were completed with the assistance of research assistant Amanda Jayakody.
9. The information was provided on a de-identified basis, which is fairly typical when conducting an analysis of this nature. To the best of my recollection, there were no issues in relation to the cooperation of the dioceses in obtaining the data, and the only issues I can recall in this process were in respect of files which were not available to the diocese staff at the time of completing the questionnaires. The reason given was that some files were in the possession of lawyers or the police as the relevant allegation of CSA was the subject of legal proceedings. Adelaide was short-staffed and we did not capture all the cases within scope in that diocese. This meant that a complete census was not possible.
10. Of the information provided to us by way of the questionnaires, 191 cases of reported CSA by 135 alleged perpetrators across 17 dioceses were identified as falling within the scope of our study. Data from the questionnaire showed that 86 of the accused persons were either clergy or candidates for clergy ("**Accused Clergy**"). Of those 86 Accused Clergy, 29 did not have their theological college identified in the questionnaire and 14 were identified as training at St John's College, Morpeth ("**Morpeth**"). I saw this as a troubling anomaly which we interrogated to the best of our ability from the available data. Our analysis in relation to the data on Morpeth was included in a draft report ("**the draft Report**") [ANG.9110.01001.0001].

P.N. PA

Hester

11. In or about February 2009 we presented our initial findings to a Standing Committee of the General Synod in Melbourne and on 21 March 2009 I attended a national meeting of bishops where I gave a presentation on the findings set out in the draft Report.
12. At the national meeting of bishops on 21 March 2009 I recall that none of the bishops could cast any light on the apparent over-representation of Morpeth graduands. I recall that at least one raised concerns in relation to whether the Morpeth data included in the draft Report should be published because it was difficult to know whether it was significant and might cast suspicion on all Morpeth graduands. There was also some 'push back' on other issues, such as a desire to emphasise that CSA occurs in other institutions. I did not find anything unusual about this 'push back' and, in my experience, such 'push back' is unsurprising when an institution is grappling with a difficult issue of this kind.
13. Following the national meeting of bishops, I received a letter dated 8 April 2009 from Archbishop Phillip Aspinall (then Primate) setting out the feedback and questions of the bishops in relation to the findings set out in the draft Report [USYD.9101.01003.0006]. On 20 May 2009 I responded to Archbishop Aspinall responding to the bishops' feedback and questions. I also confirmed that, as we had foreshadowed at the Standing Committee and the national meeting of bishops, we had elected to omit the data on theological colleges of accused perpetrators for reasons which I set out in detail in that correspondence [USYD.9101.01003.0001]
14. While I raised the issue of the Morpeth data in my correspondence to the Primate of 20 May 2009, the focus of the study was the prevention of CSA and improving child practices within the Church and there was neither budget nor scope for further investigation into Morpeth. I was not asked, nor did I offer, to conduct any further study or analysis in relation to Morpeth.
15. We subsequently released a final report on the findings of our study in May 2009, which did not include the analysis in respect of Morpeth DOCUMENT REFERENCES RED
16. I consider that the process of consultation with the bishops in the course of conducting the study and in the preparation of the final Report was open and constructive.

Signed:  .....

Date: 25. 7. 16

Witness:  .....

Date: 25. 7. 16