

ROYAL COMMISSION INTO INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSES

TO CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE

CASE STUDY 43

THE RESPONSE OF CATHOLIC CHURCH AUTHORITIES

IN THE MAITLAND – NEWCASTLE REGION

SUBMISSIONS ON BEHALF OF CQP

INTRODUCTION

1. CQP did not originally provide a Statement to the Royal Commission and only did so after a colleague had referred him to the evidence of Brother Michael Hill given at Newcastle on 7 September 2016. CQP says the evidence concerning his conversation with Hill is wrong.

COMPLAINT TO BROTHER MICHAEL HILL

2. CQP's Statement sets out the details of the sexual abuse he encountered personally and saw happen to others on a regular basis at the hands of Brother Dominic whilst he was a student in the 1970's at Marist Brothers Hamilton.
3. He had broadly kept the facts of this abuse to himself although he did confide at some stage to his wife.

4. At paragraph 17 of his Statement¹ he became aware of the impending appointment of Brother Dominic as Principal of the school which was previously Marist Brothers Hamilton and at which one of his children was about to commence.
5. He spoke to a Mr Michael Bowman who was then the Director of Catholic Education Office in Newcastle who indicated that he would take the matter up with the Bishop of the Diocese Bishop Michael Malone.²
6. It was shortly after this conversation with Mr Bowman that CQP received a phone call from Brother Michael Hill and he then outlines in his Statement that conversation including specifically the sexual abuse he had experienced and witnessed. It is identified at paragraph 274 in the submissions of Counsel assisting and it is therefore not repeated here.
7. Having suffered at the hands of Brother Dominic he had every reason to ensure that his child was not subjected to the same problems. There was no reason for him not to tell Brother Hill of what had occurred to him and what he had witnessed. It was his whole reason for bringing the matter to the attention of the Church authorities which included Brother Hill no matter how the telephone call from Brother Hill to CQP came about.
8. His evidence as to what he told Brother Hill ought to be accepted.

RESPONSE OF THE MARIST BROTHERS

9. If as is submitted this evidence ought be accepted then the response of sending Dominic to the Wellsprings Programme in the United States was not only inappropriate but wrong.³

¹ Exhibit 43-45

² Paragraph 23 exhibit 43-45

³ Page 24693/2

10. The evidence of Brother Hill as to the reasons for contacting CQP and the content of the allegations made by CQP during the course of that telephone conversation ought not to be accepted. The coincidences of Brother Hill ringing CQP after no contact for twenty years at a time very shortly after CQP had made contact indirectly with Bishop Malone is just simply extraordinary and wrong.

11. The inevitable conclusion therefore is that Brother Hill did not choose to reveal to the Church authorities the significance of Brother Dominic's conduct when he became aware of it in 1996. This one assumes was done purely for the purpose of protecting the Marist Brothers and/or the Church itself.

27th January 2017



Colin Heazlewood

Counsel for CQP