
1. At all relevant times the North Coast Children’s Home was strongly associated with the Anglican Church and its predecessor. [25 sic 24].

2. At all relevant times the North Coast Children’s Home was controlled by the Rector of St Andrew’s Church Lismore in the Diocese of Grafton of the Anglican Church or his nominee and members of the Anglican Church (and its predecessor). [25 sic 24].

2A. At all relevant times the Anglican Diocese of Grafton had responsibility for the children in the North Coast Children’s Home. [25 sic 24].

3. Tommy Campion, CA, CB, CC, CD, CH, CK and CN were sexually abused by clergy, staff or other residents of the North Coast Children’s Home while they were resident at the Home. [32].

4. During the period 1940-1985 there were frequent acts of psychological, physical and sexual abuse perpetrated on the children resident at the North Coast Children’s Home. [33 sic 32].

5. The physical, psychological and sexual abuse suffered by the former residents at the North Coast Children’s Home had profound and long-lasting effects on the lives and mental health of the former residents. [34 sic 33].

6. During 2005 and 2006 the Diocese of Grafton agreed financial settlements for child sexual abuse and sexual abuse with claimants under its Care and Assistance Package. [35 sic 34].

7. The response of the Diocese of Grafton to the group claims was that the Diocese of Grafton and its Corporate Trustees had no legal liability for sexual or physical abuse of a child by clergy, employee or other persons at or associated with the Home. [42 sic 41].

9. By 26 September 2006 Rev Pat Comben and Peter Roland knew of at least 20 instances of sexual abuse against former residents of the North Coast Children's Home. [45 sic 44].


11. The professional standards committee of the Diocese of Grafton played little or no part in providing pastoral care and assistance to the group claimants. [47 sic 46].

12. The Diocese of Grafton required that the group claimants sign a deed of release before counselling, acknowledgement, apology or financial settlement would be provided. [49 sic 48].

13. The settlement negotiations on 19-20 December 2006 were conducted in a commercial and hostile manner. [51 sic 49].

14. The Diocese of Grafton misled claimants that the Care and Assistance Package adopted in November 2005 would be followed and then negotiated financial settlements that were significantly below those indicated in the Care and Assistance Package. [52 sic 50].

15. The denial of liability by the Diocese of Grafton on the basis that the Home was not controlled by the Diocese of Grafton had a detrimental effect upon abused former residents who should have been provided with acknowledgement that the North Coast Children's Home was the responsibility of the Church. [59 sic 57].

16. The lack of a pastoral response by the Diocese in handling the group claims had a detrimental effect upon abused former residents. [59 sic 57].
17. The amounts offered to Mr Campion CA, CK, CL, CM and CN as part of the group claim were substantially smaller than if the claim had been resolved under the Care and Assistance Package adopted by the Diocese in November 2005. [59 sic 57].

18. The Diocese of Grafton failed to properly apply the Professional Standards Ordinance 2004 or the Protocol dealing with Complaints of Sexual Abuse to the group claimants. [61 sic 59].

19. The Diocese of Grafton’s failure to properly apply the relevant Ordinance and Protocol compromised the ability of the Diocese to provide a sympathetic and proportionate pastoral response to the group claimants. [61 sic 59].

20. The Bishop of Grafton failed to appreciate that the Diocese of Grafton had a moral obligation to provide redress to those abused at the North Coast Children’s Home. [63 sic 61].

21. CD’s claim was processed in a manner similar to the group claims but without any pastoral assistance. [65 sic 63].

22. Bishop Slater reacted with hostility to Mr Campion’s insistence that he be afforded a financial settlement in line with the Care and Assistance Package adopted by the Diocese in November 2005. [66 sic 64].

23. Bishop Slater’s letter to Mr Campion of 14 August 2008 indicated a substantial conflict of the interests of the claimant, the Bishop, the Diocese and the other group claimants. [67 sic 64].

24. Mr Campion’s claim was dealt with in an ad hoc manner combining the approach adopted for the group claimants with additional payments for counselling and Medicare reimbursement. [68 sic 65].

25. Mr Campion was never offered a financial settlement component which reflected the process under the Care and Assistance Package. [68 sic 65].
26. When Reverend Pat Comben was asked to provide an apology to Tommy Campion about the way Mr Campion had been treated by him, Reverend Comben provided an apology which was false and he knew was false. [69 sic 66].

27. The Bishop of Grafton failed to refer either CB or CC's claims to the Professional Standards Committee in breach of clause 24(1) of the Professional Standards Ordinance 2004. [72 sic 69].

28. The Diocese of Grafton refused to pay financial settlements to CA, CB and CC because the Diocese considered it did not have financial reserves to pay such claims. [73 sic 70].

29. The Diocese of Grafton had not made any financial provision for professional standards because it had prioritised the Clarence Valley Anglican School debt over its financial obligations under the Protocol and Care and Assistance Scheme to pay abused former residents of the North Coast Children's Home. [73 sic 70].

30. The Bishop and Diocese of Grafton treated CA, CB and CC unfairly and in a way different to the group claimants which had a detrimental effect upon CA, CB and CC. [76 sic 73].

31. In 2012 Bishop Slater preferred the interest of an elderly former member of the Home's committee over the interests of providing a supportive and pastoral response to Tommy Campion. [81 sic 78].

32. The Primate advised the Bishop of Grafton between 2006 and 2012 that the group claimants should have their complaints properly heard and be offered counselling and pastoral support. [81 sic 78].

33. The Primate advised the Bishop of Grafton between 2006 and 2012 that he should seek out further persons who had been abused at the North Coast Children’s Home but the Bishop did not do so. [81 sic 78].
34. The Primate advised the Bishop of Grafton between 2006 and 2012 that he should inform the police of all criminal allegations which came to his attention arising out of the North Coast Children’s Home but he did not do so. [81 sic 78].

35. The Primate took steps to advise the police of criminal allegations which he was aware of having arisen from the North Coast Children’s Home. [81 sic 78].

36. The Bishop of Grafton, Keith Slater, failed to refer allegations of sexual abuse at the Home to the Professional Standards Director that could have assisted ongoing internal and police Investigations. [84 sic 81].

37. The Bishop of Grafton and the Diocese of Grafton should have managed the process under the Protocol at the same time as the group claim was being handled between the Diocesan solicitor and the claimants’ solicitor. [85 sic 82].


39. The Diocese of Grafton gave precedence to the debt arising from the Clarence Valley Anglican School over the settling of claims of child sexual abuse during the period 2007-2012. [91 sic 88].

40. The Diocese of Grafton had sufficient assets either in its name or the Corporate Trustees of the Diocese of Grafton to meet the financial component needed to settle claims of child sexual abuse. [91 sic 88].

41. The Diocese of Grafton put the interests of the Anglican Church ahead of providing financial compensation to victims of child sexual abuse. [91 sic 88].

42. In 2002 then Bishop of Newcastle, Roger Herft, became aware that Reverend Allan Kitchingman had been convicted of five counts of indecent assault of a child at an Anglican home in the Diocese of Grafton. [100 sic 96].

43. In the period 2002-2004, then Bishop Herft failed to take any disciplinary proceedings against Reverend Kitchingman. [100 sic 96].
44. From 2002 the Diocese of Grafton had both jurisdiction and authority to discipline Reverend Kitchingman but did not do so. [100 sic 96].

45. From 2006 Phillip Gerber, as professional standards director of Grafton and Newcastle, was aware that Reverend Kitchingman had been convicted of sexual offences against a child but failed to commence disciplinary proceedings against Reverend Kitchingman. [100 sic 97].

46. From 2002 the Bishop of the Diocese of Grafton was aware that Reverend Kitchingman had been convicted of sexual offences against a child but failed to commence disciplinary proceedings against him. [100 sic 97].

47. From 2004 the Registrar of the Diocese of Grafton, Reverend Comben, was aware that Reverend Kitchingman had been convicted of sexual offences against a child but failed to cause disciplinary proceedings to be commenced against Reverend Kitchingman. [100 sic 97].

48. From the date of Reverend Kitchingman's conviction in 2002 to 2013, no disciplinary action was taken against Reverend Kitchingman by either the Diocese of Newcastle or the Diocese of Grafton. [100 sic 97].

49. From 2005 to the present no disciplinary action has been taken against Reverend Brown or Reverend Morgan by either the Diocese of Grafton or the Diocese of Newcastle. [104 sic 100].

50. From 2002 to 2013 there was a reluctance in the Dioceses of Grafton and Newcastle to commence disciplinary proceedings against a member of clergy who did not hold a licence to officiate. [104 sic 100].

51. The disciplinary processes adopted within the dioceses of Grafton and Newcastle are cumbersome, legalistic and expensive and this contributed to reluctance in the Diocese of Grafton and Newcastle to commence the disciplinary process with regard to Reverend Kitchingman and Reverend Brown. [104 sic 100].
52. Where the Dioceses of Grafton and Newcastle both had jurisdiction over the professional standards matters concerning Reverend Kitchingman, including his discipline, there was no clear system in place to determine which diocese would assume responsibility. [104 sic 100].

53. From September 2006 Reverend Comben failed to take steps to refer all allegations of criminal conduct against children formerly resident at the North Coast Children’s Home to the NSW Police. [105 sic 101].

54. In 2011-2013 the Bishop of Grafton, Keith Slater, failed to refer allegations of criminal conduct made by CB and CC to the police for investigation. [105 sic 101].

55. The Diocese of Newcastle did not adopt its own guidelines for safe ministry until 4 years after the General Synod had recommended guidelines for parish safety. [107 sic 102].

56. The Diocese of Newcastle failed to take action under the principles of ‘safe ministry’ to manage any risk posed by the involvement of Reverend Kitchingman at Christ Church Cathedral until October 2013. [107 sic 102].

57. The National Register of the Anglican Church does not record the [sic] all the names of persons that may be required to be registered because various dioceses have been unable to review all their files to determine whether an entry on the national register should be made. [112 sic 108].

58. The General Secretary of the General Synod, Martin Drevikovsky, was unsure in his evidence as to how many files were still to be reviewed to determine entry on the National Register. [112 sic 108].

59. The professional standards directors of a number of dioceses have had difficulty operating and entering information into the National Register on a timely basis. [112 sic 108].