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THE COMMISSIONER: Ladies and gentlemen, before we commence proceedings this morning, I wish to raise a matter of an unpleasant nature.

It has been brought to my attention that some members of the public have been expressing opinions about witnesses who might be expected to be giving evidence in these proceedings in the coming days, in an offensive fashion. That is not acceptable conduct and it will not be tolerated in this inquiry.

As I have often heard said to juries by judges presiding in criminal trials, it is very wrong to prejudge because prejudgment is the basis, of course, of prejudice, and in circumstances where we are still in the process of taking the evidence of the first witness in this inquiry, it is most inappropriate to form views and, from them, to be offensive towards other people.

I would ask everyone to conduct him or herself with decorum and dignity, and $I$ hope that this matter does not have to be raised again.

Ms Lonergan.
MS LONERGAN: Thank you, Commissioner. This morning we are going to interpose Mr Troy Grant, and I call Troy Grant.

## <TROY WAYNE GRANT, sworn:

## <EXAMINATION BY MS LONERGAN:

MS LONERGAN: Q. Mr Grant, could you state your full name for the record, please?
A. My name is Troy Wayne Grant.
Q. You are the Nationals member of the New South Wales Legislative Assembly for the electoral district of Dubbo?
A. That is correct.
Q. You have held that position since March 2011?
A. Since 26 March 2011.
Q. Prior to entering parliament, you were a constable of police in the NSW Police Force initially?
A. That is correct.
Q. Joining the force in October 1988?
A. Yes.
Q. Then you progressed through the ranks to become inspector of police?
A. That is correct.
Q. What year did you reach that rank of inspector?
A. In 2008.
Q. You resigned your commission in March 2011 to take up your position in parliament?
A. That is correct.
Q. In March 2013, you were sent a letter from the Crown Solicitor's Office seeking your assistance with the provision of a sworn statement?
A. That is correct.

MS LONERGAN: Could the witness be shown a copy of his statement dated 29 April 2013, together with a letter dated 28 March 2013.
Q. First could you look at the letter dated 28 March 2013.
A. Yes.
Q. You see that letter asks you to cover certain things in a statement for the assistance of the Commission?
A. That is correct.
Q. One of the matters you are asked to address your mind to, on page 1, next to (a) is:

```
details of any discussions that you may
have had with Detective Chief Inspector
Fox ... in which the phrase "the Catholic
Mafia" (or similar descriptor) may have
been used?
```

A. That is correct.
Q. Are you able to assist the Commission with whether you had, prior to receiving this letter, seen or used that phrase before?
A. Not to the best of my knowledge and belief.
Q. Did you do what was requested by the letter and prepare a statement addressing the matters raised in the letter?
A. I did.
Q. Can you turn now to the statement dated 29 April 2013. Is that statement true and correct, to the best of your know1 edge?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Is that your signature on page 2 of the statement?
A. My signature appears at the bottom of both pages.

MS LONERGAN: I tender that statement and letter, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Ms Lonergan. The statement by Mr Grant and the letter to him from the Crown Solicitor's Office will be admitted and marked exhibit 3.

EXHIBIT \#3 LETTER TO MR GRANT FROM THE CROWN SOLICITOR'S OFFICE DATED 28/3/2013 AND STATEMENT OF MR GRANT DATED 29/4/2013

MS LONERGAN: Q. In the course of your policing career, Mr Grant, you carried out investigations into a Father Ryan of the Maitland-Newcastle diocese?
A. That's correct. In 1995 I commenced an investigation into Father Vincent Gerard Ryan, concerning allegations of sexual assault, initially upon two victims that, over the course of the inquiry, resulted in charges being laid against 31 victims.
Q. At the time you carried out those investigations you were stationed at the Northern Region; is that the correct title?
A. When I was first given the job of investigating that matter, I was on secondment to the north region Major Crime Squad child protection investigation team. My substantive station was Kurri Kurri within the Cessnock patrol and I was performing A list duties at Cessnock detectives' office immediately before taking up that secondment.
Q. At that time you were a constable or a senior constable?
A. I think I was constable first class and I think a week or two after I arrived at the Major Crime Squad, I became a
senior constable.
Q. At that time did you have a particular person who was your direct report?
A. Yes, that was Detective Sergeant Rhonda Mulligan.

I was in a team with three other investigators and her.
Q. Was she the leader of a child protection team at that stage?
A. Yes, she was.
Q. In terms of assistance and/or encouragement in relation to any investigations you were performing into Father Ryan, how would you describe her role?
A. She was excellent. She provided me every assistance and guidance that I required. She accompanied me to the final interview that I conducted with Vincent Ryan, when I took him out of Cooma Correctional Centre on a section 43 order to interview him for the final time on a series of victim complaints.
Q. Was there any incident or event where you received an impression that Detective Sergeant Mulligan did not want you to complete investigations or have appropriate time to complete investigations?
A. Not at all.
Q. She was your direct report from July to October or November 1995?
A. Yes, around that period. I was on secondment and Detective Chief Superintendent John Ure was the commander of the north region Major Crime Squad. There were two offices for that crime squad, one located at Chatswood and one located here at Newcastle. He was the commander of both offices and had an office in both. My secondment was a three-month secondment period. He arrived, I'm not quire sure, just prior to my arrival or just after my arrival for that secondment, and he was unaware that I was on a secondment. When I made him aware of that fact, he had me transferred into the Major Crime Squad.
Q. Was that transfer to facilitate the completion of your investigation into Father Ryan?
A. Yes, it was.
Q. How did you find Detective Chief Superintendent Ure in terms or encouragement or otherwise in relation to your
investigations of Father Ryan?
A. He was fully supportive. I offered in the early part of the investigation, once $I$ realised that this was becoming rather large - I was on 1 y 25 at the time, I was a plainclothes senior constable, I offered and was happy for the investigation to be handed to a more experienced or senior detective. He was very strong in his encouragement and asked me to keep going and assigned Detective Senior Sergeant John Mooney as a mentor for the investigation. He was kept constantly updated, and supported me throughout, was extremely strong and he participated in the search warrant execution of the investigation by supervising the search warrant executed on the bishop's premises here in Newcastle.
Q. Detective Sergeant Mooney started working as your mentor immediately after Detective Sergeant Rhonda Mulligan; is that correct?
A. That's correct. I was transferred to the special crime hold-up unit of the Major Crime Squad and allowed to continue the investigation. Detective Senior Sergeant John Mooney was not only my direct report for that unit, that squad, he was also the mentor for the Father Ryan investigation.
Q. May we take it from the answers you have given to my questions this morning that you had no issues in relation to any of those police officers you have identified, Detective Superintendent Ure, Detective Sergeant Rhonda Mulligan or Detective Sergeant Mooney in terms of their support and/or encouragement in relation to your investigation of the Catholic Church paedophilia matters? A. I have absolutely no issues and I hold them only in the highest regard.
Q. I am turning now to paragraph 5 of your statement, if you don't mind Mr Grant, just examining a couple of the matters you have raised in there.

You mention that you believe you had two conversations with Detective Chief Inspector Peter Fox after he took carriage of the Catholic priest investigations matter in the Hunter. Do you have any recollection about the year in which these conversations took place?
A. I don't, no. It's been pointed out in the correspondence I received from you that it was potentially in the vicinity of 2002 or 2003 , and I have no reason to
doubt that that would be accurate.
Q. Did you take any notes of the conversations you had with him?
A. No, I did not.
Q. Why is that?
A. The conversations I had with him was to offer my assistance in regards to lessons learnt out of my investigation with Father Ryan and dealing with individuals within the Catholic Church who played certain roles in relation to making that job difficult and who were the key players still within the Maitland-Newcastle diocese. So I made him fully aware of my viewpoint and opinion on those and warned him in relation to potential dealings he had. I nominated locations and other names of individuals relative to my inquiries that may or may not have been relevant to his investigation. I offered him any support that I could to help him by supply of any copies of evidentiary material that $I$ had in my possession.
Q. Did Detective Chief Inspector Fox ask you for copies of any paperwork you had at that time?
A. No.
Q. Did you, at any point in that conversation or conversations with Detective Chief Inspector Fox, complain in relation to support or otherwise that you were getting from those who supervised you in your investigations? A. No, I did not, and I had no reason to.
Q. If you turn to the second page of your statement, you make some observations about limited deals you had with Detective Chief Inspector Fox during your career. You mention that at one stage he was your supervisor at Cessnock detectives' office for a short time. Are you able to assist with what year that was and for how long that period of supervision proceeded?
A. It was in 1995. I think I took up the secondment to the Major Crime Squad in July and I believe I commenced my A list training duties at Cessnock detectives just after Christmas, so in the vicinity not exceeding sort of five months, six months.
Q. You make the observation that your knowledge of Detective Chief Inspector Fox's processes and approach to his work at the time was that, in investigations, he tended
to be meticulous in recording matters in his duty book?
A. That is correct; he was a meticulous investigator.
Q. And to some extent, he trained you as to what you should do in terms of recording matters in your duty book? A. Absolutely.
Q. You then, in paragraph 7, talk about not recalling specifics of your conversations or any reference to a phrase such as "the Catholic Mafia". Do you find that phrase "Catholic Mafia" a colourful phrase that you would have recollected, had you heard it used or used it? A. Yes, I do. It's one that obviously grabs attention. It's something I'm sure I would have remembered ever saying. It's something that nobody that knows me would expect me to say. It's a great phrase. In my current role as a politician, it's a cracker that I could use at any time, had I had the need to use it.
Q. If you had, in your career as a police officer, encountered obstruction or interference in your activities by any senior police, would you have spoken out about that? A. Absolutely.
Q. When you say "Absolutely", do you mean in a public forum as opposed to just murmuring with other officers present in your local area command or district?
A. No, no, I would have taken it through the complaint management system at the time, had it occurred, and I'm well known within the organisation, I believe, for being forthright and frank and not being afraid to speak up to senior officers or about senior officers. I've got a track record of that in the organisation and I had never any reason to report any type of activity that would even be perceived as being any form of Catholic Mafia or any interference from the police force at any time.
Q. In paragraph 9 of your statement, you mention that, given you had no hindrance or obstruction from the police force concerning your investigation, you had no reason to discuss that with Detective Chief Inspector Fox. But you also say this.
... nor do I recall him disclosing to me any hindrance or obstruction regarding his investigation from Police.

Do you see that?
A. That is correct.
Q. When did you first hear any suggestion from Detective Chief Inspector Fox that he was being hindered or obstructed by police in his pursuit of investigations?
A. On his appearance on the ABC program Lateline.
Q. That's in November 2012?
A. I'm not sure when it was.
Q. Quite recently, though?
A. Yes.
Q. In paragraph 10, you talk about providing a statement to the NSW Police in mid-2011. I just want to get a small amount of background into that matter. Was it the position that you had been quoted in an article which led to some need to clarify the position?
A. That is correct.
Q. If I can have you turn to a volume that will be in the witness box next to you, volume 2 of the bundle of
materials. Turn, please, to tab 111 to page 519. Before I take you to that article, can I clarify something in your paragraph 10. In line 4, as part of a sentence commencing in line 3 of paragraph 10, you say the following:

I have provided a statement to the NSW Police Force in mid-2011 regarding in frequent contact.

Then you go on. Is that supposed to be "infrequent"? A. Yes, it's a typographical.
Q. Can you explain what type of contact you are referring to there, in terms of contact between you and Joanne McCarthy?
A. Yes, I was contacted by Joanne McCarthy, I can't recall exactly when for the first occasion, but then on multiple occasions in relation to her frustration and knowledge of investigations within the Maitland Catholic diocese. I was often asked for quotes or a commentary in relation to any part of my questions that may relate to the investigations that were occurring in this area. As a result of that conversations, it led me to - she requested of me to contact Detective Sergeant Dave Wadde11, who she
instructed me was in charge of an investigation at the time, to encourage him to get on with it or for me to provide assistance to him in any way that I may have.
Q. When you used term "infrequent contact", do you mean now and then, you were contacted by Ms McCarthy?
A. Yes, look, I might get a couple of phone calls over a couple of days, then not have any conversation for a number of months.
Q. If you look at page 519, in the fourth column, next to the second bullet point, there's a statement attributed to you there, to the following effect:

> The failure of a senior police officer with responsibility for the McAlinden matter to respond to an offer of help last year from the then police officer Troy Grant, who investigated Vince Ryan. Mr Grant, a newly elected NSW government MP, said this week he was "obviously concerned there still seems to be issues that have to be fully investigated."

Was that a comment that was taken somewhat out of context, in terms of your discussions with Ms McCarthy?
A. Yes. It's in context with the broader issues and systemic problems of child paedophilia in the Maitland Catholic diocese that I had been an advocate for, for some 17 years.
Q. Was it meant to be a critical comment of an investigation taking place at that time into matters involving Denis McAlinden?
A. No, I know nothing about that investigation. I don't know any - I don't have any information to be critical of.

MS LONERGAN. Those are my questions, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Ms Lonergan. Mr Cohen.

## <EXAMINATION BY MR COHEN:

MR COHEN: Q. Mr Grant, you indicated your sworn testimony that you started an as a plainclothes senior constable; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. You weren't a detective at that time?
A. That is correct.
Q. You were 25?
A. That is correct.
Q. You are an experienced politician now, but in 1995, would you have described yourself as a young man trying to make a mark?
A. No. I was a young man trying to do the best job I could.
Q. Were you careful and precise in your nature?
A. I was professional.
Q. Does that mean you were careful and precise in your nature?
A. I'm not quite sure $I$ understand your question.
Q. It's a very simple question. Can you answer it? Were you careful and precise in your nature? You were 25 in 1995. In 1995, as a 25-year-old, were you careful and precise in your nature?
A. To a large extent, I believe I may have been.
Q. Was it your practice to record all matters in writing that were important to you?

MS LONERGAN: I object, Commissioner. Is this question being asked in relation to policing duties or of a more general nature? Obviously the relevance to this Commission is Mr Grant's policing practices.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, thank you, Ms Lonergan.
Would you be more precise about the meaning of your question, Mr Cohen?

MR COHEN: Q. You heard my learned friend. In relation to your policing practices, was it your practice to record all matters of importance?
A. In the main, yes.
Q. When you signed your statement that you have given to the Commissioner today, which has been received as exhibit 3 or part of exhibit 3, did you consider the material
contained in it carefully before you signed it?
A. Yes.
Q. You say in paragraph 6 that Mr Fox was your supervisor at Cessnock - and you have given oral evidence about that for six months; is that correct?
A. I'm not sure of the exact time period. It was from three to six months, yes.
Q. But as much as six months is your estimation and your recollection?
A. Yes. There are records that would clearly indicate it, that I don't have access to, but yes.
Q. So it wasn't a fleeting period then?
A. No, it was a period between three to six months.
Q. It was not a period of time that would be such that you would only have limited dealings, surely?
A. The limited dealings were that I didn't work side by side with Detective Fox on a large number of investigations. We were tasked and had different jobs that we went out and did, so --
Q. But you were in the same office together?
A. Yes.
Q. And you were able, by reason of your proximity to him, to understand, as you described, him as being meticulous?
A. That is correct.
Q. You have been a police investigator over a period of time. You have formed habits and methods of observation beyond what the ordinary person in the street would have; is that right?
A. I believe so.
Q. So you were in a good position to observe Detective Chief Inspector Fox and come to a view that he was meticulous; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. By "meticulous", do you mean the Commissioner to understand that he was - that is Detective Chief Inspector Fox - somebody who was apt to exhibit painstaking efforts?? A. Exactly right. I was quoted in the Sydney Morning Herald, which is a correct quote, saying words to the
effect of, "If I was a victim, I would want Inspector Fox as the case officer."
Q. Does this mean that he was somebody that you looked up to at the time?
A. It's a comment reflecting that $I$ saw how meticulous he was and how passionate about investigations he was and therefore if I was a victim of crime, I would want him investigating that crime.
Q. Therefore, you saw him to adopt a practice of careful research?
A. Absolutely.
Q. And a conscientious application to the work at hand?
A. That's correct.
Q. And scrupulous attention to detail?
A. That is correct.
Q. I put those propositions to you because those are all definitions of the word "meticulous", aren't they?
A. I don't know what the definition of "meticulous" is, but that's my understanding of what it would mean.
Q. You accept that they are, at the very least, synonyms for "meticulous", don't you?
A. I accept your premise, yes.
Q. In 1995, as a young man of 25 , starting out on a policing career, just about to commence such a career as a detective, I take it you were apt, by reason of the view you formed of Detective Chief Inspector Fox, to include him as somebody within whom you could confide; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you did take the opportunity to confide in him, didn't you?
A. No, I took the opportunity to offer assistance in relation to my investigation that may have been of assistance to his.
Q. Indeed; but you also confided in him, didn't you?
A. Yes, I did, in relation to members of the Catholic Church within the Maitland-Newcastle diocese.
Q. You said you don't recall using the term Catholic Mafia; that's your evidence today, isn't it?
A. That is correct.
Q. But that's a recollection, isn't it, casting your mind back to a period when you were 25; is that right? ?
A. Yes, but the allegation is that that conversation happened in 2002 or 2003, at which time I was 32 or 33.
Q. As a man of 32 or 33 , it's put to you that you used that term then; is that right?

* A. That's what I've heard has been given in evidence here and I have no recollection of ever using that term and I have no reason to have used that term, because I had and saw no interference with my investigation in which to give --
Q. Let's explore that.

MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, I object. The witness has to be allowed to finish his answer.

MR COHEN: Q. I do apologise. Please finish.
A. I did finish. I'm not sure how much was heard in the court. I can repeat it, if you like.

> (Answer marked * read)

THE WITNESS: In which to give that reference.
MR COHEN: Q. Thank you. I apologise for interrupting. You tell the Commissioner, don't you, that you can't recall the specifics of the conversation? That's what you say in your statement?
A. That is correct. It was some time ago.
Q. But you are now purporting in the witness box to give a very detailed description, aren't you?

MS LONERGAN: I object. The witness is not and has not purported to give detailed descriptions. All he has done is deny he used a certain phrase. He has, in fact with some care, only referred to certain broad matters, not a detailed description.

MR COHEN: I take the point.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Grant.

MR COHEN: Q. Let me put it this way, Mr Grant: do you accept that you could be quite mistaken in your recollection?
A. No.
Q. There's no chance or possibility on any basis that you could be mistaken?
A. There's always a chance or a possibility of anything.

However, all evidence is to the contrary. There was no
interference in my investigation, there was no adverse pressure from anyone within the NSW Police Force, borne out by the fact that it was probably the most successful paedophile investigation of priests, and if there was going to be any interference that I didn't know about or happened or allegedly happened, well, it didn't work.
Q. I thought we were talking about the term "Catholic Mafia". But to the extent we are at cross-purposes, I was referring you to the use of the term "Catholic Mafia". It is entirely possible that you are quite mistaken in your recollection, isn't it?
A. No.
Q. Why not?
A. Why not?
Q. Yes. Why is your recollection completely and unequivocally without doubt?
A. Because I had no reason then, and have no reason now or in the future to ever draw that inference or use that terminology.
Q. The fact that you had a reason to do something is not an answer to my question, sir. It is possible, is it not, you could be entirely mistaken about your recollection of this conversation with Detective Chief Inspector Fox, isn't it?
A. I don't believe so.
Q. But your belief is that - a belief. You don't have a record in writing of this, do you?
A. No, I don't.
Q. There was no contemporaneous record made in 1929 or 1939?
A. I can't record something that didn't happen.
Q. Are you saying the conversation didn't occur?
A. Sorry?
Q. I thought you said you can't recall something that happened. You say that this conversation in 2002 or 2003 did not occur?
A. No, you are putting it to me that I would have recorded the use of "Catholic Mafia". I said I can't report or record what didn't happen or was said.
Q. Sorry, we are at cross-purposes. I was asking you if there is no record, and your testimony is there is no record?
A. No, there is no record of that conversation or what I believe was a second conversation some years later, because both conversations were inconsequential.
Q. You have told the Commission that your purpose in discussing with Detective Chief Inspector Fox about your experiences of the Ryan investigation were the purpose for the conversation?
A. That's correct.
Q. That, surely, is not inconsequential
A. No, but the outcome is, because there was no correlation between my brief of evidence and obviously the ones he was investigating; therefore it was inconsequential.
Q. We are not talking about an outcome; we are talking about the conversation at the time. That was not inconsequential, was it? It was of the utmost importance to both of you, wasn't it?
A. The conversation at the time was a police officer, who had experience in investigating a type of investigation in an area where a similar investigation was occurring and offering any assistance to assist that officer with that investigation.
Q. Which could hardly be described as inconsequential, could it?
A. Well, the inconsequential bit is that there was nothing in my investigation that related to the investigation undertaken by Detective Fox. That's my reference to "inconsequential".
Q. The issue discussed between you in this conversation flowed out of the similarities between the Ryan
investigation and the Fletcher investigation, didn't it? A. That is correct.
Q. You informed Detective Chief Inspector Fox that, in your understanding of the investigation, Ryan's crimes and his conduct were, as you understood it, similar to what Detective Chief Inspector Fox had described to you about Fletcher. That's right, isn't it?
A. That is correct, and some similarities with locations.
Q. And you told Detective Chief Inspector Fox that you were extremely upset by the failure of Monsignor Cotter to report Ryan's conduct to police because it permitted many more victims to be abused?
A. Absolutely.
Q. That was your view, wasn't it?
A. Absolutely. It's still my view today.
Q. You then went on to say to Detective Chief Inspector Fox that you had been subject to hindrance in relation to your investigations of the Ryan matter, in that conversation; is that right?

MS LONERGAN: I object. There needs to be some clarity, given the importance of where the inference was coming from, as to whether the question is being put on the basis of hindrance by police or hindrance by the Catholic Church.

MR COHEN: I was just getting to that, but I will clarify it.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Cohen.
MR COHEN: Q. You indicated to Detective Chief Inspector Fox that you had suffered hindrance by senior police, didn't you, in this conversation?
A. No, I did not.
Q. It was at that point that you indicated that it was, as you described, the Catholic Mafia that were hindering you?
A. That's incorrect.
Q. This hindrance occurred at the investigation stage of your investigation, or at the early investigation stage of your investigation of Father Ryan, when you were trying to
conduct interviews and obtain witness statements. That's what you told Peter Fox, isn't it?
A. No, that is incorrect. It's grossly incorrect. My conversations with him were specific to the interference by individuals within the Catholic Newcastle diocese during the course of my investigation, both into initially Ryan and then in relation to the cover-up by Monsignor Patrick Cotter.
Q. You also told Detective Chief Inspector Fox the hindrance that you identified took the form of having other investigations imposed upon you in an unreasonable way so as to divert your attention from the matter at hand?
A. No, that's incorrect.
Q. That's what you told him, isn't it?
A. No.
Q. When you were investigating the Ryan matter, were you allocated other investigations or tasks that took you away from the Ryan matter for periods of time?
A. I was no different to any other member of the Maitland --
Q. Please answer the question.
A. I will if you let me finish.
Q. When you were investigating the Ryan matter, were you allocated any other tasks that took you away from the Ryan investigation?
A. I was allocated cases before Father Ryan's case came to me and after.
Q. And did they take you away from the Ryan investigation?
A. They took my duties as each of the different investigations required. I did not have Father Ryan's investigation as a sole investigation, nor did any other member of the Major Crime Squad have a sole investigation. It is the course of police business that you investigate a large number of matters that proceed at various different stages of the investigation process, as well as court processes or referrals. I had a large number of investigations that $I$ was carrying out at the same time as I did the Father Ryan investigation.
Q. Were you sent on trips to the north coast of New South

Wales or outside of the Hunter to obtain statements or to conduct other functions during those periods, away from the Ryan investigation?
A. I was tasked as part of the Major Crime Squad team to participate in other investigations which required me to travel between Wyong and Tweed Heads, which was our region. Predominantly it was in the Coffs Harbour and Taree regions that I was involved in a couple of other investigations away from Newcastle.
Q. It was in this conversation with Detective Chief Inspector Fox in late 2002 or early 2003 that you indicated that those very activities you just described to the Commissioner were what were being deliberately put in your way as a hindrance, didn't you?
A. No.
Q. You have been active in the media indicating a lack of action by police in investigations made into child sexual abuse by Catholic priests, haven't you?
A. No, that's incorrect.
Q. Well, you have been reported in the Newcastle Herald to that effect, haven't you?
A. No. I'll just check. Can you ask the question again?

I think you said that $I$ have been reported being critical of police hindrance of Catholic investigations; is that right?
Q. Yes. That was my first question.
A. No.
Q. You have been reported to that effect in the Newcastle Herald, haven't you?
A. Not to my knowledge. I've been extremely critical in relation to Catholic Church's role in relation to various investigations and my knowledge of the Father Ryan and Patrick Cotter incidents has been repeatedly quoted here and in the Sydney media, on the Lateline program, on various news outlets, and I've said the same in the Legislative Assembly chamber.
Q. You were taken to a news article in the Newcastle Herald which is in volume 2 of the bundle at tab 111, and a particular article is extracted at page 519. Are you saying that those references to police mishandling are misquotes?

MS LONERGAN: I object. Commissioner, I only took the witness to one paragraph that directly referred to a statement attributed to him. If there's to be questioning about other content in the article, and an attempt to relate that to statements or propositions put in the public domain by this witness, (a) he ought to be given time to read it; and (b) that particular proposition should be identified in the article.

MR COHEN: I take my learned friend's comment.
THE COMMISSIONER: Is it that article?
MR COHEN: Q. It is the same article on page 519, if Mr Grant has it. In fairness to you, why don't you read the article and then tell us when you have done that. A. Yes.
Q. The second dot point to which you were taken in the article, by my learned friend Ms Lonergan, you say you were misquoted?
A. I'm saying - I answered the question to Ms Lonergan truthfully and honestly - that my comments were taken out of context, because my comments to Joanne McCarthy were on the broader issue Catholic paedophilia in this area and the need to fully investigate those matters. I have no knowledge of which to make a comment or be quoted in this article about the rest of the content of that article.
Q. I will try again. Do you say you were misquoted? A. No. I'm saying I was taken out of context. That is the evidence I've already given and the evidence is still the same.
Q. So the quotes in the article are correct?
A. Yes.
Q. When you spoke to Detective Chief Inspector Fox in 2002 and 2003, did you tell the Commissioner that you contacted him to make the initial contact?
A. I can't recall. I can't recall if he rang me or I rang him, I don't know.
Q. Isn't it the case that he rang you, looking for your assistance, because he was on his way to the correctional facility to interview Ryan in that facility at the time.

Do you remember that?
A. That's possibly correct, I can't recall.
Q. Isn't that the basis upon which this discussion occurred and in which you offered your comments?
A. Yes, as --
Q. Isn't that when you warned him - I'm sorry, had you finished?

MS LONERGAN: The witness said, "Yes," then he started to say another word.

THE WITNESS: A. Yes, as I've indicated earlier, I had a conversation. I can't remember who initiated it. I can't remember whether he rang me or $I$ rang him to offer assistance and I warned him in relation to individuals who were in the Maitland-Newcastle diocese that I had experienced difficulties with during the course of my investigation to help him out and offer him, in addition to that, any material I had in my possession that may relate to his investigation. I don't know the specifics of his investigation - to this day I still don't know - or two investigations or however many he's had.
Q. You say you didn't make a comment about the Catholic Mafia, but is it possible now that because you are an elected representative to the New South Wales parliament that you are shying away from conceding that comment was made because there may be some adverse political consequences for you?
A. No. No, quite the opposite. I think that with the ability I have to utilise parliamentary privilege, it would only be in my political interest to use it if it was true. Unfortunately it's not.
Q. I'm not talking about parliamentary privilege, Mr Grant. I'm talking about you being concerned about being identified with such a comment by your constituents. That's a real possibility for you, isn't it?
A. No.
Q. Indeed, it's a real possibility for you amongst your Coalition colleagues on your side of politics, isn't it? A. Not at all. I called for Cardinal George Pell in the public domain to fall on his sword. I think that's evidence that I'm not afraid or think about the
consequences that you are alluding to whatsoever.
Q. In the conversation you had with Detective Chief Inspector Fox in, let's call it the end of 2002 for the sake of some definition, did you explain in your discussions about members of the Catholic clergy, as you described it in that conversation - did you discuss particular members of the clergy with Detective Chief Inspector Fox?
A. Absolutely.
Q. Who are they?

MR GYLES: Commissioner, I object. This evidence goes directly to the second hearing. For our part, we weren't provided with a copy of the bundle for this part of the hearing. We have been given Mr Grant's statement for the first time this morning. If Mr Grant is going to give relevant evidence going to communications or conduct, action or inaction on the part of the church in respect of these investigations, that ought happen at stage 2, in my respectful submission.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MR COHEN: Might I be heard?
MS LONERGAN: Can I accept and adopt and repeat the submission made by Mr Gyles.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, you can be heard, Mr Cohen.
MR COHEN: Is it the case that Mr Grant will be giving evidence during the second term of reference at all?

MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, that's a matter to be determined by those assisting you, and appropriate steps will be taken to elicit and distribute evidence relevant to term of reference 2 at the appropriate time.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Ms Lonergan.
MR COHEN: The proposition is a simple one. Clearly Mr Grant has evidence to provide. It seems convenient, because we are here now.

THE COMMISSIONER: We are not here to deal with issues
relevant to term of reference 2 , Mr Cohen.
MR COHEN: I understand that.
MS LONERGAN: May I add, certain persons have chosen not to be present for term of reference 1 and, in my respectful submission, it would not be appropriate to proceed down the path of taking evidence that would be relevant to term of reference 2 matters.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Ms Lonergan. I do not think we should venture too far into term of reference 2 matters,

## <EXAMINATION BY MR GYLES:

MR GYLES: Could I deal with one aspect of the evidence that has been given, and I would like to deal with it now, if I may, given that it may be that we won't see Mr Grant at stage 2 and this evidence is in. It is a short series of questions.
Q. The first is: it is the case, isn't it, Mr Grant, that you received no communication or approach from anyone within the Catholic Church or associated with it seeking to influence your investigations into the activities of Father Ryan? That's the case, isn't it?
A. Written communications, was it?
Q. You received no communication or approach from anyone within the church or associated with it seeking to influence your investigation into the activities of Father Ryan? That's right, isn't it?
A. That's correct.
Q. You know of no other police officers having been approached by persons within or associated with the church seeking to influence the investigation into the activities of any Catholic priest. That's the case, isn't it?
A. Yes. Sorry, Commissioner, may I correct my first answer.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Yes, Mr Grant.
A. Sorry, I received no communications. I did have a nun visit my home when I was living down here, during the course of my investigation, my private home.

MR GYLES: Q. But no one within the police force ever
communicated to you, did they, expressly or impliedly, that it would not be in your best interests to fully investigate the matters?
A. No.
Q. The Ryan investigation proceeded in the ordinary course, didn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. You made all appropriate inquiries and set out to obtain evidence sufficient to support a conviction?
A. Yes.
Q. And did so?
A. Yes.
Q. And in your experience of the Ryan investigation, it is accurate to say, isn't it, that there was no group within the NSW Police Force seeking to exercise influence over the manner in which investigations into Catholic priests were being conducted?
A. That's absolutely correct.
Q. And I think what you have told the Commissioner is that if there had been such a group seeking to exert influence over you, then you would have taken steps to speak to your superiors about it, wouldn't you?
A. Exactly correct, and in the position I have now, I would be singing from the rafters if that had any truth to it whatsoever.
Q. Your complaint often expressed goes to the matters which we aren't dealing with in this stage of the inquiry, which go to a failure to come forward. Your complaint is not based upon some proposition of collusion between the church and police, is it?
A. No, definitely not. The church on its own.

MR GYLES: May it please the court.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Gyles. Mr Roser?
MR ROSER: Mr Saidi will ask the questions, Commissioner.
<EXAMINATION BY MR SAIDI:
MR SAIDI. Q. Mr Grant, I want to go back to your
experience as a detective, if I may. You spent some years in the field of investigating serious crime, is that so? A. That's correct. Just to confirm, I was never a designated detective. I was a plainclothes investigator.
Q. Having said that, though, you did carry out
investigations on serious indictable matters, did you not?
A. That's correct.
Q. Over a period of some years?
A. That's correct.
Q. The Vincent Ryan investigation was a very significant investigation for the Hunter region at the time, was it not?
A. Yes, it was.
Q. Indeed it was one of the first, if not the very first of the prosecutions against a member the Catholic clergy? A. It was the first in this diocese.
Q. From that perspective it was one which, as you indicated, grew initially from two informants or complainants to in excess of 30 or so complainants; correct?
A. That's right, I charged him with offences against 31 victims.
Q. During the course of that investigation, is it correct to say that you were engaged in the investigation over a period of a couple of years, if not longer?
A. That is correct. I commenced the investigation around August 1995 and the investigation into Father Ryan happened over a series of incidents. He received a custodial sentence for a number of matters. I then used the section 43 order to take him out of prison to interview him for the purposes of other allegations, and then he volunteered in that interview a large number of other victims unknown to police which he then faced or was sentenced for the totality of 31 victims at a later date.
Q. Is it fair to say during the course of that investigation that you obtained links as to further inquiries that could be made, information relating to contacts that could be contacted and who may be helpful?
A. That is correct.
Q. Indeed, during the course of that investigation, is it
fair to say that you also became familiar with operative techniques that could be employed when investigating such crimes?
A. That is correct.
Q. You were contacted by Mr Fox to seek your assistance in terms of the knowledge base that you had; is that correct?
A. Yes. As I said in my evidence, I can't recall if I rang him to offer or he rang me for help. I don't - if he said he rang me, I accept that.
Q. Whether it was one way or the other, either way, he called on you for assistance; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. That's fairly normal in police circles, is it not, for one police officer investigating a crime to call on another police officer for assistance?
A. Sure, and it makes a lot of sense.
Q. When you say "sure", and perhaps this is an inelegant way of putting it, but isn't it almost mandatory for a police officer conducting an investigation in which he may have assistance from another police officer who carried out a similar investigation, to call on that other police officer to provide information?
A. I'm not sure if the word "mandatory" is appropriate but it would be foolish not to.
Q. Perhaps "mandatory" is a strong word. Could I use this phraseology: it would be an exercise in great common sense to undertake that course of action?
A. I agree.
Q. That happened on a daily basis in the NSW Police

Service, at least during the period when you were working; is that so?
A. I can't equivocally comment for every police officer but I imagine it did, yes.
Q. But in terms of your experience, you were aware that people could call on you for assistance and you in turn knew that you could call on your fellow police officers for assistance?
A. That is correct.
Q. If fellow police officers were carrying out investigations which touched upon a similar investigation which you were carrying out and you called upon them for assistance, you would expect them to cooperate fully, would you not?
A. Yes.
Q. If they had any statements in their possession which could be of assistance to you in your investigation, you would expect them to provide you with such statements or information, would you not?
A. Absolutely.
Q. Indeed, if they had any information, whether they be formal statements or whether they would be sources of contact or whether they would be avenues of further inquiry, you would expect a fellow police officer making contact with you, or vice versa, to provide you with all of the information at their disposal, would you not?
A. That is correct.
Q. In your experience as a police officer, you would frown upon any police officer upon whom you called for assistance hiding information from you that may be relevant to your investigation, would you not?
A. I would have, yes.
Q. Indeed, you would regard that as improper conduct, would you not?

MR COHEN: I object to that question.
MR SAIDI: If it offends my friend's sensibilities, I will change it.
Q. You would regard that behaviour on the part of a police officer, in not providing you with information of assistance, as being less than desirable, would you not? A. I can talk as a sergeant of police. I was trained in relation to internal investigations, and, given that training and experience, yes, I would.
Q. Indeed, would you regard it as a serious matter, from your experience and from your knowledge of investigations, that when calling upon a police officer, a fellow police officer for assistance, if that police officer deliberately withheld information from you?
A. Yes.
Q. I just want to go on to a couple of other aspects, if I may. In terms of investigations, again on your experience, it is an important matter to maintain the integrity of police investigations, is it not?
A. Paramount.
Q. When you say "paramount", it is absolutely crucial that the integrity of police investigations be maintained, is it not?
A. Absolutely.
Q. In maintaining police investigations, do you see part of it as being that any information which is obtained during the course of a police investigation is not passed on to any person not involved in the investigation?
A. Yes.
Q. Indeed, is it your experience that if any information is passed on - that is information confidential to a police investigation - to a third person, that could jeopardise the effectiveness of the investigation?
A. Potentially, yes.
Q. You have made some reference, only a few answers ago, to being involved in internal complaints in some fashion? A. Yes.
Q. I am drawing on your experience now as a person involved with internal complaints. In terms of any police officer obtaining --

MR COHEN: I object to this. This witness is not an expert. This goes nowhere, Commissioner.

MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, may I suggest the question be completed and the witness pause, so we can hear the full extent of the question.

MR SAIDI: I will go back, given that objection.
Q. Your experience with police complaints and dealing with police complaints, internal complaints, can you give us an idea of that?
A. I was trained in how to conduct investigations, report the investigations, both through the internal complaint
management process of the NSW Police Force and also through to the Ombudsman.
Q. You also dealt with complaints yourself, did you not?
A. I did. One of those led to the arrest of a police officer.
Q. I want to come back to the question I asked you.

Going back on your experience as a person who was involved with the dealing with police complaints, you would regard it as a serious matter, would you not, that any police officer who had any confidential information related to any police investigation passed that information on to a third party?

MR COHEN: I maintain my objection.
MR SAIDI: And I press the question.
THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Cohen, is it a matter of the witness' expertise?

MR COHEN: Yes, and it is a question of the evidence that might be received, and it has to be evidence on a proper footing. This is rolling up a series of matters, and these are matters which this witness can only give a fleeting impression about, in my submission.

THE COMMISSIONER: His expertise, in my view, has been established and I will allow the question.

MR SAIDI: Q. Do you want me to repeat the question? A. Yes, please.
Q. Going on your experience as a person involved in internal affairs matters or complaints, you would regard it as a serious matter, would you not, if a police officer obtained confidential information relating to an investigation and passed that information on to a third party in any unauthorised manner?
A. Yes, I would.
Q. If a police officer had any concerns in relation to an investigation, is there an organisation, as you understood it, within a region or within the NSW Police system known as the complaints management system?
A. Yes, the Professional Standards Command of the NSW

Police Force has a complaints management system that refers different categories of complaints to be investigated and/or dealt with differently, whether inside a command, external to a command or more higher serious ones at a higher level.
Q. Again I am drawing on your experience of your knowledge with the NSW Police Force as it was before you left the service and also your experience with the complaints management system that was maintained. Assuming a police officer had concerns in relation to either corruption or in relation to hindering of an investigation in which he was involved, or matters of that kind, there was a system, was there not, within the NSW Police Force whereby that person could take it to an appropriate person or body to register such a complaint?
A. Yes, there is.
Q. Going back to the period when you were there - I am deliberately keeping it to when you were there, so we don't go outside your knowledge - going back to the period you were there, was it the case also that a police officer, if he had serious concerns about corruption or conduct, whether it be unbecoming, illegal, unlawful or otherwise, if he had any concerns about that, that police officer could make a complaint in anonymous materials, whereby sorry, the word "anonymous" is not appropriate. He could make a complaint whereby his or her identity could be kept confidential in terms of that complaint being registered and investigated?
A. That is correct, both in terms of the NSW Police Force and also the Independent Commission Against Corruption.
Q. Indeed, if a police officer had concerns about corruption, whether it be by the police officer working next to him, at the desk next door to him, a police officer in the next room to him, a police officer upstairs or downstairs of a higher rank, or indeed the region commander, if a police officer had concerns about the integrity or concerns about corruption of any of those persons, there were avenues available to that police officer to take that matter up, were they not?
A. Yes .
Q. And they include matters, and you have already referred to one - they include bodies such as the Police Integrity Commission, for example?
A. Yes.
Q. The Professional Standards Command within the NSW Police Force?
A. Yes.
Q. A police officer could take it to any superior officer who he trusted and give that information to that superior officer, so the superior officer could then deal with that information; do you agree with that?
A. Yes.
Q. In your situation, when you were dealing with the Father Ryan investigation, you had concerns about - I use a very general term, I use this phrase in a general sense; I don't mean to be derogatory to anyone - you had concerns about confidentiality during the Vincent Ryan investigation, did you not?
A. No, I had concerns in relation to the actions of individuals.
Q. In that situation where you, as an investigating police officer, had concerns about the actions of any individuals and any possibility of any individual influencing the outcome of an investigation, would it be the case that you would ensure, as far as possible, that the integrity of the investigation be maintained?
A. Absolutely.
Q. And that no information of any kind be passed out to a third party?
A. Yes.
Q. The greater the potential that there may be interference with an investigation, the more important it becomes that the integrity of the investigation and confidentiality be maintained? Do you agree with that A. I do.
Q. One important way of ensuring and maintaining confidentiality is by making sure members of the media do not obtain confidential information. Do you agree with that?
A. Yes.

MR SAIDI: Thank you, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Ms Lonergan, anything arising?
MS LONERGAN: No, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Is it appropriate that Mr Grant be excused now?

MS LONERGAN: Yes, Commissioner, it is appropriate that he be excused.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you for your evidence, Mr Grant, you are excused.

## THE WITNESS WITHDREW

MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, can I suggest the following course of action. We take the morning tea adjournment now. Something has arisen in the form of a request from the media for access to the statement of Mr Grant. In my respectful submission, Commissioner, I do not see any problem with that course, but it may be that others at the Bar table wish to be heard on that issue.

MR SKINNER: I don't, Commissioner.
MR ROSER: Neither do I, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Gyles?
MR GYLES: No, Commissioner.
MS LONERGAN: In that case, I suggest we take the morning tea adjournment now and resume at 11.45.

## SHORT ADJOURNMENT

MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, before recalling Detective Chief Inspector Fox, can I deal with three transcript corrections that were pointed out to me by Mr Cohen.

The first occurs at page 115 , line 19 , where it says, "she was more of a complaint than informant"; it should read "complainant".

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, that's agreed, isn't it, ladies and gentlemen?

MR COHEN: Yes, Commissioner.
MR ROSER: Yes, Commissioner.
MS LONERGAN: At page 144, at line 36 , it should read, "I left in no doubt" - the word "no" is left out.

Then on page 176, 1 ine 2, there is a year which should read "1999". There is an additional 8 in the year.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Those changes will be noted. Thank you, Ms Lonergan.

MS LONERGAN: Thank you. I recall Detective Chief Inspector Fox.
<PETER RAYMOND FOX, resworn:
[11.52am]
<EXAMINATION BY MS LONERGAN CONTINUING:
MS LONERGAN: Q. Yesterday, Detective Chief Inspector Fox, I was asking you some questions regarding the meeting on 2 December 2010?
A. Yes.
Q. I want to move now to a phone call that you had with Inspector Anthony Townsend --
A. Yes.
Q. -- approximately a week after the meeting on 2 December.
A. Yes .
Q. Can you describe, for those present, what the purpose of your phone call was?
A. The purpose of my call is that I hadn't been given any explanation why I had been asked to no longer investigate the matter, and I also still had, obviously, a great deal of concerns, as I elaborated on in my evidence yesterday --
Q. Can I ask you, what was Inspector Townsend's position in terms of your questions about being allowed to be involved in the investigation? Was he operations manager?
A. He is the operations manager in the north region office.
Q. Was it his call as to who should be allocated the
investigation, as you understood it, or not?
A. Normally he would have, I would imagine, a significant say to the region commander as to its allocation.
Q. So you telephoned him to express some displeasure with the decision; is that correct?
A. I had. I hadn't really - since I electronically sent him a copy of my report of 25 November, I had no communication back from him or feedback as to his interpretation of that.
Q. And may I ask, was Inspector Townsend present at the meeting on 2 December?
A. He arrived fairly late into that meeting. He certainly wasn't there for the vast majority of it.
Q. Was he present while you were present?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you able to say now what parts of the meeting he was present for, or not?
A. I think, off memory, when I was given a copy of the email I sent to Joanne McCarthy on the night of 2 December, it actually indicates in my record there as to what part he arrived.
Q. Would you turn to tab 84 in volume 2 and just direct me to that part that confirms the presence of Inspector Townsend.
A. Yes, it is on the last page. Sorry, the third page would be better. He's mentioned in the second paragraph.
Q. Can I direct your attention to page 357 , in the second paragraph, third line you comment:

Graeme Parker arrived during meeting and Tony Townsend towards the end.
A. Yes. That was my understanding, and probably a fair indication that $I$ would imagine he - I haven't got it specifically, unfortunately, when he arrived, but I would imagine it wasn't probably very long --
Q. I'm going to stop you there. Don't imagine when he would have arrived. If you recollect the point at which he arrived, say so, otherwise refer to your more contemporaneous record for assistance.
A. I believe he arrived partly through the discussion as outlined in paragraph 2 on page 358.
Q. You recollect Superintendent Townsend actually making a comment there?
A. Inspector Townsend, yes.
Q. Inspector Townsend then said "She has" in the context of being involved in matters?
A. Yes.
Q. Is there anything else in that email that assists as to involvement by Inspector Townsend in the meeting?
A. No. My recollection, he was reasonably mute through the course of the meeting. I think I said in my statement that he played a very minor role.
Q. So you called him because of his capacity as operations manager?
A. Yes.
Q. By "calling", I mean you made the phone call about a week after this meeting?
A. I telephoned him, yes.
Q. Did you ask him to see if he could arrange to have the decision for the matter, the investigation you were interested in, reviewed?
A. Yes.
Q. What did he say about that request?
A. He was quite emphatic that the decision had been made by the region commander, Carlene York, and Max Mitchell, and in short, no correspondence would be entered into.
Q. Any other matters relevant to the Special Commission of Inquiry that you discussed with Inspector Townsend in that phone call?
A. Again I expressed my concern that what $I$ had put in my report to him of 25 November hadn't been taken into consideration. I also raised concerns about - again, reiterating some of the issues $I$ raised at the meeting of 2 December, in that I was concerned about the wellbeing of some of the victim witnesses and the rapport $I$ had built up and the handling of them.
Q. The matter that you wanted reviewed was the decision
about your involvement or otherwise being permitted in that investigation?
A. Yes, basically, you know, for me not to be involved at all, when I had already had so much involvement with it, and was more than willing and passionate about assisting, yes.
Q. Do you recollect Inspector Townsend saying to you that, although firm decisions had already been made in relation to the conduct of the investigation, that further assessment could be made after all the relevant material had been reviewed by the strike force?
A. I don't recall, no.
Q. In giving that answer that you don't recall, are you saying that definitely wasn't said or you just don't recollect?
A. I don't recollect that, no.
Q. Could you turn to tab 87 , page 370 , which appears to commence an email exchange between you and Joanne McCarthy on 10 December 2010, just read to yourself the email from Ms McCarthy that starts halfway down that page, please.
A. Okay .
Q. Let me know when you have finished completing your reading of just that email from Ms McCarthy to you.
A. Yes .
Q. Would you agree with me that that email from Ms McCarthy raises with you a concern regarding how victim [AL] was interviewed at or around about that time? Do you see the third paragraph:
[AL] contacted me yesterday very upset.
A. Yes. Do you agree with me that it is Ms McCarthy conveying to you that she, Ms McCarthy, had some question mark over the way [AL] was managed by police?
A. Spoken to, managed, interviewed, yes.
Q. At the end of the email, Ms McCarthy says:

Can you let me know if there's anything I can do at the moment other than what I'm doing, which is waiting to strike at the right time.
A. Yes.
Q. Are you able to assist the Commission about what you understood Ms McCarthy to mean by that comment?
A. [Answer suppressed].
Q. I'm going to stop you there. I just want to deal with the way you interpreted that.
A. That's how I interpreted it, yes.
Q. Was your receipt of the phone call from [AL]? You don't need to look at the documents. You just volunteered some information about having receiving a phone call.
A. Yes, yes, it was.
Q. It was from [AL]?
A. Yes.
Q. About the same subject matter?
A. Yes.
Q. Now I want you to read your email in response. Take your time, because it does go for nearly two full pages. A. I'm sorry, again it may take a little while if I'm to absorb it.
Q. No, no, you must be allowed to read it properly and thoroughly.
A. Thank you. Yes.
Q. Was the purpose of you sending this email to assist Ms McCarthy with making a complaint about the officers who had dealt with [AL]?
A. My purpose in sending that is probably the very same advice I would have given to anyone coming to me asking me how to complain about the conduct --

MR McILWAINE: I object, Commissioner. Again, the witness is being unresponsive. In my submission, that question was capable of a "Yes" or "No" answer.

MS LONERGAN: It was, Commissioner, but as --

MR McILWAINE: But the witness continues to use that opportunity, as on previous occasions, and it appears he is about to do so again, to give evidence which you, Commissioner, are not able to receive pursuant to section $9(3)$ of the Act. He should be directed not to do it and to cease doing it, Commissioner.

MR COHEN: Could I be heard, after my learned friend?
MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, in my respectful submission, the answer that Detective Chief Inspector Fox started to give appeared to be, at least at the beginning, responsive. I would not bind this witness to a "Yes"/"No" response in a question of that nature, unless he deviated into irrelevancy, and he had not yet done so.

MR COHEN: Commissioner, I rise to address you about a more fundamental question of jurisprudence that matters here. Reference has been made by my friend to section 9(3) of the Act. In my submission, section $9(3)$ is nothing more than an enabling provision, facultative, directive. What it does, especially now that the Evidence Act is extant in this state, is it imports the Evidence Act.

In my respectful submission, to put section 9(3) as some sort of extraordinary barrier over which no one can expect to get is, in my respectful submission, nonsense. What must happen, Commissioner, is that you must have regard to the Evidence Act. Indeed that Act allows you to take material in narrative form; it enables you to disregard the rules of evidence as you see fit. There is a mandatory provision in section $9(3)$ which means you must have regard to those things, but it is not some civil barrier which cannot become impenetrable. That, in my submission, is how it should be read and inform such a motion.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Cohen.
MR McILWAINE: I do not seek to cavil, but my concern is shortly prior to this question, the witness was asked about the interview of a victim. He described the treatment of that witness as "atrocious". My clients have a particular --

THE COMMISSIONER: I think it was "abysmal".

MR McILWAINE: Sorry, "abysmal". It would appear, from what I understand, that this witness has no direct knowledge of what took place between particular officers and a particular witness, yet he volunteered that opinion. He has done that - that's just one example of a number of occasions when he has done that. That type of material, in my respectful submission, whatever my friend says about section 9(3), is a clear breach of section 9(3). It is not evidence that would be admissible in civil proceedings, within any way, shape or form.

The witness continues to give that type of evidence, damaging persons' reputations, and he should be prevented from doing so.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr McIlwaine, I will allow the witness to continue to answer the question and I will permit you to cross-examine him on those matters when the time comes.

MR McILWAINE: With respect, Commissioner, allowing cross-examination does not remedy the harm because the evidence is before the Commission and it is liable to be published, and damage to reputations occurs, and that can't be remedied by cross-examination.

THE COMMISSIONER: Whose reputation are you submitting to me is in danger of damage at the present time?

MR McILWAINE: In relation to this, it is --
THE COMMISSIONER: Perhaps you don't want to add to that, but do you say a particular officer?

MR McILWAINE: Two particular officers, Commissioner, the officers who interviewed the complainant who is referred to. One of those is my client, one is not. I should not say "interviewed", but dealt with that particular victim. That is my concern, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr McIlwaine, we are exploring the reasons for what has been written in this email by the witness and I propose to allow it. Thank you, Mr McIlwaine.

MS LONERGAN: Q. The question, Detective Chief Inspector Fox, was: was the purpose of you sending this email to advise Ms McCarthy about how to go about complaining about
police conduct? Try to confine yourself to that specific question, rather than making a generalised statement, if you could, please.
A. Yes.
Q. You don't have to answer the questions I ask you "Yes" or "No", but when you can, that is most helpful.

Do you not see that as inappropriate conduct of a senior police officer, to advise a member of the public how to complain about other police officers?
A. I would hope that any police officer of any rank would assist anybody that is wishing to make a complaint about the conduct of a police officer on how to go about doing that. I believe that that's actually part of the policy.
Q. Were you keen to assist in a complaint being made about officers involved in the investigation Strike Force Lantle because you were keen to see that investigation fail?
A. Not at all. I was hoping that the victims would be treated with decency and care. I gave the advice not only based on what Ms McCarthy told me in that email, but also based on the telephone call I received from [AL], who, even though I had told her I was no longer allowed to remain in contact with her, she rang me this particular night, she was in tears, she spent half an hour on the phone telling me, and her words were, "Brad Tayler is harassing me. He won't take no for an answer. He's demanding that I come in and give him a statement. I've explained to him that mum's not well and we're going away for Christmas, but he won't take no for an answer." And I continually consoled her while she cried and was extremely distressed over her treatment at his hands.
Q. Turn your attention to page 369 , which is part of the email. In the last paragraph, you make a comment to Ms McCarthy in your email:

> I feel terrible about that part and not being able to look after them - I really mean that.
A. That's exactly how I felt, and I still feel that way. I feel so sorry for the way they were treated.
Q. You feel that you treat witnesses and victims of
sexual assault crimes better than any other police officer? A. [Answer suppressed].
Q. When you say "what was occurring here," you were not party yourself to these interviews, were you? You weren't present when these interviews took place, were you? That's a "Yes" or "No" question. Were you present when these interviews took place or not?
A. No.
Q. So you were relying on the report of [AL] in relation to how the interview seemed to be conducted, to her?
A. I didn't believe she was lying. That's what I was relying on.
Q. I'm not suggesting for a minute that [AL] was lying.
A. Good.
Q. What I'm suggesting is you were relying on her perception on what was occurring to determine what exactly happened in relation to the interview?
A. On that and also the email from Ms McCarthy.
Q. Ms McCarthy wasn't present for the interview with [AL], to your knowledge, was she?
A. Not to my knowledge, no.

MR McILWAINE: Commissioner, I now make an application for the suppression of that evidence. The basis of the application will be: as I understand the evidence of my client, Mr Tayler, no such conversation at all took place, and in fact I have information that the reference to Mr Tayler is a mistake as to identity.

MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, I must rise to interrupt my learned friend. There are processes in this Special Commission; that is, evidence is taken from the witness, led by me, and then cross-examination will take place. There is not a time or place for submissions being made from the Bar table in the middle of examination-in-chief, in my respectful submission. Mr McIlwaine can deal with his client's concerns and interests at the appropriate time in cross-examination.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr McIlwaine.
MR McILWAINE: I was making an application for suppression, which needs to be made now, before the material is published. That's the only reason I got to my feet. This is evidence, hearsay evidence, by this witness's own admission, alleging serious matters against my client. My client is going to be called. Other witnesses will be called about conversations with this particular witness. It is unfair in those circumstances, in my submission, to allow that material to be published at this point.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr McIlwaine, you will have the opportunity to put things right if what you say is correct. Thank you.

MS LONERGAN: Q. Can I direct your attention, Detective Chief Inspector Fox, to page 369. Two paragraphs above what we were just looking at is where the paragraph commences, "They will then either", and then you have 1, 2 and 3 - three options listed there on page 369.
A. Yes.
Q. There you are suggesting to Ms McCarthy what you think is going to happen with the Lantle investigation; correct?
A. I'm throwing up hypothesis, not so much what would happen to it but the ultimate way it would be submitted to the final analysis.
Q. You are throwing up those hypotheses seven days after the matter is, as you see it, taken from you?
A. Yes .
Q. You are, in effect, criticising or prejudging what is going to happen with the investigation, aren't you?
A. Yes.
Q. You are doing that based on your own prejudices and assumptions about what you think is going to happen, rather than actually knowing that these are the three options that will occur?
A. No.
Q. Sorry, I think I asked that question badly. Can you explain your answer, please?
A. Yes. I was basing that on all the concerns I had leading up to 2 December, and now also based on the telephone conversation I had with [AL] and the information provided to me by Ms McCarthy, and I was - my concerns, I think, in handing the matter over on 2 December were materialising in the way these victims were being treated, and I based my hypothesis surrounding an assessment of all that information.
Q. Can you turn to page 370 , which is the third page of your email. In the last substantive paragraph you make the following statement:

> FYI, the COPS can do on-line checks of computers. If you retain an email on your system they can read it, who sent it, where and when, and that sender's computer ID. If you print and delete it is a dead end for them. Another alternative is to save it to a Word file and then to a disk or memory stick again deleting the email. Don't let the bad guys know.
A. Yes.
Q. I suggest to you that that's you signaling to Ms McCarthy that you want her to delete emails between you and her?
A. I didn't want the police force to find them, and that's what I was saying to her, yes.
Q. So the answer to my question is yes?
A. Yes.
Q. That's because you were behaving in a duplicitous manner in terms of --
A. Yes.
Q. -- in terms of you telling Ms McCarthy what investigations were going on and confidential information about police activity?
A. Well, no, the email there centres around me giving her advice on how they should deal with a formal complaint over the way police were conducting themselves. But it was simply the fact that I didn't want the police force to know, because I had been given a direction not to communicate with Ms McCarthy, that I didn't want that in
there.
Q. You wanted Ms McCarthy to assist you in the pursuit of that deception by deleting any emails between you and her? A. Yes.
Q. I should add, by production of the email I have just shown you and other emails I have shown you and I will take you to, do you agree with me it is evident that Ms McCarthy did not delete emails in such a way that they could not be produced ton this Commission.
A. Yes, and as I said in the in-house hearings, I'm glad that she didn't, and that's true.
Q. If you turn to tab 89, I want you to read that emai1, which is your email to Ms McCarthy. Just read that to yourself.
A. Yes.
Q. That email sets out the matters you have given some evidence about in relation to a call you received from [AL]?
A. Yes.
Q. Can I suggest to you that, because that email is dated 14 December and refers to you having just got a call, the information from the phone call with [AL] didn't come to you until 14 December?
A. That appears correct, yes.
Q. So in relation to your dealing with this email you sent to Ms McCarthy on 10 December, you hadn't yet had a conversation with [AL] yourself; you were relying on Ms McCarthy's report at that time?
A. No, I had had a phone call with her. I got the two conversations mixed around. I do apologise for that.
Q. In the second paragraph you talk about [AL] having told you that she's not ready to give her statement to the police yet, she doesn't feel ready. Do you see that?
A. Sorry, not those exact --
Q. I withdraw that. Let me put it another way.

Is this email an attempt to encourage Ms McCarthy to further a complaint against the officers who were carrying out the Lantle investigation?
A. No.
Q. What was the purpose of the email?
A. It was basically to let Ms McCarthy know that police seemed to be continuing to - on a pursuit of upsetting this particular victim.
Q. It's the same material, isn't it, that Ms McCarthy had conveyed in the previous email to you about contact -A. I don't know.
Q. Did you assist [AL] in delaying her interview until after the new year?
A. What I told her to do - I think --
Q. Just have a look behind tab 90, if that assists you.
A. That's the same email.
Q. Behind tab 90 there should be a letter from [AL]. Does that assist you in what you were intending to accomplish?
A. Yes, it does. What I was simply doing is telling [AL] - she was - as I said earlier, she was in tears, she was distraught, and she was very upset by the way she was being treated by particular officers.
Q. You have already given that evidence. Could you focus on my question.
A. So what I was explaining to her was how to be firm with them. She appeared to be being bullied, and she used the word to me "harassed". I told her, if she sent it in writing, as a formal complaint, to Max Mitchell, saying,
"Tell them to back off, tell them to leave me alone and stop doing this, 1 will come in in the new year after I've got over" - you know, around all these other family issues that she articulated to me, and happily provide her statement then. I said, "Put it in writing and hopefully they'11 do that and play by the rules and you can provide the statement then." I was actually trying to assist the investigation, I suppose in a way, in that they were getting this poor woman so offside, I thought she was about to walk out on them. So I was trying to help.
Q. You encouraged her to make a complaint to Max Mitchell, did you?
A. I did. Well, I didn't ask her to make a complaint, I asked her to write a letter to him, basically saying,
"Tell them to back off and tell him about the treatment she was being exposed to."
Q. Max Mitchell was a superintendent at the time, was he?
A. Yes.
Q. A senior officer?
A. Yes.
Q. And the officers who were working on Lantle, to your knowledge, were officers over whom he had a supervisory role?
A. Yes.
Q. Was your conduct designed to deliberately create trouble for the investigators working on Lantle?
A. Quite the opposite. It was actually designed to try and assist the inquiry, because, as I said, this woman was on the verge of threatening to just walk away from this and not assist any further whatsoever, and by my intervention, I believe it was the only reason that she eventually came forward and provided further material to the inquiry.
Q. Could you turn to tab 91, please. It's an email from you to Ms McCarthy, dated 22 December. It's quite long, so I'11 let you read that to yourself.
A. Yes.
Q. Detective Chief Inspector Fox, first of al1, I want to ask you a question about the second paragraph on the first page of your email. I want to understand the context of the comment you made there. You say, "I also had a long talk to Shaun" - who is Shaun?
A. Shaun McLeod.
Q. "Helen suggested" - is that Helen Keevers?
A. It is.
Q. "The three of us" - is that you, Helen and Shaun?
A. Yes.
Q. "Go to the Ombudsman or PIC"?
A. Yes.
Q. Was that because the three of you formed the view that the investigation wasn't being appropriately dealt with?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you agree with me that that's making trouble for the officers who are trying to investigate the matter or not?
A. I don't think that that is a - that it would have been a proper process if it related to that.
Q. Do you agree with me that it's making trouble for the police to take that step?
A. Yes.
Q. Have a look at the last paragraph on the page, where you talk about a call to Tony Townsend. Was that a call you made on 22 December that you are referring to there or the old call that you have already given evidence about, about a week after 2 December?
A. No, the conversation is different, so it's a different cal1.
Q. It's an additional conversation?
A. Yes.
Q. You say you sent him a rather pointed email. Are you able to assist with what was in that email and what was pointed out about?
A. I don't recall it. All I can go off is what $I$ said there. As it says there, I have made numerous attempts to have him return my calls, and I've obviously said something that would hopefully grab his attention, but as to what I put in that email, I can't now recall.
Q. On the next page of the email, page 393, you say in the third paragraph about having raised the call with Inspector Townsend:

No one is now investigating the church matter as they were all off sick.
A. Yes.
Q. You were concerned about that?
A. Yes.
Q. You wanted them to consider you to conduct the investigation?
A. Clearly, the three - the entire strike force was now off sick and was not likely to return. I had been
passionate about doing this from the start, and I thought, "Okay, surely there's now no argument why I shouldn't be involved in this matter."
Q. Did you know at that time that a Sergeant Jeff Little had been allocated or was being considered to be allocated that matter? In the third last paragraph on that page, you mention him.
A. I didn't know he would be allocated that matter, no.
Q. Did you think he may be?
A. I entertained the possibility that, on past form, if they gave it to another relatively inexperienced officer, I didn't see that that would preclude them doing the same again.
Q. In the next paragraph, Detective Chief Inspector Fox, in the last sentence, you mention calling "Paul Jacob tomorrow"?
A. Yes.
Q. Paul Jacob is the boss of the Sex Crimes Squad from State Crime Command; have I got that correct?
A. He is an inspector there. I don't think he's the boss.
Q. I'm terribly sorry, I think I've promoted him accidently.
A. I'm sure he would be happy for the money!
Q. He is a senior officer in the Sex Crimes Squad?
A. He is, yes.
Q. Did you call him the next day, are you able to say?
A. I don't know. I wasn't able to locate him. It may have been that he was off for Christmas, bearing in mind it would have been 23 December. I remember calling him, but wasn't able to find him.
Q. I just want to clarify something you said in evidence on Monday, just to make sure $I$ have understood it properly. It occurs on page 82. You volunteered an answer about your office having been searched when you were on leave in October 2010?
A. Yes .
Q. You mentioned that, in all your years of policing, you
had never heard of police going into another officer's office when they were away on leave? I don't want you to comment on that, I'm just getting the context --
A. No.
Q. -- of when you said that?
A. No.
Q. And you used this term, "and turning it upside down trying to find a very sensitive brief like this". I want to ask you a question: are you suggesting when you returned from leave, your office was turned upside down because it had been ransacked?
A. No, I've never used the term "ransacked".
Q. Did your office look any different when you arrived at work, on return from leave, in terms of papers being moved around, drawers being left open, documents being changed location?
A. Yes and no.
Q. You had better explain what you mean by "Yes and no"?
A. They were multiple questions of different movements, so that's what I mean by "Yes and no". I did notice that things had been moved around and items in my office were not in the location where I had left them. Certainly not to the extent of tipping desks or drawers upside down on the floor, but it was quite evident that someone had been in there.
Q. Are you saying you knew that before Mim came to tell that your office had been searched?
A. Yes.
Q. You knew something had happened in your office while you were away?
A. I did. It didn't apply to my mind that something sinister had happened. I thought a cleaner may have come in and knocked a few things over or something, but I thought quite innocently of it initially until I was told things later.
Q. If you look at tab 92, please, that's an email from you to Joanne McCarthy again, dated 24 December 2010.
I just want you to focus on the first paragraph, please.
A. Yes.
Q. You say there that the employee had told you:

They told her they were looking for any statements or documents I might have concerning investigations into the Catholic Church. She told them it would probably be locked in my safe and suggested they wait until I get back.
A. Yes.
Q. That's consistent with your recollection?
A. Yes.
Q. But the additional material that employee told you was that they did in fact carry out a physical search of your office?
A. Yes.
Q. Thank you, I just wanted to clarify that position.

Turn to tab 97, please, and behind that tab is a statement from [AJ]?
A. Yes.

MR SKINNER: I object to that, Commissioner. Behind that tab is an unsigned document.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MS LONERGAN: I will rephrase the question.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Ms Lonergan.
MS LONERGAN: I am not going to ask any questions about the contents of the document that has been redacted to show the name [AJ]. I am going to ask a question about the email associated with it. The document behind it is only there to identify what was forwarded to Ms McCarthy.
Q. Detective Chief Inspector Fox, the email of 9 April 2011 shows, doesn't it, that you forwarded to Joanne McCarthy the document behind that email?
A. Yes.
Q. That document concerns matters confidential to [AJ], does it not?
A. Yes.
Q. And [AJ] expressed a wish to you that that document not be disseminated to anybody?
A. Originally, yes. And I think there's an earlier email actually where Joanne McCarthy actually sought my consent to forward it to her, and I declined it because I wasn't prepared to do that, I had already given a copy of it to [AJ].
Q. That's because [AJ] said she didn't want anybody else to see it?
A. At that stage; but later on, by this time, [AJ] had consented to me providing a copy of that to Joanne McCarthy.
Q. Are you able to say when [AJ] communicated to you that she was happy for you to provide that?
A. It wasn't very long. It was around the time that I did so, because Joanne McCarthy, from recollection, she had spoken to [AJ], who - I don't recall it exactly, but they were trying to make some arrangement and then it was easier if I electronically sent a copy, because I already had that on a disk.
Q. You say [AJ] gave your her consent to provide this statement to Ms McCarthy?
A. I wouldn't have done so otherwise. That's why I declined when Ms McCarthy asked me first. That's clear in my email; I said I would not do so without her consent and I only forwarded this after she had given her consent.
Q. Did you make a note that [AJ] had given her consent to forward the statement to Ms McCarthy?
A. No.
Q. Are you able to say whether the consent came from [AJ] via email or in person or on the phone?
A. No, I believe it was a phone call - I think. It may have been an email, I'm not sure.
Q. If I suggest to you that [AJ] says that she did not ever give you consent to distribute her statement to Ms McCarthy, you would say that's wrong?
A. That's wrong definitely. As I said, I made it very clear that $I$ wouldn't do that without her consent and it was only after I obtained it that I did so.
Q. Turn to tab 111. I am going to take you to page 504. Just to place the document, I'm going to take you through in time and place, this is - I will ask you some questions about it. Turn it up and read it to yourself, then I will ask you some questions about it. It is pages 504 to 509. A. Yes.

MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, can I propose this course. I am nearing the end of my examination and there are three or four quite long documents I'm going to ask some questions about of Detective Chief Inspector Fox. It may be a better use of time if we take the luncheon adjournment now and resume at 1.45, and I will provide to Detective Chief Inspector Fox's lawyers all the documents I am going to take him to, there are about five or six of them. He can have the opportunity to read them over the luncheon adjournment, and that will move things a little quicker this afternoon and take some pressure off the process of reading documents in the box under pressure.

THE COMMISSIONER: Very well, Ms Lonergan.
MS LONERGAN: I have another application to be made, which Mr Hunt will now address.

MR COHEN: I understand what my learned friend is trying to achieve, but the idea that Detective Chief Inspector Fox has to sacrifice his opportunity for an hour's peace and quiet is a little --

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Cohen, we will build into the luncheon adjournment sufficient time for Detective Chief Inspector Fox to read the documents at leisure.

MS LONERGAN: Perhaps we could resume at 2.00 pm .
THE COMMISSIONER: How long are the documents,
Ms Lonergan?
MS LONERGAN: The one that is being read now is six pages. It is a document which Detective Chief Inspector Fox has signed, albeit two years ago. Then there are a couple of emails that are four to five pages long each. In fact, one of them is an email with a series of questions, and it would be no surprise that I am taking the witness to that matter. Then there is an email in response, where

Detective Chief Inspector Fox has provided his own answers. Again, that is not a document he has never seen before. I do not want to be ungenerous to Detective Chief Inspector Fox. I thought I suggested 55 minutes and I thought that would be sufficient. But if there is any issue, I would rather start later, and other practitioners can go about attending to other matters while Detective Chief Inspector Fox reads the material.

MR COHEN: Nobody has yet asked Detective Chief Inspector Fox if that's convenient to him.

THE COMMISSIONER: I sha11 do that now, Mr Cohen.
Q. Sir, if you were permitted an extra 15 minutes of lunchtime, do you feel that you would be able to read the documents that have been briefly described by Ms Lonergan? A. I will endeavour to do so, yes, and I would appreciate a lunch break as well.

THE COMMISSIONER: That's understandable. I propose that we resume at 2.05.
Q. If, Detective Chief Inspector Fox, you feel you have not had sufficient time to digest the documents, perhaps you could communicate to Ms Sullivan, who will ask for further time.

MS LONERGAN: Yes. Commissioner, I would be happy with that course. Commissioner, Mr Hunt has an application to make in respect of non-publication.

MR HUNT: The application, Commissioner, is that you would revisit the issue of perhaps considering making an interim or a provisional non-publication order. It's the matter that Mr McIlwaine raised on behalf of his client, and there is a person neither represented nor currently present before the inquiry.

The application is that you would provisionally make a non-publication order in relation to the opinion evidence of this witness in relation to the nature of, broadly, police dealings with [AL], being "disgraceful" and "abysmal" until further order.

The submission would be that possible matters that might excite you, Commissioner, to reconsider the
continuation of that provisional order would include, for instance, cross-examination of this witness by Mr McIlwaine on those issues, evidence being given in due course by either Mr Tayler or Ms Steel on those matters, or indeed further consideration by you, Commissioner, or further argument.

Really, the position is that, given the slender possible weight to be attributed to that evidence, given the hearsay nature of it, against the possible damage to reputation, the authorities excite that this is an area where it is proper in a commission of inquiry to impose non-publication orders. So, to as it were, preserve the status quo for the current purposes, I am inviting, you Commissioner, to make an order in those terms pending further order.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Hunt.
Mr McIlwaine, I presume that you have nothing further to say about it.

MR McILWAINE: Most eloquent is all I can say.
THE COMMISSIONER: In those circumstances, I propose to make a non-publication order with regard to the comments "disgraceful", "abysmal" and anything in that vein in relation to the conduct as it concerned the witness [AL] until further order.

Does that cover it, Mr McIlwaine?
MR McILWAINE: Yes, thank you.
THE COMMISSIONER: I will adjourn until 2.05pm.
LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT
UPON RESUMPTION
MS LONERGAN: Detective Chief Inspector Fox, first of all, behind tab 111, I asked you to look at documents that were pages 504 to 509. Can you turn those up, please?
A. Yes.
Q. First of all, those pages have your signature at the bottom of each page?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you outline for the Commission the context in which this document was created and signed by you?
A. It was an internal investigation, where I was asked directed to give answers in relation to two matters. One may not - I do not believe pertains to this Commission.

The second matter pertained to a text message on my work phone that was from Detective Senior Constable Shaun McLeod, that made reference to "I've spoken to Jo," or something along those lines. I can't recall the full context of it just now.
Q. That is all right. So it was Jo McCarthy?
A. It just said "Jo". I conceded in the interview that Shaun McLeod was - you know, obviously he would have to be here to say who he intended to mean.
Q. I think we are diverting a little bit. Let's cut to the chase. Was this part of a proceeding in relation to an alleged breach of the directive issued to you on 2 December 2010?
A. Yes, it was.
Q. This document that was prepared, was this some sort of question and answer format that was done in an interview setting?
A. Yes.
Q. Are the answers you gave in that document true?
A. Some are, some are not.
Q. Let's start first with the ones that are not true. Can you identify those?
A. Question 1 is true.
Q. No, I have just asked you to identify the ones that aren't true. I trust that will be the shorter part of the exercise.
A. Okay. My answer to question 7, reading it again, is probably a bit ambiguous. You know, I haven't lied or tried to mislead. The way I originally read the question is that the direction only related to Joanne McCarthy, in that it didn't relate to other persons outside of that. Obviously it did relate to journalists, but I wasn't trying to mislead by saying that.
Q. Would you concede also that there was a direction not to speak to witnesses who were part of the investigation that was to be made?
A. Everyone was told not to speak to journalists, but the direction not to speak to Ms McCarthy was specifically to me, and that's what I've stated there.
Q. You can see there was also a direction to all present not to speak to the press.
A. They were told not to, yes.
Q. Would you proceed with the next matter that is not true.
A. Sorry, the answer to question 8 is true.
Q. Yes. I'm only focusing on ones that are not true, Detective Chief Inspector Fox.
A. Question 9 .
Q. In what respect is your answer not true?
A. It asks me, have I spoken to Joanne McCarthy after the direction was given? I've stated there that I had only spoken to her the once, and I had spoken to her numerous times - you know, in short.
Q. I understand.
A. Question 10.
Q. Why is that untrue?
A. I contacted Joanne McCarthy that night, not a week later.
Q. What about question 11 ?
A. Question 11 is not true. Question 12 is not true.
Q. Why did you use the term "absolutely" there, in answer to the question, "Do you" --
A. I used that word --
Q. Let me read on to the record the question, so it makes sense:

Do you believe you have complied with the
direction given to you by Superintendent Mitchel?

You answered "absolutely".
A. I use that word interchangeably with "yes" a heck of a lot, as people who know me would attest to.
Q. Were you attempting by giving that answer "Absolutely" to reinforce that you would never breach a direction of this nature?
A. Possibly, possibly.
Q. And that wasn't a truthful position to have put forward?
A. True.
Q. I should note for the record that the materials I am taking you to this afternoon were provided to you to read at 20 to 2, and you were provided with about 35 to 40 minutes to complete reading those documents.
A. Yes.
Q. I'm not being at all critical, I'm just noting for the record that an opportunity has been given, and I'll just let you continue identifying any other matters in here that are untrue.
A. I just want to read them carefully, because I take it from that you want to hold me to each and every small aspect in each of those answers, and some of them are long answers.
Q. No, not at all. I'm interested in significant untruths, such as the ones you have just mentioned.
A. Okay, if they're quite obvious, but there may be the odd line. I hope I'm not missing it by trying to hurry the process a bit.
Q. All right. Detective Chief Inspector, can we go about it this way: I don't require you on to look at every nuance of every statement you have made there.

Can we approach this way: were you trying to give as frank a reflection of the true position as possible when you completed this document?
A. Yes. Obviously I was concealing the fact that I was in communication with Joanne McCarthy, and I wasn't prepared to disclose that. That was the primary - that's what I'm primarily looking for when you're saying "untruths"; but generally speaking, the vast majority of it is correct.
Q. I'11 move on now to a document in volume 3, tab 119. That's an email from you to Superintendent John Gralton and others?
A. Yes.
Q. I just want to inquire as to the significance of the other people to whom this email is addressed. Ian Mather, who is he?
A. Ian Mather works at the region office. I'm guessing, as a result of that, that he may have been filling in for the operations manager at the time, but I'm not certain about that.
Q. And John Gralton, was that Superintendent John Gralton?
A. It is. By this time he was - I think by then he had been made the full-time commander of Newcastle city.
Q. Carlene York?
A. Is the region commander Northern Region.
Q. Craig Rae?
A. Craig Rae is a superintendent from Lake Macquarie, but I believe at the time he was performing some relieving duty while Carlene York was absent for periods.
Q. Why did you direct this particular email to all of those persons?
A. Because, although sending it back primarily to John Gralton, I was having concerns that much of what I had been expressing and saying, I was gaining the perception that not all of this was being conveyed to the region commander fairly and in full.
Q. What was the purpose of you sending this email, in terms of its content? Were you asking for particular permission or changes to any situation you had existing at the time?
A. Yes. I had contact from Detective Sergeant Faber. She was at Lake Macquarie, attached to Charlestown police station. She was assembling a police investigation in relation to a priest [NP] and there were some components that needed, for want of a better term, shoring up, or if I could confirm them. She had attempted to do that through a number of avenues, and I'm only guessing but she would be able to --
Q. No, don't guess.
A. She rang me to assist with a number of contacts $I$ had and also to try to procure a number of photographs for her through witnesses and people I knew.
Q. Why did you think you needed to ask these people, or any of them to whom this email is directed, for permission to assist Sergeant Faber?
A. In short, I had been told by Superintendent Mitchell not to have any further involvement, and considering that these were going to be investigations in relation to a now convicted paedophile priest from the Maitland-Newcastle diocese, I didn't want to encounter any reprisals or action against me for making those inquiries.
Q. You interpreted the direction given to you by Superintendent Mitchell as requiring that you don't speak to any police officer regarding any investigation into church paedophilia?
A. No.
Q. I'm sorry, I asked that badly. Do you agree with me that that was your interpretation of the direction by Superintendent Mitchell, that you are not to speak to any officer about any church paedophilia investigation?
A. No.
Q. I'm just trying to understand why you thought you needed to get permission to speak to or proceed with providing information to Detective Sergeant Kristi Faber?
A. The reason is because obviously I would need to start ringing various people, and some of those had, in the past, been connected with Fletcher and McAlinden and other matters, and I didn't want there to be a perception by any of these police that I was breaching the direction to not investigate - well, to investigate those matters, even though I wasn't, but I perceived that there may have been a belief that that's what I was doing.
Q. In the third paragraph you say:

I spoke to persons (But not Joanne McArther) in confidence who are assisting.

Is that a reference to Joanne McCarthy?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Is that an untruth there, that you hadn't spoken to Joanne McCarthy?
A. No, that's not what it says. It says, "I spoke to persons" - sorry, "but not Joanne McCarthy in confidence". That's true, yes.
Q. So you were maintaining the position that you were keeping it confidential to yourself but you had not in fact breached the direction at that point?
A. Yes.
Q. Number 3 at the bottom:

Am I yet to be told the reasons for those directions.

Would you agree with me that you had been told that the reason for the directions were, firstly, that the investigation needed to be kept confidential?
A. What I'm asking there is --
Q. No, I'm asking you a very specific question. Would you agree with me that you had in fact been told that one of the reasons for the direction, in particular the one about not speaking to media or Joanne McCarthy, was to keep the investigation confidential?
A. Yes.
Q. You were told that on 2 December at the meeting?
A. Yes.
Q. Wouldn't you agree with me that you were also told at the meeting of 2 December that the Newcastle Local Area Command was going to be running the investigation?
A. That statement was made to me. I didn't consider it a reason, but that statement was made, yes.
Q. So you don't accept, can we take it from your question that you posed at number 3 there, that they were reasons for the direction?
A. No, it was just simply stating the facts. But what I'm alluding to there is I still was unable to understand, with my involvement and my connection with all the - with a number of victims, et cetera, why I had been totally pushed aside, not just from leading it but to having any involvement in it whatsoever.
Q. Can you look at tab 119A. That appears to be a response provided to you from Superintendent Gralton; do you agree?
A. Yes .
Q. Could you assist with who Gabrielle McDonald or David Swilks are?
A. David Swilks was a superintendent then attached to, I believe, Tuggerah Lakes. Again, there seemed to be a lot of people relieving, and again I imagine that he, by this stage --
Q. I don't want you to imagine. Just tell you what you knew.
A. I know that he was doing some relieving at region as I can't remember the role for Gabrielle McDonald, but I'm unsure at this stage why I've addressed it to her. I can on1y speculate.
Q. It appears it was addressed to her by Superintendent Gralton, as opposed to you addressing anything to that person Gabrielle McDonald?
A. Yes.
Q. If you turn to tab 122, that's an email - there might be some debate about what is the correct date of your email to Detective Inspector Graeme Parker and Sergeant Jeffrey Little. It may have been 2 April 2012. Are you able to assist with the date there?
A. That appears correct.
Q. What led to you sending that email to those officers?

Did you get a phone call or something came to your attention?
A. No, that resulted from the phone contact I had from Sergeant Kristi Faber, and I believe the earlier email that we've discussed, and I believe there's another email that may have predated that. Sorry, what that was is I spoke to Graeme Parker and there were a number of areas that he was trying to clarify, and I pointed out to him, I said, "Mate, haven't you read my report of 25 November?" And he said, "What report?"
Q. So you forwarded that to him and Sergeant Little because you were worried they hadn't read your report? A. He told me they didn't have my report. I doubted that, and I still doubt that he hadn't seen it, I've got
reason to believe that he had. Nevertheless, I thought, "I've still got an electronic copy," and I sent it to him again.
Q. As I understand your evidence, Detective Parker told you he hadn't seen your report, but did he also say that Sergeant Little hadn't seen the report at that stage, to his knowledge or --
A. No, he said he hadn't seen my report.
Q. "He", as in Parker?
A. Yes, I was talking to him specifically. He asked obviously, he asked for me to send a copy of it to him, so I gathered no one there had a copy, otherwise he would have had a look at his own holdings, I would imagine.
Q. Do you recall receiving a phone call from Detective Parker and Sergeant Little on their car phone on around about 4 Apri1 2012?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall what was discussed in that phone call?
A. I think they were either going to or coming from Sydney.
Q. I'm not asking where they were going or coming from --
A. What was discussed.
Q. -- just what was discussed. I don't need you to refer to any documents. I'm asking about your recollection of the phone call, if you have one.
A. I remember them calling me and asking me some questions about it; but again, it was on speaker phone in a car travelling somewhere, I imagine, on the expressway and --
Q. But you weren't in a car travelling on the expressway somewhere?
A. No.
Q. Where were you?
A. I don't know.
Q. You can't remember?
A. I can't remember.
Q. Can we take it you made no particular note of that
phone call, or you may have?
A. I may have, I don't recall.
Q. Are you able to say whether on 4 April 2012 you were at work?
A. Yes.
Q. You were?
A. I believe I was, yes.
Q. Do you have your 2012 duty book any more?
A. I don't know. When I left work --
Q. Don't worry. If you don't know, we will leave it at that.

You were asked whether you had any information that would assist the matters into which Detective Parker and Sergeant Little were working. First of all, can you answer whether you were asked whether you had anything else?
A. They did ask questions surrounding that subject, yes.
Q. I want to suggest you said words to the effect of:

No, I've got nothing more. I didn't do an
interview with Clarke, I only had an off
the record chat with him that wasn't recorded.

Does that accord with your recollection as to one of the things that was said in that conversation?
A. In all likelihood, yes.
Q. If you turn to tab 125A, is that an email from Sergeant Jeffrey Little to you?
A. Yes .
Q. It's copied in to Detective Graeme Parker and Superintendent John Gralton?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you have an opportunity to read that over the luncheon adjournment?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you agree with me that the purpose apparently of this email was to raise questions regarding your

25 November 2010 report and the material in it?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you carefully consider the questions that were raised in this email?
A. At the start I did. I think towards the end it's apparent that I started to get a bit - it wasn't that I wasn't trying to support, but all the communications with him is - seemed very awkward, in that I was providing emails, they were providing back questions, breaking that up. And what $I$ kept reiterating time and time again is, "Come up and sit down and I can take you right through this." You know, it would be like trying to conduct this Commission, I suppose, via telephone link. It just makes things, of course, that much more difficult. [Remainder of answer struck out].

MR ROSER: I object to that.
MS LONERGAN: That last part of the answer should be struck off the record as being not responsive to the question, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MS LONERGAN: Q. At page 672, as part of that email I have just had you look, appears to be an email from you to Officers Parker and Little and copied to Superintendent Gralton?
A. Yes.
Q. That appears to be an email reply by you, where you raise the issue that you don't know "where your matters have gone". Do you see that at the top of page 673?
A. Yes. That's a fair comment.
Q. So is it fair to say that you were trying to tell Detective Parker that you weren't really sure what they had been doing so you didn't know what assistance you could provide?
A. Yes.
Q. I'm going to ask you to turn to tab 125B, and you will be relieved to know we are getting very near to the end much my examination.
A. Yes.
Q. Again, this is a document that $I$ drew to your attention as one you ought to read over the break that we had?
A. Yes.
Q. You did read that document, did you?
A. Yes.
Q. It's an email response by you to questions raised by Detective Sergeant Little?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you do your best to convey all the information that you could in those responses?
A. It certainly wasn't all the information. As I said, I would have liked to have sat down with somebody. But bearing in mind this was sent up to me at a time when I was involved in a fairly complex and difficult matter, but I did put some time aside and I tried to address most of those questions as best I could.
Q. Can you turn to page 676(e). Did you in this document exaggerate information that you had or steps you had taken in relation to investigations into church paedophilia? Just direct your mind to my question before reading the page, if you don't mind.
A. Investigations I had into church paedophilia?
Q. Yes.
A. Sorry, if I don't read the page, I can't remember what's on it.
Q. No, I don't want you to read the page. I want you to ignore the page.
A. If I have, not intentionally. I don't know whether I've said it. Bearing in mind I'm not sitting down with off memory, when I was doing this, I was absolutely pressed with a couple of other issues burning and I've knocked this out quite quickly. I'm not trying to make an excuse, but just trying to set the scene around the circumstances in which it was - you know, they wanted me to get back as soon as possible and I tried to hurry this through.
Q. Did you deliberately Detective Parker and/or Sergeant Little about steps you had taken in relation to
investigation of church paedophilia?
A. Definitely not, no.
Q. Would you agree with me that the statement on page 676(e) to the effect you prepared a brief against Bishop Malone is an exaggeration of the facts?
A. Yes, it is, in that what I had actually --
Q. No, just accept or reject my proposition. Do you accept my proposition that it's an exaggeration of the facts?
A. It's part of a brief, not the full one - so yes.
Q. Let's examine that a little further. I'11 just turn to the transcript of Monday. I'm going to read this exchange to you on page 31 of Monday's transcript, commencing at line 13:
Q. Can I ask you this: Did you, as part of your investigation of Fletcher, formally investigate any official of the Catholic Church of Maitland-Newcastle diocese at that time?
A. Yes. I contemplated very serious7y at that stage whether there was sufficient evidence to charge Bishop Michael Malone with hindering of a police investigation.
Q. Let's examine that a bit further.

When I use the term "formally investigate", does that mean that you were carrying out a formally recognised investigation into Bishop Malone or was it more a side effect of the Fletcher matter?
A. It was more of a side effect. I was utilising statements from other clergy and the victim's mother in that process. At a later stage $I$ spoke to a member of the DPP and discussed the possibility of whether or not we should charge Bishop Malone or other alternatives.
Q. That discussion with the DPP solicitor was an informal one?
A. Yes, it was.
Q. You didn't at any time, did you, take
a formal interview from Bishop Malone relating to any allegations in relation to his conduct specifically.

> A. No. He - I know from documents I have seen that he obviously obtained some legal advice at the time, but I did obtain a statement from him where that was canvassed, but he wasn't formally interviewed as such.

Commissioner, I just want to liaise with Mr Cohen to see whether I need to read out all of the next page of evidence to the witness.

Commissioner, it might be easier if a copy of the material could be provided to the witness - it is two pages of material - before we get to a particular question which I want to direct him to. Mr Gyles has kindly provided a hard copy for the witness.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Gyles.
MS LONERGAN: Q. Detective Chief Inspector Fox, I was on page 31 at line 42, and I ask you to read from there to page 32, line 32. Just read that to yourself.
A. Page 142 to 143?
Q. No, page 31 to 32 .

MR COHEN: Commissioner, this could go around in circles.
I think there be some misapprehension about what the witness should be reading.

MS LONERGAN: May I approach the witness?
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Ms Lonergan.
THE WITNESS: Yes, I've read it.
MS LONERGAN: Q. Then you see the next question, on page 32 line 34 - keep it with you. Have you read down that page 32 line 32?
A. Yes, and the next question on line 34.
Q. The next question is:
Q. We want to be very clear, at no stage did you prepare a second brief, extracting some of that material from the Fletcher prosecution, to make it into a brief

```
regarding allegations or exploring
allegations against Bishop Malone?
A. Yes.
```

A. Yes.
Q. So you were agreeing with me that you didn't prepare a brief in relation to bishop Malone, did you?
A. Yes.
Q. You're agreeing with me?
A. Yes.
Q. So when you say on page 676(e), paragraph 3, "I did prepare a brief against Bishop Malone," that's not true, is it?
A. No. Sorry --
Q. It's untrue?
A. Yes.
Q. Is it reasonable to state that from the email from Sergeant Little, with the numerous questions that were raised, that it was an attempt to obtain relevant information from you? It might not have been the way you wanted it done --
A. Yes, I agree.
Q. -- but it was still an attempt?
A. Yes.
Q. And, in effect, that process was a form of consultation with you?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall having a telephone conversation on 12 April with Detective Sergeant Little, where you phoned him and said you were about to send that email that we've just been looking at? Do you remember doing that, phoning him before you sent it?
A. I may have. I don't recall.
Q. You just don't recall the conversation?
A. Yes, but I don't dispute that I probably would have.
Q. I want to suggest to you that you said you were looking at a much bigger picture and that it was apparent that Strike Force Lantle had very strict terms of
reference? Do you recall saying that?
A. I don't recall it but it's quite likely that I did say something like that.
Q. And that you offered to be available to sit with him and assist him with his work on Strike Force Lantle?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And that you wouldn't at that stage reveal what Troy Grant had told you. Do you remember that?
A. No, because when Troy Grant made that comment to me, I felt that $I$ should hold that in confidence and he should talk to Troy Grant about that.
Q. So you would agree that you didn't want to reveal to him or told him you would not reveal to him what Troy Grant had told you?
A. Yes.
Q. You made a comment to the effect that most of the information you have is in the back of your brain?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall in April 2012 having a telephone conversation with Detective Sergeant Kristi Faber?
A. I know there were some calls around that period between us, yes.
Q. Do you recall saying to her during one such conversation in April 2012 that her life was in danger from the Catholic Mafia?
A. What? No.
Q. No, you never said that?
A. No.
Q. So do you deny saying her life was in danger from the Catholic Mafia because of her continued investigations with Strike Force Georgiana?
A. No. That's bizarre, sorry.

MS LONERGAN: Those are my questions, Commissioner.
May I indicate that Mr Skinner has requested whether he could cross-examine first.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Ms Lonergan. Yes,

Mr Skinner.

## <EXAMINATION BY MR SKINNER:

MR SKINNER: Q. I'11 be brief, Detective Chief Inspector Fox.

You admitted this morning, if I recall, that you were prejudging much of your investigations? You said that to counsel assisting?

MR COHEN: I object. That question should be much more narrowly focused.

MR SKINNER: I don't have a transcript.
Q. Do you deny you said it?
A. I don't understand what --

MR COHEN: I maintain my objection.
MS LONERGAN: I support Mr Cohen's objection. It does need to be a little more closely focused, in my submission.

MR SKINNER: $Q$. The note I made is that you were willing to concede that you were prejudging the conclusion of much of operation Lantle when you were saying it was a sham?
A. No, I don't agree with that proposition in that term, no.
Q. Why not?
A. What I was saying is that much of what Lantle was doing I considered to be a sham, certainly based on some of the evidence I have given here today about the way some of the witnesses/victims were being treated. Again, my consideration of the degree of expertise and experience of some of the investigators and the way it was being handled, and then, you know, staff lacking for varying periods and, you know, apparently very little activity being progressed on it.
Q. But that was fixed up, was it not? Little came in and tack over from the other officers?
A. At one point, yes. At some stage, yes, he did.
Q. So the staff going off sick, apart from delay, is not really relevant, is it?
A. It's relevant when I've got - you know, when you've got some of the victims crying and ringing up other police saying they had been bullied and harassed by some of the detectives on it. I would consider that's something significant.
Q. The bullying and harassing, as you call it, I think to be fair to you, you're quoting the view [AL] had about it - -
A. I am indeed and that is totally what I'm basing it on, but I had no reason to think she was lying.
Q. If I could finish, the bullying and harassing is essentially an opinion about the pressure on her to go and give a statement; correct?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. Why wouldn't Brad Tayler, conducting an investigation in which the wheels had been spinning for quite some time, even on your evidence, press her to come in and give him a statement?
A. I'm glad you pointed that out. It makes it clear that detective chief inspectors do get statements. Number 2, you work in with victims. There is a charter of victims' rights, where you give them compassion, care, time. You don't sort of say, "Listen, you get your arse in here tomorrow or else," or words to that effect. If they've got family commitments or whatever else - it's their life. They've been abused and you are treating them like garbage. The police are not what's important here; it's the victims. That's what I had very serious concerns about. They were being treated like garbage.
Q. The ultimate aim of an investigation, in your mind, was to get some prosecutions going; correct?
A. If the evidence supported that, yes, I was certainly very passionate to see that it was investigated thoroughly and properly and to the full scope that it should have been.
Q. You are an experienced officer, as you said many times, experienced not only in investigating but ultimately all the way through to seeing how trials run, aren't you? A. Sorry, I didn't know I'd said that. But if you're suggesting I am experienced, I would probably agree with that. I've had a couple of years, yes.
Q. You were, however, taking secret statements; correct?
A. What do you mean by "secret"?
Q. You kept them secret from those you met on 2 December 2010 at Waratah, didn't you?

MR COHEN: I object to that question. That's not the evidence.

THE WITNESS: No, not at all.
MR SKINNER: Q. You didn't tell them and you only gave them to them afterwards. I'm speaking about the statements that I think from your evidence and from the material in the brief are from [AK], 29 June 2010; Michael Stanwell, 23 July 2010; and the unsigned one, which is the only one I've seen from [AJ], 29 June 2010. They were secret from the other police officers in Newcastle Local Area Command?
A. Sorry, I understand what you are saying now that, I hadn't told them - you're saying I hadn't told the police that I had those statements before 2 December?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes, I had.
Q. Sorry, you're saying you told the police you had those statements in the specific terms that I've put them to you, who they were from and the dates you took them, before 2 December?

MS LONERGAN: Commissioner --
THE WITNESS: I don't know.
MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, I object to that last question. It wasn't a question that was put before and it's being insisted in a way that implies it was.

In my respectful submission, these are matters outside the mandate of Mr Skinner's client's interest. These seem to be more matters in the purview of the police force, if they wish to pursue this avenue of inquiry. I'm not entirely confident of the relevance of Mr Skinner's client's rights at the moment.

MR SKINNER: If my friend will give me a little bit of leeway, Commissioner, I have to lay some ground.

THE COMMISSIONER: I will allow you to lay some ground, Mr Skinner, but please try to be precise.

MR SKINNER: I'11 move on.
Q. Were you, as you took those statement, recording your movements and the preliminary telephone calls to those complainants and that sort of thing in a duty book or in any other document that could be accessed?
A. No.
Q. Why not? You'd know that would be standard procedure, wouldn't you?
A. Of course. I have stated many, many times that I didn't want anybody else to know that I was taking those statements at that point of time.
Q. Even someone who might have the misfortune to have to defend someone charged with very serious charges down the track?
A. I don't understand what you're --
Q. You do understand what I mean, don't you?
A. Well, if I did, sir, I would have said, "I understand you," but no, I don't.
Q. Troy Grant said this morning that you were meticulous in your investigation, particularly in recording in your duty book; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. You know that the context in which statements are taken from complainants is extremely important to record and might be useful for somebody to get a fair trial down the track?
A. Components of the statement, did you say?
Q. Complainants, I said.
A. Sorry.
Q. I'm using the term as it is used, as $I$ understand it: a complainant is somebody who is allegedly a victim. Until it is proved they are a victim, they are a complainant. Do you understand that?
A. I do understand it sir, yes, thank you.
Q. Certainly Joanne McCarthy is not such a person, is she? When you use the term "complainant" you use it in a different way, don't you?
A. No, I don't believe so. I considered Joanne McCarthy a complainant. You can be a complainant on behalf of somebody else. I have dealt with many, many complainants in that capacity over my years.
Q. You realise, don't you, that in the matter you were investigating, she was and is a potential witness?
A. That is Joanne McCarthy?
Q. Yes.
A. I don't know.
Q. People you say are victims first spoke to her before they first spoke to you. Why would she not be a witness to that? Why wouldn't you get a statement from her?
A. I don't know whether that would be required.
Q. It's totally orthodox, is it not, on every occasion that someone comes to court alleging historical sexual assault that a statement is taken from the very first person or persons they say it to, so you can fix in time when they first came forward?
A. From what I understand, [AL] and [AK] first complained to members of the Catholic Church, and at that stage I wasn't prepared to go to them and ask them for statement.
Q. In 2010, on your own evidence here and as recorded fairly contemporaneously scattered through all sorts of material here, you say you first got involved in this again when you read articles in the Newcastle Herald written by Joanne McCarthy and she contacted you?

MR COHEN: I object. That's not clearly a narrowly focused question.

MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, could I be heard in relation to this general line of inquiry.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Ms Lonergan.
MS LONERGAN: As I appreciate Mr Skinner's position, he acts for Father Brian Lucas. We are examining at the moment the circumstances in which Detective Chief Inspector Fox was asked to cease investigating certain matters and,
in my respectful submission, the questioning at the moment is going away from those matters.

MR SKINNER: I won't press this. I can shorten this, Commissioner. I will just ask one question, if I may.
Q. Did you ever take a statement from Joanne McCarthy? A. No.
Q. The email that you sent, I think from my notes, some time in December anyway, to Joanne McCarthy which had attached to it an unsigned statement from [AJ] --

MS LONERGAN: That email is dated April 2011 and I will assist Mr Skinner with the tab reference.

MR SKINNER: I am grateful for that.
Q. It is 9 April 2011, tab 97 and you were asked questions about the email earlier today. Do you remember that?
A. Yes.
Q. I think, by way of an objection, I clarified the document attached to it was actually unsigned at that time; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. [AJ] is the witness that you have referred to on sever occasions as having taken 28 hours to get a statement from; is that correct? It is [AJ] that you referred to in that regard?
A. I don't think I have said that, no, on a couple of occasions. I may have said it once, I think. You may have read it more times, I appreciate, but I think it's only been asked once.
Q. Sorry, when I said "said" I was loosely referring to your evidence here and also your contemporaneous records. A. Yes, I will acknowledge, in that case, yes, that is certainly the situation.
Q. Did you spend a lot of time getting that statement from her?
A. My word I did.

MS LONERGAN: I object, Commissioner. Again, I cannot
see the relevance of this line of inquiry in relation to either Mr Skinner's client or how it assists in relation to obtaining evidence relevant to term of reference 1.

THE COMMISSIONER: In any event, Mr Skinner, there has been an agreement, hasn't there, that that is the person to whom the witness referred at least once?

MR SKINNER: Yes.
Q. Did she sign that statement --

MR COHEN: I object. This is a very handy line of pre-trial discovery for other purposes but it is nothing to do with this term of reference in the way it is put.

MS LONERGAN: I support and repeat Mr Cohen's objection.
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Mr Skinner, the document is before you. You know the answer to the question.

MR SKINNER: I note the time. Those are all the questions, at this point, given the Commissioner's rulings, that I seek to ask.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Roser, Mr Saidi? I am sorry, Mr McIlwaine?

MR McILWAINE: Commissioner, I have some questions. I am happy for my friend to go first. He may cover territory I would otherwise cover.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. I apologise for being discourteous.
<EXAMINATION BY MR ROSER:
MR ROSER: Q. Sir, you said the people appointed to Lantle were inexperienced. You said that?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you classify 69 years in the police force as inexperience?

MR COHEN: I object.
THE WITNESS: I would say he's a very old detective.

MR ROSER: Q. Very good. I'm glad you're smiling about it. You said that the people attached to Lantle were inexperienced, didn't you?

MR COHEN: I object. Which people?
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, could we be more precise?
MR ROSER: Q. Steel, Quinn and Tayler.
A. What I was specifically referring to when I made that --
Q. Do you say - just answer the question?
A. I was trying to, sir.
Q. Well, answer it. Do you say --

MR COHEN: I object. Section 41 of the Evidence Act expressly provides that questions of this type shouldn't be harassing, annoying or unduly oppressive. That's exactly what these are.

MR ROSER: Also under the Evidence Act, the responsive answers to questions.

MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, may $I$ be heard on a matter of tone and courtroom decorum.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MS LONERGAN: May I suggest that the tone in which those questions were delivered was vehement and unnecessarily so, in my respectful submission. That would not necessarily communicate to the transcript, but I note for the record the tone was vehement and quite aggressive, in circumstances where it was only the third or fourth question put in cross-examination of this witness.

MR ROSER: Well, I dispute that.
MR COHEN: If I might remind the Commission, this is not a murder trial and you are not a jury.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Cohen.
MR ROSER: That's very helpful. I realise that.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Roser, could I ask you please to deliver your questions in a more moderate tone.

MR ROSER: Yes, Commissioner.
Q. Detective Inspector Tayler, how many years experience did he have in 2010?
A. Life experience or experience as a police officer?
Q. As a detective?
A. I don't know.
Q. But you have said he was inexperienced?
A. No.
Q. You gave evidence that you said the people attached to Lantle were inexperienced, didn't you?

MR COHEN: I object. That was not the evidence.
MR ROSER: My submission is it is.
MR COHEN: Then take us to the evidence.
THE COMMISSIONER: I have a note that the evidence was that the degree of experience and expertise of some of the - I have missed some of it. Perhaps you could go through each detective.

MR ROSER: Yes.
Q. Do you say that Detective Inspector Tayler was inexperienced in 2010?
A. I don't know.
Q. Why don't you know?
A. I'm not fully au fait with Inspector Tayler's background. If you would like to tell me what it is, I could probably give you an indication on it. But I'm not au fait with all of Inspector Tayler's background. I haven't seen a copy of his statement. I haven't had a chance to read it.
Q. You were in the police force with him for about 15 years, weren't you?
A. And about 15,000 others, yes.

MR ROSER: Commissioner, I would ask you to direct the witness to answer the question.

THE COMMISSIONER: You have the answer now, Mr Roser.
Q. But, would you be careful, please, Detective Chief Inspector Fox, simply to answer the question and not to add anything extra.
A. Yes.

MR ROSER: Q. How many years did you know Detective Inspector Tayler in the police force?
A. I didn't know Detective Inspector Tayler very well. I came into contact with him time and again periodically. We were never stationed in the same station, certainly not in the same command, to my knowledge, and I'm not completely familiar with where he was. And that's why I'm - not that I'm being evasive but I don't want to give an unfair answer because I simply don't know.
Q. Is he one of the people that you classified as inexperienced being attached to this strike force?
A. I didn't classify him one way or the other because I don't know.
Q. You said that the people attached to Lantle were inexperienced, didn't you?
A. What I was referring to, I think.
Q. No, did you or did you not?
A. I don't know. If you can take me back to that, I might be able to answer that in context.
Q. Don't you know what you've said in evidence in this Commission?
A. We are at the end of day 3. If anyone here can remember all of it, they are doing much better than me. I've got a pretty good idea, but I'm just after the specifics around that particular area of my answer. You want me to be specific. If I'm going to be fair to you, sir, and give you a very specific answer, if you can give me the specifics surrounding it, I can achieve that. But it's very difficult for me to do, in fairness, if I'm not provided with that.
Q. Who were the inexperienced people attached to Lantle
pre the end of December 2010
A. I considered Detective Sergeant Steel inexperienced in the area of a lack of recent involvement in any form of criminal investigation so far as being a detective.
Q. She was an acting inspector pre this investigation, wasn't she?
A. I accept that if you're telling me that.
Q. Well, you re in the police force. You know her, didn't you?
A. I was at Raymond Terrace. She wasn't at my station.
Q. So you didn't know her or her rank?
A. If she was acting - people are acting in roles in the police force all the time. I think when we went through those emails, it gave an indication that there is a continual evolvement of people when they are acting into a higher capacity and I don't know what she was doing immediately before she was drafted into Lantle.
Q. Haven't you just given evidence that she was inexperienced to be a party to this strike force? What do you assess that on?
A. What I'm assessing that on is the years since she had been a full-time detective. That is based on, as a detective, it's a very, very different field. I would probably struggle going out there and writing up a breach report for a bald tyre. I don't know much about that. I wouldn't expect that a highway patrol officer or someone in another specialised field within the police force would be able to walk in as a detective and pick up an extremely important, complex and far-reaching investigation into the Catholic Church.
Q. What was she doing prior to being attached to this particular strike force, do you know?
A. I know when she was working at Newcastle when I was there in 2008, I can tell you my contact with her then.
Q. We are talking about 2010. I thought you said before you didn't work with her?
A. No. You asked me about Detective Chief Inspector Brad Tayler, and I told you I did not work with Detective Chief Inspector Brad Tayler. You did not ask me about Detective Steel.
Q. What was Detective Steel doing pre July 2010 ?
A. I don't know.
Q. But you have made an assessment that you --
A. My understanding --
Q. Just wait for the question.
A. Certainly.
Q. You said that she was, what, writing out a ticket or something like that?

MR COHEN: I object to this. That's not the evidence.
THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Roser, the witness didn't say that Detective Sergeant Steel was writing out a ticket.

MR ROSER: Q. What do you say she was doing prior to being attached to particular strike force?
A. What I was basing it around, to try to make it simple, Sergeant Steel had been, to my knowledge, for many years and I came into contact with her when I worked at Newcastle in 2008 - she was a general duties uniform sergeant working in the station. On occasion, for a week here and there and I think in the four months I was at Newcastle - she may have worked up in the acting inspector's role for a week or two, from the best of my memory. It may be the case that you will enlighten me that something similar progressed. But I wasn't aware of her transferring full time into the detectives' office whilst I was at Newcastle, and I don't know, you may be able to tell me that she did so shortly after I left.
Q. So that's the last dealings you had with her was in 2008, was it?
A. Yes.
Q. For a couple of months that she was working with you?
A. Yes.
Q. And you don't know what she was doing between 2008 and near the end of 2010?
A. I don't know for certain but I don't - you know - and again, I don't want to be committed to it because it's only police hearsay, but it's still my understanding that she was a uniform officer for quite a considerable period of time.
Q. You gave some evidence yesterday in relation to this particular officer, didn't you? Do you remember that?
A. I may have. I don't know what you're talking about specifically.
Q. At page 152 - as part of an answer to what my learned friend asked you - at line 20, you said.
... and I'd have thought that there's no way in the world I would have given it to a uniform officer that I've pulled back in from a police truck and said, "Here is this church investigation."

Who were you talking about there?
A. Sergeant Steel.
Q. Where did you get that knowledge from, that she worked as a uniformed officer working in a police truck?
A. I accept I don't know that she was working in a police truck.
Q. You see, that's what you're about, aren't you? You just make it up as you go?
A. I think that the expression I used, sir, was, perhaps a colloquialism. I didn't expect it to be taken literally.
I think in the general term of police-speak, if you like, it is that it's simply referred that she was still working predominantly in and attached to the general duties area now, she may have been doing some relief duties or other things. Mind you, I'm not being detrimental, I get along with her. She's a wonderful girl and I've got a lot of respect for her. It's not a personal thing, but if I was sitting in office and saying, "We11, I want my very best investigator, someone with an enormous amount of experience, to take on this very difficult and complex brief," I know I'm going to go to the cream of my office to do it.
Q. You described her yesterday in evidence, when you were asked a question in relation to her experience, that you wouldn't have given it to a uniformed officer. Who are you talking about there?
A. Kirren Steel.
Q. How do you know she was in a uniform when she was
pulled in to do this strike force?
A. I don't recall, but my understanding is that she had been working --
Q. Where did you get that understanding from?
A. Just the police rumour mill.
Q. Police rumour?
A. You know, I think most police have got a rough idea of what's going on. I'm not trying to be evasive, but I'm not working at Newcastle or Waratah so I'm not oversighting what she's doing on each and every shift but you get a general idea of where people are.
Q. Who told you she was working in a police truck at that time?
A. As I explained, I didn't mean that she was specifically working in a police truck.
(Interruption in proceedings)
MR ROSER: It appears that someone in the audience has cause to laugh about something, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: There is some laughter in the back of the courtroom which is unhelpful. If I can hear it from up here, it must be very distracting for counsel. Please desist.

MR ROSER: Thank you, Commissioner.
Q. You also gave evidence yesterday at page 185 in relation to this particular officer, at line 38:

The officers allocated - and again, the
next detective that was given it after
Kirren Steel went off sick had been a uniformed officer at Raymond Terrace ...

Who was that?
A. You said Karen Stee1. It's Kirren Stee1, and the uniformed officer from Raymond Terrace that was given the matter was Sergeant Jeff Little.
Q. How long did you work with Sergeant Little?
A. He was a uniformed officer at Raymond Terrace. Off the top of my head, possibly around a year. It may have
been longer or shorter, but something around that time.
Q. When he was allocated it, he was a detective sergeant?
A. He had been just promoted into that role by two days, yes.
Q. When he was allocated it in December 2010 he was a detective sergeant, wasn't he?
A. He had been transferred to Newcastle. I don't know if it had been confirmed on the documentation then. But if you're telling me it is, sir, I accept that.
Q. When you did the investigation of Fletcher, what rank were you?
A. I had been a detective sergeant for nine years.
Q. You were a detective sergeant, weren't you?
A. Sorry?
Q. You were a detective sergeant, weren't you?
A. I had been a detective sergeant for nine years.

Sorry, you mustn't have heard.
Q. You were asked some questions just a minute ago by my learned friend about tab 125B?
A. Yes .
Q. You were asked some questions in relation to the answer at page 676(e), and you were taken to "I did prepare a brief." Do you see that? It's a passage you were taken to half an hour ago?
A. I accept it, sir. I'm just trying to find it. That's al 1 .
Q. Why did you lie there?
A. It's not a case of I lied there, sir. A lie is a deliberate intentional effort to deceive someone, and that certainly wasn't the situation. This was an email where, for the sake, I suppose, of trying to be succinct, I've said, "I prepared a brief." I've acknowledged to Ms Lonergan that it was not a brief as such with a covering sheet, et cetera. There were some four or five statements from members of the clergy, there were also a number of statements from civilians that would have doubled from the Fletcher brief to have formed a brief for Malone, had I decided to head down that course. But rather than articulating through that document that I had some eight
statements and who and what they were, I've simply used the term "brief", which I acknowledge is not a full brief that we would normally interpret.

But this was just a simple conversation between two police and it wasn't intended to lie, and it wasn't an attempt to deceive in any way. It was simply a very quick simple way to explain it and I would have articulated it a bit more if he had called back and said, "What do you mean by that?"
Q. You intentionally put in there, "I did prepare a brief," didn't you?
A. Yes.
Q. And you did it with intent to deceive, didn't you?
A. I have answered that, sir. I will repeat: No.
Q. You wanted Detective Little and Inspector Parker to believe what you put in there, didn't you?

MR COHEN: I object. Which part?
MR ROSER: Is my friend is having problems following that, "I did prepare a brief."
Q. You wanted to tell them - that's Detective Sergeant Little and Inspector Parker - that you had prepared a brief in relation to that particular priest or bishop, didn't you?
A. That's what I've said. I hopefully have explained it.
Q. And you intentionally deceived them, didn't you?
A. No. I hope not. I hope that it wasn't taken
literally. If I had, I don't know how it would have assisted or not assisted. But certainly if they actually had thought I prepared a full brief and rang up and said, "Listen, could we have that," I would then have, of course, explained, "No, listen, what it consists of Jeff, is the statements of so and so and so and so and so and so. I actually didn't put it together as a completed brief." But they are the documents I was referring to.
Q. If they came back to you and said, "Where is this particular brief," you would have given them the brief straight away or told them what was in that particular brief that didn't exist? Is that what you are saying?
A. Yes, basically, I'm assuming they would have already had that because --
Q. No, just answer the question. If they came back to you and said, "Can you supply a brief to me that you say you prepared," you would have given it to them without any problems, wouldn't you?
A. I would have given them all those statements that I've referred to. I had electronic copies but the hard copies would have been on Maitland file. As I said, it wasn't you know, we are drawing very fine lines as to the terminology of a brief. Yes, a brief would have had a covering sheet on the front and an indictment and a couple of other formalities, and maybe a formal interview with Michael Malone. I concede it did not include that. I did not intend to mislead. It was simply the case that I had sat down with the DPP, gone through with Hamish Fitzhardinge there, with those statements.

If I'm referring to that as a brief, I think most people would accept that it's probably - it would have comprised a substantive amount of the documents that would have been in the finalised brief, but it wasn't a completed brief. And I acknowledge that, but it wasn't a case of me deceiving them. I imagine if they thought it was something that was completed, they would have phoned up and said, "Listen, can we have a copy of it this afternoon or tomorrow," and it would have been --
Q. And you would have given it to them straight away? A. I would have just explained fully what it was and if they needed a copy of those documents, I would have forwarded it to them.
Q. If you turn up tab 127A, have you read that?
A. No.
Q. Why don't you read it.

Have you finished reading that?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. You were asked for this particular brief, weren't you?

MR COHEN: I object.
THE COMMISSIONER: What is the objection, Mr Cohen?

MR COHEN: The evidence discloses that that document was not received.

MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, I agree with Mr Cohen's objection.

THE COMMISSIONER: Do you see that, Mr Roser?
MR ROSER: Yes. Thank you, Commissioner.
Q. Have you seen that document before?

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Roser, I believe the witness may be looking at the wrong document. It is page 127A.

MR ROSER: Q. Page 678B and C.
A. No, I was off sick. I believe I was off sick at that time. No, I haven't - I don't recollect that document, no.
Q. I'm sorry?
A. I don't recollect seeing that document.
Q. Do you have any recollection of ever being asked to produce this particular brief that didn't exist?
A. No.
Q. When you say "I did prepare a brief," what were you trying to say to Detective Sergeant Little?

MR COHEN: I object. This is the fourth go, Commissioner. This is becoming oppressive, in my respectful submission.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Cohen, we have had that the witness wasn't intending to deceive. I think I will allow Mr Roser to put these questions.

MR COHEN: May it please the Commissioner.
THE WITNESS: What I was trying to achieve was just to say in, you know, a very short way - obviously this was a very informal way of advising him. It's via email, so I think the first thing that came to my mind is that this wasn't a sit-down conference or an exchange of information but just a very quick, succinct explanation of what I knew and what I had and I did not go into - I think if I had put everything down, I would still be typing today. But
when I said, "It's a brief," it was simply to convey to Jeff Little that he had serious concerns about the conduct of Bishop Michael Malone and a number of other clergy in their conduct surrounding my investigation of Father Jim Fletcher and the forewarning of Father Fletcher that a complainant had been to police and there was an investigation afoot, and who the victim was who had spoken to police.

Obviously, for that to have happened, caused me great consternation and concern, and I simply wanted to convey to Jeff, "Listen, this is the sort of thing that I've had occur," and I looked quite seriously at whether or not there was enough there to proceed against Bishop Malone, but a decision was decided down the track not to.
Q. If you turn up tab 91, the second page, page 393, you were taken to this document by my learned friend Ms Lonergan just a while ago. I just take you to the second-last paragraph on that page. This was an email that you sent to Joanne McCarthy on 22 December 2010. Do you remember that?
A. Yes.
Q. At 22.11. You have got a statement there:

Nothing was sent to the State Crime Sex Crimes Unit. They were not even told about it.

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Why are you relaying that information to a journalist who was writing articles about this particular investigation at that time?
A. Because by this stage I had formed the view that there were some police that were intent on --
Q. Can you answer the question.

MR COHEN: He is answering the question. I object.
MR ROSER: Q. Why did you send it to a journalist?
MR COHEN: I object. That was entirely responsive, in my submission.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
Q. May we have the answer, please.
A. I had by this time formed the belief that some police were intent on not fully investigating this particular matter and were preventing - were failing to notify senior officers and possibly the State Crime Command of the full circumstances of the situation, and I believe that the conduct of those police officers was corrupt, and I was agreeing with Joanne McCarthy in that, in a long trial over some five to six months of seeing the conduct of police, that this again appeared to be another piece that fitted in with that hypothesis.
Q. Why were you telling a journalist who was writing articles about this particular investigation at that time of that information?
A. Because she, like I, I believe - sorry, she had expressed to me the view that she felt the police were trying to not investigate this matter. There had been numerous attempts, from what Ms McCarthy told me, to have an investigation occur as early as April 2010 when she provided all this documentation to them. Detective McLeod had also told me that he was told that it wouldn't be investigated. I was very concerned that factions within the police force were determined for the allegations not to be fully investigated, and it now appeared that the only way for that to have occurred was to drag them there kicking and screaming.
Q. What, through a journalist?
A. Yes.
Q. So, all the training that you've had about the integrity of an investigation, you were willing to sacrifice by giving police information to a journalist to publish it in a newspaper? Is that what you're saying?
A. What I'm saying here --
Q. No, is that what you're saying?
A. What I'm saying, sir, is that I had sent reports I don't know what information is contained when I say "I sent reports." I did not need to articulate further. But what I was saying, I had sent reports for the State Crime Command to become involved and nothing occurred. I think I've expressed the view earlier that those reports
appeared to have gone into the proverbial black hole, and I don't see any information there that is going to harm any investigation by simply saying, "I had asked for an investigation but nothing is happening."
Q. But what you are saying there is:

Nothing was sent to the State Crime Sex Crimes Unit. They were not even told about it.

Where did you get that information? ?
A. I think that by this stage, after four or five years, having been the author of those reports, I felt that it was a fair call to say that they hadn't called me in all that time, therefore they probably hadn't seen them.
Q. We are talking about this particular strike force. You understand that, don't you?
A. We are talking about - sorry?
Q. You are talking about this particular strike force, aren't you:

Nothing was sent to the State Crime Sex Crimes Unit. They were not even told about $i t$.

You are talking about Strike Force Lantle?
A. I'11 just read that paragraph so $I$ can put it in full context.

Sorry, I'm mistaken. Reading that full paragraph, it's now apparent we are talking about my report of 25 November, not my reports of 2006. So in regard to what I'm saying there, is that I was told that State Crime Command would be present at the meeting of 2 December. They weren't.
Q. I suggest to you that that is a lie. You are lying that you were told that the State Crime unit would be at the meeting on 2 December.
A. If Mr Haggett is suggesting otherwise, I would --
Q. No, no --
A. That is a lie.
Q. I put it to you that you are lying to this Commission in relation to that statement?
A. No, no.
Q. I suggest to you that you are lying on that issue, as you have lied on numerous other issues in this Commission?

MR COHEN: I have a question, Commissioner, which is a profoundly important one.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Cohen.
MR COHEN: Those questions are clearly put on instructions. Those instructions clearly must have come from Mr Haggett, surely, given the way they were framed. Mr Haggett is not available to give evidence in this Commission. It is profoundly unfair in all of this. That must be right.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Roser, are you going to ask the witness who it was who informed him that State Crime Command would be represented at the meeting?

MR ROSER: I will.
Q. Who told you that the State Crime Command would be there?
A. Superintendent Charles Haggett.
Q. Where did you get the information nothing was sent to - you are talking about Strike Force Lantle. Look at the paragraph, please:

Nothing was sent to the State Crime Sex Crimes Unit. They were not even told about it.

Where did you get that information?
A. That's the assumption $I$ have made by the fact that

I submitted a report on 25 November, six pages long,
detailing numerous clergy over a long period of time sexually abusing probably hundreds of children, and the fact that I would have imagined if State Crime Command had have been told of that, they most certainly would have been at the meeting of 2 December. It was very surprising that they would have no interest in that if they had been shown. This is not an official statement; it is a statement by me
to Joanne McCarthy, informally, against the directions of Mr Mitchell. It is not meant to be an official document. But that is the conclusion that I drew from the fact that State Crime Command did not attend that meeting when I was clearly told by Mr Haggett that they would be there and that it would be a meeting where the subject matter would be discussed to see how we addressed those issues.
Q. So you had no substance, just your assumption, in making that statement to a journalist to publish it in a newspaper?
A. There was definitely never an intention, I don't believe - well, not in my intention, and I would be extremely surprised if it would have been in Joanne McCarthy's intention, but she can be asked - to publish that. Yes, we were putting our heads together, if I can put it in that term, because we both shared very deep concerns about what had been going on.
Q. You see, I put it to you that that statement, that assumption by you is totally false. What do you say about that?
A. You may have been in possession of documents or something. But again, it's just surprising that no one appeared at that meeting that particular day, which disappointed me because the meeting was quite hostile and I really was unable to put across - which I felt that if someone was there from State Crime Command, things may have turned out differently.
Q. So because the State Crime Command wasn't there, you were entitled in your mind to make assumptions that they had not been informed about this particular strike force? Is that what you're saying?
A. No.
Q. Well, what are you saying?
A. What I'm saying is that they hadn't been told about all the information that $I$ had been putting together and my suggestion of what should be looked at as a more holistic approach, rather than confining again a very narrow investigation surrounding a small number of priests and one matter. I was able, I believe, to draw links of that conduct to numerous other instances of child sexual abuse by various other clergy, not only in the Hunter but to other areas of the state.

MR GYLES: I object. This is going well beyond the terms of reference of the inquiry. It is evidence that's of no weight in the sense that we have no direct evidence of any of these things and it's unresponsive to the question, in my respectful submission.

MR COHEN: Commissioner, the evidence, in my respectful submission, does have relevance, more than tangential relevance, to these terms of reference, because these are, in my respectful submission, matters that in this special circumstance link across the divide between the two terms of reference. They link to common matters, and this witness is giving you, Commissioner, what you need, which is an explanation of that link. There is a link. You yourself, if I may respectfully remind you, said at the opening in February that there was unlikely to be much commonality but there would be circumstances where there was commonality. In my respectful submission, this is just that case and you ought receive this evidence.

THE COMMISSIONER: The witness has said he believes he was aware of some links between what was going on in Maitland-Newcastle and perhaps some other areas.

I am prepared to accept that response and leave it at that, Mr Gyles.

MR COHEN: If the Commissioner pleases.
MR ROSER: Q. The paragraph that relates to what you are saying there is strictly confined to Strike Force Lantle, isn't it? Isn't it?
A. I don't know.
Q. Well, you wrote it, didn't you?
A. Yes.
Q. And don't you talk about that it was confined to that particular strike force?
A. I was not told --
Q. Answer the question.

MR COHEN: I object, because it doesn't refer to Strike Force Lantle anywhere on the face of the document in that paragraph.

THE COMMISSIONER: "The file is then to stop there."
MR COHEN: That is essentially different, in my respectful submission.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Roser, are you prepared to explore what the file is?

MR ROSER: Yes.
Q. Also the next paragraph:

That Newcastle is to continue the investigation.
What investigation are you talking about there? Is that Lantle, what you had been told about, that Newcastle was investigating on 2 December 2010?
A. What I'm saying is that I was never told clearly, certainly not at that time, what the parameters of the investigation were. What I had been asking for was, rather than - as had been occurring across Newcastle for a decade - singular small investigations with --

MR ROSER: This is not responsive, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: No.
THE WITNESS: Sorry.
THE COMMISSIONER: $Q$. Mr Fox, what is the file to which you refer in that paragraph - "My file"?
A. Yes. I believe it's the report which I would imagine that once it reached the region office on 25 November, would have been then referred to as a file.

MR ROSER: $Q$. It also refers to, in that context of what you are saying there, the statements of [AL], [AK] and [AJ], doesn't it? That's what you're referring to?
A. They would have formed a portion of that, yes.
Q. And that's what you're talking about, that nothing was sent to the State Crime Command sex unit in relation to that particular matter?
A. No, what I'm saying is I continued to try to say, "We need to look at a bigger picture," and that's what I'm saying.

MR ROSER: I object to this. It's not responsive, and this has happened numerous times.

THE COMMISSIONER: It's not responsive.
Q. Would you direct yourself, please, Detective Chief Inspector Fox, precisely to Mr Roser's question.

MR COHEN: Commissioner, it is very late. Is that a convenient time?

MR ROSER: No, I don't think so.
MR COHEN: It's not a matter for you, with respect.
MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, may I make a submission that Mr Roser is in the middle of completing a question, and that question should be completed before we move to other matters.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, that may be done, Mr Cohen.
Q. Detective Chief Inspector Fox, are you able to sit on until that's done?
A. I am, Commissioner.

MR ROSER: Q. When you say there, and I'11 ask it again, when you are talking about the State Crime unit, you are talking about Strike Force Lantle, the documents that you were to hand over and you did hand over on 6 December 2010. That's what it was about, wasn't it?
A. No.
Q. I suggest to you that you didn't know what the State Crime Command had or was investigating at that particular time; correct?
A. Yes .
Q. But you were still prepared to make the assumption that they had no documentation or that anything was sent to them; correct?
A. Yes .

MR ROSER: Is that a convenient time, Commissioner?
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Roser.

MS LONERGAN: Commissioner, I understand Mr Roser has an application to make in relation to a particular witness being excused from giving evidence at this Special
Commission. First of all, could Detective Chief Inspector Fox be excused from the box for the moment.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. You may stand down. Thank you. (Page 290 line 9 to page 294 line 44 redacted)

THE COMMISSIONER: Is there anything before we rise?
MR SKINNER: Commissioner, may $I$ be excused for the remainder of this session of the terms of reference?

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Skinner. Thank you for your attendance.
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