_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _

HISTORICAL INSTITUTIONAL ABUSE INQUIRY

_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _

being heard before:

SIR ANTHONY HART (Chairman)

MR DAVID LANE

MS GERALDINE DOHERTY

held at
Banbridge Court House
Banbridge

on Tuesday, 23rd June 2015 commencing at 10.00 am (Day 131)

MS CHRISTINE SMITH, QC and MR JOSEPH AIKEN appeared as Counsel to the Inquiry.

Page 2 Tuesday, 23rd June 2015 1 2 (10.00 am)CHAIRMAN: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Can I just 3 remind everyone, as always, to ensure that mobile phones 4 have been turned off or placed on "Silent"/"Vibrate". 5 I~must also remind you that no photography is permitted 6 anywhere on the premises or indeed within the Inquiry 7 chamber, and, of course, from time to time inevitably 8 9 some names may be mentioned in the chamber where it 10 would otherwise be difficult or impossible to follow what is being said. Where those names are covered by 11 the Inquiry's designation policy, they cannot, of 12 13 course, be used or repeated in any way outside the chamber. 14 15 Mr Aiken. Opening remarks by COUNSEL TO THE INQUIRY (cont.) 16 17 MR AIKEN: Chairman, Members of the Panel, good morning. 18 We, as you know, covered a lot of ground yesterday with a lot of complex detail. I am afraid there is more to 19 come today. 20 21 When we finished last evening, we had taken a little 22 time to look at the then Cardinal Daly's public statement of 5th December 1994. If we can bring up, 23 please, page 722 so we can remind ourselves of the 24 25 statement. In it post-Smyth's first set of convictions

in Northern Ireland the cardinal was setting out what he knew of the affair and what steps he took, and arising out of this we looked at an exchange of correspondence between the then Bishop Daly and Abbot Kevin Smith.

So this statement was promulgated on 5th

December 1994. It is a statement that didn't go down

well with everyone in that the Archdiocese of Armagh has

provided the Inquiry with a copy of a letter that

Brendan Smyth sent to Cardinal Daly of

6th December 1994. So the material that we looked at

yesterday in terms of the summary and the interviews and

some of the behaviour that we began to see demonstrated

the manipulation, the grooming-type behaviour, but also

through the medical reports we can see someone with the

propensity of Smyth, the lack of insight that there was

for someone in that situation in terms of their

behaviour.

If we take a look at the letter he wrote -- it is at 10504, please -- you will see it is written from Magilligan Prison. It is dated in the top right corner 6th December 1994. It is written:

"Eminence."

2.

In the cardinal's statement he was referring to the damage that Smyth had done to his victims and to the church. He said:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 4

"It has been drawn to my attention that you recently stated, 'Father Brendan Smyth has done severe damage to the church'. If you have been misquoted, then please ignore this letter and destroy it. If you have not been misquoted, then I wish to express my anger and disbelief that a person with your lofty intellectual qualifications could possibly have made such a statement. Whatever my sins and failings, and they are many, it is not they but the media reporting of them which has created an atmosphere of mixed shame and embarrassment for the superficial Catholic and, need I say it, I did not in any way create or encourage the media extravaganza; rather the contrary. I pleaded guilty to wildly exaggerated and in some instances false charges to try to limit media coverage. In that I admit I failed dismally. As a moderately informed Catholic Christian I do not believe that it is possible for anyone to damage the church. The church is God's gift."

He goes on to talk about how the church cannot be damaged by anyone. He says:

"The present unsavoury tempest is a testing, trying, proving experience from which the church will emerge renewed and, if possible, strengthened."

There may be something in those words in terms of the witnesses have explained the significant changes

Page 5

that have taken place in the church in terms of safeguarding, but I am not sure that's the reason that the author of the letter was referring to, but it gives you an idea into the mindset of someone in this type of cycle of behaviour.

I am going to shortly -- we had been looking yesterday, and this is, as you know, a complex picture -- we'd looked at the strand of the picture that relates to the Norbertine Order and we have been looking at Abbot Kevin Smith.

In the context of insight I am going to just show you three further entries from the council minutes at this point. We were looking at them yesterday. These come from 2... -- sorry -- from 1994.

The first is of 12th April 1994. So Smyth has not yet pleaded guilty in court. That takes place in June. If we look, please, at page 857 and the second paragraph, if we just -- yes, it is of 12th April 1994. We can see that on the page before, 856, but here in the second paragraph we can see:

"Father Abbot said he felt no personal guilt on Father Brendan Smyth's case. He said that over the years he had spoken many times to Father Brendan Smyth, made recommendations to him, warned him. At one time some years ago he had contemplated withdrawing car --

his car from Father Brendan Smyth, but in this way he was not supported by abbot's council."

You will recall there was at one stage a discussion in late 1978 and it was not clear what that was necessarily responding to. I suggested you might read into the document it is obviously something that required a car to facilitate, but the abbot, Kevin Smith, is saying at this point that he felt no personal guilt for how he had handled the matter.

Then on 24th May 1994, which is at page 861, this is at paragraph 4. There had been discussion of the Abbot Kevin Smith's own role and it is recorded in the council minutes:

"He did not see why he should be made the bearer of responsibility in respect of the Father Brendan Smyth case. He had taken care and trouble over the welfare of this confrere, at times obtaining for him specialists' attention. He had sought to debar Brendan Smyth's use of a car but had not obtained support of abbot's council for this measure."

It seems there was another abbot bringing some pressure to bear from outside the abbey on a course that that abbot considered Abbot Kevin Smith should take.

There is not in the council minutes the recording of the actual resignation of Abbot Kevin Smith, but we

- 1 know --
- 2 CHAIRMAN: Can you just scroll up to the page beyond that?
- 3 MR AIKEN: Can we just scroll up, please? Scroll up
- 4 a little further.
- 5 CHAIRMAN: Where it says "Father Abbot's personal role".
- 6 MR AIKEN: You will note the last sentence that we are going
- 7 to be coming to for a different reason in due course,
- 8 but at this point -- it's something we can ask Father
- 9 Fitzgerald about, but it doesn't seem to have been
- 10 necessarily a unique problem to Brendan Smyth and the
- 11 Holy Trinity Abbey.
- 12 CHAIRMAN: Just up a little bit further. Yes. Thank you.
- 13 MR AIKEN: Then as part of Operation Overview -- and the
- 14 Panel will have heard me on a number of occasions, in
- 15 Module 3 many occasions, describing Operation Overview,
- which was the police investigation of 1995 that
- encompassed 29 cases, case 29 of which was looking at
- 18 children's homes. Cases 1 to 28 was looking at various
- members of the clergy and their sexual offences.
- One of the Operation Overview cases -- in fact, it
- 21 was case 1 of 29 -- looked at the behaviour of Abbot
- 22 Kevin Smith in relation to his handling of Brendan Smyth
- 23 and whether the Abbot Kevin Smith should face
- 24 prosecution.
- In this context on 21st November 1994 the father of

2.

Page 8

one of the first victims made a statement to the RUC about his meeting with Abbot Smith in early 1989. You heard me talk about that meeting earlier in the chronology to do with the Norbertines. That takes place in March 1989 in an hotel. According to the parent in the statement, which can be found in the bundle at 32114 through to 32116, and then his wife's statement can be found at 32108 and 32109, he records that Abbot Kevin Smith wrote down the details of the abuse the parents were disclosing, but according to the father, he didn't seem concerned. The parent reports in a statement that Abbot Kevin Smith informed the parents that Abbot Kevin Smith had been told about Brendan Smyth's abuse in as early as 1971.

Now there an accuracy to that, whether that's the first time he knew, but certainly we saw yesterday reference to incidents in 1971.

What I will ask you to note is that the children that this set of parents had gone to talk about Smyth's abuse to Abbot Kevin Smith about were not even born when Abbot Kevin Smith first claimed to those parents to have been aware of Brendan Smyth's propensity.

He also told them, according to the parents' statements, that he had arranged treatment for him and it was progressing well. He was to contact them later

in the year, and then the father of the child says he didn't bother. That can be found at 32108.

The same dad, though, does record that he got an angry phone call four years later around Christmas 1993 from FBS 52 from Holy Trinity Abbey, who is since deceased, who apparently said that he and Abbot Kevin Smith would meet the family to sort something out. It is said that he, according to the dad of the children -- FBS 52 is claimed to have said that the parents were doing the Catholic Church a lot of harm. That reference can be found at 32109.

Now the fact of this exchange is borne out by the letter of 26th September 1994 that Abbot Kevin Smith sent to Chris Moore. The letter is at 975 through to 977. If we can look, please, at 977 and the second paragraph, you can see:

"With my approval in December 1993 FBS 52 , one of our community, telephoned the father of one of the young people against whom Father Smyth had offended. Our purpose was to arrange a meeting with the young person's father to discuss Father Smyth's offending and its possible consequences for the victim and the community."

So there is from Abbot Kevin Smith himself corroboration of the exchange that the parent was saying

had taken place, and earlier in the same letter Kevin

Smith talks about meeting the parents in 1989.

This letter, as you know, was written to the journalist who ultimately authored the book "Father Brendan Smyth" -- called "Betrayal of Trust: The Father Brendan Smyth Affair and the Catholic Church". He had been pursuing the Abbot Kevin Smith for answers to a series of questions about Smyth's behaviour and what was known about it and when.

In that same letter of 26th September -- I am not going to open it all now to you -- he set out for Chris Moore a series of revelations -- at that time they were revelations -- about Smyth and the abbot's own conduct.

The letter confirmed that Smyth's abuse of children began early in his religious life. That's at 975. That in those days frequent reassignment was the way the church handled paedophile priests. That's also at 975.

He explained then the medical treatment that they -he and the Order had sought for Smyth in 1968, 1973 and
institutional treatment in 1974. That's at the bottom
of 975 and moving on to 976.

He explained in the second paragraph on 976 that -you can see this on the screen:

"Father Smyth's behaviour has perplexed and troubled our community over many years. We always hoped that

2.

Page 11

a combination of treatment, Father Smyth's intelligence and the grace of God would enable Father Smyth to overcome his disorder. We did not adequately understand the compulsive nature of his behaviour or the serious and enduring damage which his behaviour could cause."

We looked yesterday at the paragraphs two further down where the abbot indicated that on two occasions Smyth had been sent to America without the receiving bishop being told of his propensity and that on both occasions further offending had occurred.

He claimed then in 977, if we scroll on to the last page, the third paragraph, that he was not aware that the RUC or the Garda were pursuing Smyth.

Now to what extent that's correct, because you saw yesterday a reference in the council minutes in 1991, a welcoming from the council that the difficulties with parties in Northern Ireland appeared to have been resolved. What that exactly means is not entirely clear.

But that's what the Abbot Kevin Smith was explaining to Chris Moore in 1994. Obviously there is a lot of accuracy that is now capable of being shown to the Inquiry about the content of the factual matters in this letter in terms of what Abbot Kevin Smith did know.

In April 1997 he travelled voluntarily to Northern

Page 12 Ireland for the police to interview him. By that stage 1 he had resigned. He had resigned, as I said, at the end of 1994, and his interview runs from 32129 through to 3 4 32141. He was asked -- if we can bring up 32139, please, he 5 was asked by the police: 6 "Q. When ..." 7 If we can just scroll down, please, to the 8 9 questions: 10 "Q. When did you first become aware of his criminal activity, that is his interfering with children?" 11 12 He says: "In 1989." 13 He talks about the meeting with the family in 14 15 Armagh. 16 "Q. What did they tell you?" He is asked about that. Then he is asked: 17 18 "Q. Are you saying ..." This is the fourth question down: 19 20 "Q. Are you saying this was the first time that you 21 were aware that Father Smyth was interfering with 22 children, North or South? 23 A. Yes." 24 Now it is difficult to say anything other than 25 that's simply a lie told to police officers in Northern

Ireland who were investigating the abbot's -- former abbot's behaviour.

He explains, if we look slightly further down, that the reason why he didn't consider -- he was asked:

- "Q. As a result of what you were told", in this particular case at the start of the 1990s, "being mindful of the fact that you were in [Northern Ireland] at the time you were told it", because he was in Armagh, "did you consider reporting this to the authorities?
- A. No, because I did not realise it was a criminal offence and if I had realised that it is a criminal offence, I would have reported it. At that time I didn't know what paedophilia was."

He goes on to explain that the family wanted Smyth to have treatment and that he had then arranged that, as you know, Dublin hospital with Dr Delmonte.

When asked if that was the first time he had received treatment for his problem, the answer given to the police officers was:

"Yes, it was."

Then if we move over on to the next page of the interview, he explains to the police towards the bottom of the page what he considered his responsibilities were:

"Q. Is there anything you want to say in relation

to your responsibilities for Father Smyth?

- A. My responsibilities is a spiritual one.
- I wouldn't say to anybody you were a paedophile or

 committing adultery or stealing or whatever. That was

 for the civil authority.

I would like to add that at the time I met the family if I realised what they were telling me was a criminal offence, I would have encouraged and facilitated them to report the matter to the police."

Now the RUC were in no doubt that the abbot -- the former abbot had simply lied to them about the state of his knowledge of Smyth's criminality when interviewed by the RUC on 30th April 2007. The reference for that is at 32103.

Detective Inspector O'Sullivan, who was heavily involved in the Smyth Inquiry, summarised the view of the RUC in 1997 in respect of the behaviour of Abbot Kevin Smith as follows when he said -- if we can look at 32175, please. Just scroll down, please. So the officer was clearly of the view that there had been a failure to report offences to the civil authorities and that appropriate action should be taken.

I am going to break off from the Norbertine Order at this point. Obviously what I have had to do is in a very condensed form set out a summary of the occasions

Page 15

when knowledge of Smyth's abuses came to the attention of his superiors.

from the work that we did yesterday that that was potentially a number of people involved with Smyth right at the beginning of his career. It was the first abbot of the now autonomous from 1954 Holy Trinity Abbey, Abbot Colwell. It then was Abbot Kevin Smith. You have seen in the council minutes that it was also Abbot General Calmels, with whom the matter was discussed, who said "No, the second bishop to America shouldn't be told". So -- and you have from Father Fitzgerald a disclosure that there was a whole series of individuals within the community who were able to contribute to explaining various times whenever offending had come to the attention of members of the Order.

Stepping back from that broad canvas, I pose this question to the Panel at this point as we move on to look at what those in the wider Roman Catholic Church in Northern Ireland knew, and it is this. It may be through the eyes of 2015 that the Panel will have looked on with incredulity as what I have laid out has been considered. It is undoubtedly the case that today one failure of the type that we were looking at to deal

Page 16

properly with a situation of this sort would lead to a veritable storm.

Witnesses have already said to the Inquiry that we are looking at events from an entirely different time, when there was a different or indeed lack of understanding about the sexual abuse of children and its effects, when there was a lack of knowledge or guidance about how to deal with it, when today's perhaps natural inclination to report matters to the civil authorities was not part of the psyche of the church or indeed the population in general.

The Panel will want to consider whether, bearing all that in mind, there can be any justification for the chronology that I have just laid out, because the inevitable consequence is that not one of the children in the children's homes that we have been looking at in this Inquiry would have been abused if the opportunities that were presented to deal with Smyth's behaviour had been taken. The issue for the Inquiry is whether what was done or not done, looking through the eyes at the time those events were occurring, whether those were systemic failings by the Order.

I am now going look at the position of the Diocese of Kilmore, in which Holy Trinity Abbey was situated.

Father Francis John MacKiernan was appointed Bishop of

Page 17

Kilmore on 11th October 1972 and he remained in that role for 26 years until his resignation on 16th

October 1998. He was born on 3rd February 1926. He was ordained a priest for the Diocese of Kilmore on 17th

June 1951, aged 25. After a short spell as curate at

St. Malachy's in Belfast he spent the next ten years teaching in St. Patrick's College, Cavan, where he had also been a student. It is there it appears that he was a student alongside Abbot Kevin Smith. When he became

Bishop of Kilmore in October 1972, he was aged 46. When he resigned in 1998, he was aged 72. He died on

23rd December 2005 at the age of 79.

In his statement to the Inquiry Father Donal Kilduff on behalf of the Diocese of Kilmore -- the statement is at 742 through to 749 -- has explained a number of incidents that the Diocese of Kilmore can say came to the attention of the then Bishop MacKiernan.

They deal with one of those at paragraph 7(a), if we can look, please, at 744, and this is a matter relating to an individual called FBS 44. His name should not be used outside the chamber. It relates to the period 1957. You can see at 7(c) -- I said 7(a). My apologies. 7(c):

"The third is an allegation by a man called FBS 44"
-- or that is how he became known; his name is FBS 44

FBS 44 -- "now in his 70s and living in England, that he was abused by Brendan Smyth when he was an altar server in Kilnacrott around 1955. I understand this allegation may be the subject of legal proceedings."

Then you will see the last sentence:

"FBS 44" -- it should be "FBS 44" rather than "Smith" -- indicated that he told his then teacher at that time, Father MacKiernan", later the Bishop.

He says:

"There are no documents to support this."

Now that is amplified further in paragraph 15, if we look at 747, please, where Father Kilduff explains that as a result of carrying out a detailed review of material held by the diocese they were in a position to say that they had received this allegation in May of 2012.

This gentleman explains he was abused by Smyth when he was 11 or 12, around 1955, and what he said he told the then Father MacKiernan.

Now he provided a seven-page letter to the Diocese of Kilmore. There is an implication in it that he was then coming to meet with them. I have not as yet seen any record of a meeting, if that took place, but the seven-page letter of 22nd May 2012, I am just going to show you it, and then I am going to give you a typed

copy of the extracts that I want to draw to your attention.

So if we can look, please, at 763, so you can see the nature of the handwriting. So it would be time-consuming now to try and read through the letter. So what I am going to do is hand up a typed copy of the extracts that I am going to refer you to as I summarise the letter, and I am also giving you the letter in hard copy with the relevant parts highlighted. Perhaps as I name the pages if they could be scrolled through too, that would be helpful.

I am going summarise the letter in -- at 764 this gentleman explains how his family moved to the

area and his mother got him a role as an altar boy at Holy Trinity Abbey, where he met Brendan Smyth. He actually provided a photograph, which I am going to show you, if we can look, please, at 771. It was a photograph taken at Holy Trinity Abbey, and he has marked on another page and listed out who each of the individuals are, and number 4 towards the top left corner he points out is Father Brendan Smyth.

He asks the question at the end of the letter, which is at 769, as to how many of these children hold a secret, as he put it, but he explains at 764, if we go back to that, please, that he was 11 or 12 when he first

Page 20

became aware of Smyth interfering with children, though
he didn't know that was what it was at the time. He
says -- he describes peeping through curtains of
a particular room where he saw Smyth interfering with
a girl. He says he knew it wasn't right.

Then he describes on 765 when Smyth first approached him and getting him to touch him until Smyth ejaculated. After a few days he explains, as we move through on to 766, he told his mum about what he had seen. He specifically says in the letter he told his mum about what he had seen happening to the girl as opposed to what had happened to himself. He described how his mum -- if we just scroll up a little -- didn't believe him and said to him that he had the devil in him and threatened to take him to the bishop.

On the same page then he explains telling his dad, and that's the piece that's highlighted at the top at the moment, who did believe him, but told him not to mention it again, because if he did carry on, they -- presumably the people -- would come in a van and take him to Monaghan and declare him insane.

So if -- obviously we are taking it from the letter -- if this is accurate, it might assist you with the type of mindset, of thinking that may have been the case certainly in this particular instance at the time.

Page 21

Then he explains in 766, which is the large passage that's highlighted, that when he went to St. Patrick's in Cavan, he found the then Father Francis MacKiernan, a man he could talk to. He describes how he felt that he as in -- he felt Francis MacKiernan, who he spoke to, did believe him, because he said to him, according to this man in the letter, that he would look into it.

He then describes in the rest of the passage and over on to the next page being expelled from school, because he was considered a bad influence on the rest of the pupils, considering that a high percentage would go on to be ordained as priests. Now it is not clear if he is saying he was expelled arising specifically from what he told Father MacKiernan or if there were some other matters that were the subject of this, but it is one interpretation of the way the letter is framed, because it is the only subject that was being discussed in the letter, this disclosure of the abuse.

He then dates you will see on 767 his conversation with Father MacKiernan as happening in 1957. He explains on 768 how he goes on to eventually disclose the abuse to his wife in 1961, but otherwise kept silent, and then how he came to feel empowered to write about what happened when he was given an iPad and was able to see the story of FBS38 being , and that

Page 22

caused him to feel that if FBS38 had been -- if he had been stronger, ie the author of this letter had been stronger, in 1955 and '57, or if the people that he told had done something at that time, those years of abuse to a lot of children, including FBS38, who had sparked his guilt, could have been avoided. Then he says, as you will see, what chance did he have? Who would have believed him?

So on a number of levels this is the type of communication that obviously has been coming out of the woodwork for various dioceses at various points in time. This is one that is said to involve the then Father Francis MacKiernan, because, as I said to you earlier, Francis MacKiernan then becomes Bishop MacKiernan in 1972 at the age of 46.

In paragraph 7(b) of Father Kilduff's statement he reveals to the Inquiry again something which would have been new and was not something the Inquiry was aware of from any other material that it had gathered.

If we look, please, at 744, on behalf of the Kilmore Diocese he explains:

"The second was a report by a priest, FBS 49

FBS 49, who told me that he had received a complaint from a woman around 1973 that her 14-year-old daughter had been abused by Brendan Smyth.

FBS 49

said he informed Bishop MacKiernan about the alleged abuse."

Then if we move over to 746, please, paragraph 14, Father Kilduff says this:

"There is some evidence that Bishop MacKiernan may have been aware of Brendan Smyth's activities earlier than 1975" -- we're going to come to that -- "but there is no contemporaneous record of it in the archives of the diocese. A priest of the diocese, FBS 49

FBS 49 , says that he reported a complaint made to him by a woman -- he can't recall her name -- in the ,

area that her daughter was abused by

Brendan Smyth when she was about 14. FBS 49

FBS 49 said that the bishop reported it to the Abbot of Kilnacrott, who told the bishop that he would send him to a psychiatrist. According to FBS 49

FBS 49 , Bishop MacKiernan, Bishop Francis MacKiernan, sent a letter to him for him to give to the lady telling her that the Abbot of Kilnacrott had told him", the bishop, "that Father Smyth had been treated by a psychiatrist and that she could be assured this would not happen again. He said he passed the letter on to the lady. We can find no record of that letter in our records and the priest did not keep a copy. As he cannot recall this lady's name, we cannot trace this

matter any further at present."

Now we did see yesterday and I suggested to you perhaps an entry from 1973 that might relate to this, but it is not possible to be certain about that.

In light of what was said in Father Kilduff's statement and the fact that there was no documentation from which it could be substantiated, the Inquiry sought a witness statement from FBS 49, and although again he is not within the jurisdiction of Northern Ireland, he voluntarily provided that statement for the assistance of the Inquiry. That statement is of 11th June and it can be found at 816 and 817 in the bundle.

Now if we look, please, at 817, you will see that he is able to date this happening he believes in 1973, because it was while he was serving in the earlier -- area and he left that area in 1974.

Therefore he says it would have been in and around 1973.

At paragraph 4, if we scroll down, please, you will see that what he discloses to the Inquiry is this:

"The woman told me how she had recently suffered the death of her husband, a young man, and how she was left with a young family to rear. Brendan Smyth had befriended her during that difficult time. She told me that Brendan Smyth suggested taking her 14-year-old

Page 25 1 daughter to Dublin with him." As you will know from police material, that is 3 something he would have done: 4 "... taking her ... to Dublin with him, I suppose as 5 a treat, how she had given her consent, feeling confident that her daughter was safe and not wanting to 6 refuse him. They had stayed overnight at the 8 Hotel. He had slept with the girl and had had sexual 9 intercourse with the young girl." 10 Now this is obviously what FBS 49 11 recollects that he was told and he is recounting that in his witness statement. He said he was: 12 13 "... shocked and enraged. 14 I told her that what Brendan Smyth had done was a criminal offence." 15 You may regard that as, if FBS 49 16 's 17 recollection is accurate, then in 1973 a priest, not the 18 bishop, but a priest was recognising that -- what was 19 being described as a criminal offence: "I asked if she had informed the Guards. She looked 20 21 at me in dismay at the suggestion of the Guards and 22 replied, 'I thought that I could come to you in confidence. I'm in enough trouble as I am. I couldn't 23 24 take any more'. The woman was distraught. Her words 25 cut through me. I could not make her situation worse.

I was still concerned for the welfare of her daughter.

2 I asked her if she had brought her daughter to the

doctor. She replied 'No'. I asked her to take her

4 daughter to the doctor and to tell him what happened.

I was worried that she might be pregnant. Besides, the

6 doctor might be able to help the girl. He might know

7 what to do. I was not remotely qualified to deal with

8 something like that. The mother agreed to take her

9 daughter. (Whether she did or not, I do not know.)

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I told her that I had no choice but to report the matter to the bishop. An assault of this kind on a young girl by a priest had to be reported to the church authorities. My immediate authority was the bishop. Brendan Smyth's authority was the abbot. I was amazed at the poor woman's compassion for a man who had perpetrated such an evil deed on her daughter. She said to me not just once but three our four times, 'I do not want him to get into trouble'. She also said, 'I do not want it to happen to someone else'. I told her that I would report the matter to the bishop and tell him also what she had said. I do not remember any more about the conversation. I remember the above because it had such an impact upon me."

Then asked -- the Inquiry posed him a number of questions.

Page 27 1 "How he knew he was obliged to tell Bishop MacKiernan about what he had been told." 3 He said: 4 "My anger would not allow me to rest. This man had 5 criminally assaulted a young girl. His superior must be informed. He must be confronted with his actions. 6 must be held to account, and as far as I was concerned 8 he must be disciplined. There was no choice in this 9 matter. 10 What exactly he told Bishop MacKiernan. 11 I told the horrible story to Bishop MacKiernan as I have related it above. He took it seriously and said 12 13 that he would deal with it. I do not remember either 14 the circumstances of our conversation, nor the 15 conversation itself. I passed on all I knew and did it 16 immediately. 17 What Bishop MacKiernan told him he would do about 18 it. 19 He said he would get in immediate contact with the abbot." 20 21 At this stage that is Abbot Kevin Smith. 22 "What further communication FBS 49 had 23 with the family who made the disclosure and what he told 24 them. 25 The bishop came back to me in approximately ten days

insofar as I can remember. I was told that Brendan Smyth had been brought to a psychiatrist in Dublin, that he was receiving treatment, and an assurance was given that this kind of thing would never happen again. I accepted that response in good faith. I was happy that Brendan Smyth was receiving professional help. I was happy too with the promptness with which the matter had been dealt. I conveyed the response to the mother. I think I was given a letter. I am uncertain. I never heard from her again. Why did you not report the matter to the civil authorities? 'I thought that I could come to you in confidence. I'm in enough trouble as I am. I couldn't take any more." I agreed that this woman was in no position to take any more pressure or trouble. Despite my personal feelings, I respected her wishes."

Then he says:

1

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"No victim ever came to me to report anything about Brendan Smyth. More than 20 years later some stories emerged, but it was hearsay."

You will recall yesterday that we were looking at the fact that in 1973 Brendan Smyth was sent to St. Patrick's Hospital in Dublin. I postulated the question whether what paragraph 42 of Father

Smith.

Page 29

Fitzgerald's statement showed about something taking place in 1973, although it not being clear what that was, and suggesting that the entry which is at 837 in the council books may -- if we just look at 837, please, the entry of May 1973, you can see:

"The council was now asked by Abbot Kevin Smith to enter into consultation for the personal and private case of a particular confrere against whom a complaint had been received from outside the Abbey and for the remedies that could be taken."

Now obviously it is speculation as to whether those two entries match up, because the missing link is any record of Bishop Francis MacKiernan receiving the complaint from his bishop -- from his priest, FBS 49 , and then taking that complaint to Abbot Kevin

The Diocese of Kilmore have not been able to produce any record in the diocesan archives about this particular incident. So the Inquiry only has knowledge of it because FBS 49 has set out his recollection of what happened.

If the recollections of FBS 49 are correct, the issues that the Panel might like to consider is: why is there no record of it in the diocese? It was, whether it be correct or not,

Page 30

a communication that rape had occurred. Why was that not reported?

FBS 49 has given his explanation for why he did not feel able to report it, but then his boss, as it were, the Bishop of Kilmore, is being told, and

FBS 49 is saying that he told him exactly what he had been told.

There, in addition, doesn't appear to have been any sanctions imposed by the bishop. We will see that by 1975 a different course was taken, but in 1973 or whatever the precise date of this particular incident involving FBS 49 whatever the date of it, there doesn't appear to be any record of any steps being taken by the diocese to curtail Smyth in terms of the removal of his faculties, let alone reporting it to the civil authorities for him to be arrested.

There doesn't appear to be -- and this is an issue that we keep coming back to over and over again as we go through the various strands -- there doesn't appear to have been any certainly recorded communication that has been produced by any diocese to suggest that they were told by Bishop MacKiernan that there was a priest said to have done this type of very serious sexual offence within his diocese.

I am going to leave that issue and draw your

Page 31

attention to the summer of 1974, when Father Bruno Mulvihill records in his police statement of 14th March 1995 that at a golden jubilee celebration in Holy Trinity Abbey he claimed to the police -- I will just give you the reference for it -- I am not going to bring it up -- at 32126 -- that he spoke to Bishop MacKiernan, who was in attendance, and also Archbishop Alibrandi, who was the Papal Nuncio to Ireland, about what he describes in the police statement as irregularities surrounding Father Brendan Smyth.

Now there are no -- he says to the police -- Father

Mulvihill, as you know, is deceased -- that he knew from
his Prior in the Abbey, , that Bishop

MacKiernan had been fully informed by the Prior of what
was described by Father Mulvihill of this serious
problem of Brendan Smyth.

He also claimed in the police statement to have written to the bishop in November 1994, and there is a typed copy of not the actual letter but a typeset of what the letter was said to contain in the papers, but there is no record of that letter ever being received by the Diocese of Kilmore at the time it was dated, which is in 19... -- November 1974, and equally that seems to be the same position for the Papal Nuncio's letter.

So I am not taking it any further forward other than

Page 32 1 saying there is a police statement from Father Mulvihill, who claims to have had this conversation with 2 3 Bishop MacKiernan. It would simply be another instance 4 of knowledge that's already established through FBS 49 FBS 49 5 6 In any event, we then move to the 1975 Kilmore 7 investigation. Perhaps before I start that, Chairman, if we take a short break. 8 9 CHAIRMAN: Yes. Well, we will rise until 11.30. (11.17 am)10 (Short break) 11 (11.30 am)12 13 MR AIKEN: Chairman, Members of the Panel, we are now going to look at the 1975 Kilmore investigation, and while 14 15 this investigation has in various ways become the source of public scrutiny previously, its context we have just 16 17 seen won't have been understood before. So as you 18 consider the 1975 investigation that I am about to outline, the context of it is that the bishop who set it 19 up had, according to FBS 49 , received and 20 21 potentially dealt with a serious allegation about Smyth 22 less than two years prior. So we begin with on 23rd March 1975 -- and again 23 I am going to use the names to otherwise make a very 24 25 complex story as clear as I can, and they shouldn't be

Page 33 1 used outside the chamber -- on 23rd March 1975 FBS38 , then 14 years old, disclosed to a local 2. FBS 48 3 priest, , that Brendan Smyth been sexually abusing him over the past year and 4 a half. 5 FBS 48 brought the matter to Bishop 6 MacKiernan, the Bishop of Kilmore, the diocese where 7 Holy Trinity Abbey was situated. It is not entirely 8 9 clear how that managed to come about, although there is 10 a handwritten note from Cardinal Brady that assists with how it might have come about, which we will look at not 11 12 today. 13 FBS38 has in 2014 with the assistance of Darragh MacIntyre 14 15 That relates what his now lifelong friend and 16 former priest, FBS 48 , because he left the 17 priesthood, told him of the steps leading up to the 18 meeting with Bishop MacKiernan that sparked the Inquiry. If we can look at 70150, please, so you can see: 19 20 "I know it never occurred to them in 1975 to report 21 what had happened to the Gardai. **FBS 48** didn't 22 go to the Garda either, but he told my parents. very first thing that he had done was to make sure my 23 parents knew. Then he set about alerting the church 24 25 authorities to what Father Smyth was doing, just as he

had told my parents he would.

He went back to his own place and looked up the Catholic Directory, which contains all the names and addresses of priests and the religious in Ireland. He found the details of the Norbertine Order at Kilnacrott easily enough but then came upon a problem.

The directory listed two Smiths at the Abbey or rather one Smith and one -- one Smith", with an I, "and one Smyth", with a Y. "All that he could remember from his conversation with me was that it was a Father Smyth in Kilnacrott. To add to the confusion, the Smith with an I at the Abbey was the Abbot Kevin Smith. FBS 48

FBS 48 realised he couldn't differentiate between the two, but there was another avenue of recourse open to him.

Father Brendan Smyth was under the direct control of the Abbot Kevin Smith. Ultimate control of the Norbertine Order lay with the head of the Order based in Rome. I have talked to many lawyers over the years and read many legal opinions on where responsibility lay. One of those, canon law expert Father Tom Doyle, says that whenever Father Smyth was in a diocese, he was also under the control of the local bishop. The Abbey of the Holy Trinity at Kilnacrott was situated in Kilmore, then under the control of Bishop Francis MacKiernan.

Page 35 Therefore Bishop MacKiernan could also exercise 1 authority over Smyth." 2 Whether that's right or not is something we can ask 3 some of the witnesses about. 4 FBS 48 decided to bypass the Abbey and 5 pursue this avenue instead. He arranged to drive to 6 to meet Bishop MacKiernan. At the meeting he 7 outlined what he knew." 8 9 Of particular relevance, if I can draw your attention of the Panel to this: 10 "According to FBS 48 , Bishop MacKiernan 11 informed him that this was not the first time that 12 13 Father Brendan Smyth's inappropriate activities with boys had been brought to his attention." 14 15 Now if that is right, then it is more than just the complaint two years previously about the girl, but it 16 17 may be that it is not right and there has been confusion 18 to refer to boys. It may be the reference is to the incident that we looked at that FBS 49 has 19 explained, but whatever the right way of it, whether it 20 21 is one or more, it is at least one, and is recounting through FBS38's that that's what he 22 was told in terms of the awareness of Bally... -- Bishop 23 MacKiernan. 24 25 Cardinal Brady has explained in his witness

Page 36 statement to the Inquiry of -- you will see, just if 1 I finish that passage: 2 "He said that the Norbertine Order, to which Father 3 Smyth belonged, had not taken the proper action after 4 the last occasion. Bishop MacKiernan went on to say 5 that it was time the matter was dealt with properly and 6 explained he intended to set up an ecclesiastical court." 8 9 He then explains a few days later he was summoned to ... 10 "A few days after this meeting with Bishop 11 FBS 49 called to our home and invited 12 MacKiernan 13 me and my father to a meeting in the in We were left in no doubt about the gravity 14 15 of this meeting, but we had no idea what it would entail." 16 17 Cardinal Brady has explained in his witness statement to the Inquiry of 11th June -- that's from 807 18 to 812 -- that he was summonsed to a meeting by Bishop 19 MacKiernan in March 1975. He has explained he was 20 21 a teacher in St. Patrick's College, Cavan at the time, 22 though he explains in paragraph 4 of his statement at 807 that he provided occasional secretarial assistance 23 to Bishop Francis MacKiernan. 24 25 The Inquiry has received what you hopefully will

Page 37 find a helpful document. If we can look, please, at 1 40624, it appears to be a record of an interview with 2. Bishop MacKiernan in June 1994. It was disclosed as 3 part of the material that came from I believe the 4 Diocese of Kilmore. It seems to have been someone from 5 the -- on behalf of the Norbertine Order speaking to him 6 about his recollection of these events in the context of 7 -- they were preparing for a media response, which had 8 9 been necessitated by the upcoming UTV programme that they were aware of, which, as you know, is "Suffer 10 Little Children" that was broadcast in October 1994. 11 You will see it records: 12 13 "Bishop MacKiernan handed me his file dealing with Father Smyth and suggested I read through the documents 14 15 and then he would answer any questions." If we scroll down, please: 16 17 "Bishop MacKiernan explained that these transcripts were the result of a canonical inquiry which he 18 conducted in 1975." 19 Then he sets out some of the detail, but if we just 20 21 scroll down, please, to 40625, he then records what the 22 interview produced, and we will look at that shortly, but if we move slightly further down, we can see the 23 explanation for what this inquiry was for: 24

"Bishop MacKiernan explained that the purpose of the

25

Page 38 canonical inquiry was that he needed firm grounds for 1 withdrawing faculties from Father Smyth, hence this 3 Inquiry." 4 Now if we just break off from this document at that point. So that's the purpose for which the inquiry was 5 set up, according to this note of what Bishop MacKiernan 6 was saying in 1994. 7 On the evening then of 29th March 1975 Father John 8 Brady, as he then was, and 9 FBS 50 a priest and canon lawyer from the Armagh Diocese, 10 interviewed FBS38, then a 14-year-old boy, at 11 . FBS38's father was not 12 in 13 present during the interview. If we look at 70154, 14 which is out of FBS38's "I am not sure who answered." 15 16 This is them arriving at the 17 "I can remember going into this room. My father was 18 told he had to stay outside. He was left outside in an office, where he sat alone for the next hour." 19 Now the two priests who interviewed FBS38 with 20 21 FBS 48 there as well, there are handwritten 22 questions and handwritten answers. I am just going to 23 show those to the Inquiry now, because the Inquiry has 24 received copies of them. It is at 10018, and then 25 eventually I'm going to look at the typed versions.

Page 39 1 10018, please. So you can see it is on 2 notepaper. There is then a list of 3 questions. On Thursday we can establish with the cardinals whose handwriting is whose. 4 If we just scroll through quickly, please, the 5 questions for now, you can see questions are being 6 listed out. Just keep going, please. Keep going, 7 please. So some thirty questions we can see are being 8 9 listed out. Then you can see, if we just pause there, please: 10 "Questions put by me, FBS 50 . Signed by 11 FBS38, John B. Brady, FBS 48 , 29th March at 12 13 Then if we move on to the next page, we can see then 14 15 the series of answers being recorded. Again if we just 16 scroll through the answers for now. So you've got the 17 thirty answers. 18 Then you can see that at the bottom of the last page again -- we have seen the number of pages; so that's not 19 something that would have taken five minutes to do --20 21 signed by FBS38, FBS 50 , described as the 22 interrogator, John B. Brady, FBS 48 , 29th 23 March 1975. 24 Then if we look at 20031, please -- sorry -- 10031. 25 10031. Apologies. We can see:

Page 40 "I, FBS38, hereby swear that I have told the truth, 1 the whole truth and nothing but the truth and that 2. I will talk to no-one about this interview except 3 authorised priests." 4 There is obviously some writing that has been scored 5 out before the "except authorised priests". Again 6 signed by FBS38, signed by John B. Brady, 29th March 1975. 8 9 Then this documentation, the handwritten set of 10 questions, the handwritten answers and the -- both were compiled into a typewritten form and the combined 11 typewritten questions, answers and oath can be found at 12 13 10010. Can we just look at that to identify them, please? So you can see: 14 15 "Copy of replies made by FBS38 to questions put to 16 him by FBS 50 in the FBS 48 17 presence of and Reverend John 18 Brady in on March 29th." The thirty questions are then asked and answered, 19 20 the question and answer interposed before the next 21 question. I am going to leave that. If we just scroll 22 through so we can identify it for the Panel, please. 23 Obviously the Panel have the opportunity to consider 24 this document and the nature of the questions that were 25 posed and their appropriateness.

You can see in the end then it is finalised with typing out of the oath, and then you can see at the bottom, if you just scroll down a little further, please, you will see the handwriting. So it is signed off then. I apologise for my Latin. I presume that that is telling everyone this is a genuine copy of the handwritten version.

I am going to break off just there, because in his FBS38 describes his recollection of that experience

It runs from 70152 to 70161 in the bundle.

In it he describes -- and I am just going to give you the references -- he describes being frightened at 70154; that it felt like an inquisition, which is also at 70154; that some of the questions were inappropriate, 70155 -- you will see I think what he is referring to when you read the content; but he felt it was all about him and what was his fault, 70156; that the blame and the shame was being put back on him, 70156.

Now whether that is what was intended or not, that is what he in describes as an adult what he says he felt as a child at the time as he went through this process.

He describes then at 70159 his sense of sadness at

his dad sitting outside while his son was made feel
complicit in what had taken place.

He also records at 70160 that his father was given an assurance that night that Smyth would be dealt with.

I will leave the Panel to read the thirty typed questions and answers, but what I would ask you to look at now is just question and answer 17. If we look at 10011 in the context of -- the question that was being posed, if we scroll down, please, 17:

"You told FBS 48 that he was doing things which worried you. Could you tell us simply what the things were?"

He said:

"I went on holiday with him to Cork. There was another fellow with him and two girls."

He names the boy and then he names the girls. You see those names are given and, in fact, an address and postcode is given. How -- whether that was obtained after the event and written in, when you look at the handwritten document, it may well have been. The cardinal may be able to assist with that. He is asked:

"Did he get your parents' permission?

A. He asked my parents first and I went on holidays with him. We went to Cork City, . He took his own car."

1 Then he says this:

"At night he used to take one fellow into bed with him."

Now you can see from the answer that's already given that there only is one other fellow on the trip. Then he says that that happened to him as well. He describes the touching and masturbation that went on.

Now it would come to light then in the 1990s, as we will come to see, that the name that he gave was accurate, and ultimately Smyth was convicted of abusing that boy along with his brother, and as you know from the interviews, he described -- Smyth that is -- described those as his worst two cases, as he put it.

The point that I am showing you this for is that it is unclear whether there was any effort made to inform the Diocese of Down & Connor that a child in their diocese, because his address is identified as to where he lives, may have been abused, which was disclosed during this investigation, nor whether there was any effort made -- in fact, it is clear now from the cardinal's third statement that it doesn't seem any effort was made to tell that child's parents that that was the position. As we will come to see, it is the brother of this child at the time who as an adult starts

Page 44 1 talking to his uncle and aunt about his two cousins and that's whenever we get to the beginning of the end for 3 Smyth in the early 1990s. 4 At question 21, if we look at 10014, please, he is 5 asked: 6 "Did you tell anyone else? If so, what is his ...? 7 A. No, I never told anybody, only the young chap", 8 and he mentioned the same person as in question 17. 9 "Q. Did the other person or any other person to 10 your knowledge do the same things with Father Smyth? 11 Did they ever say they did?" 12 Then he gives the name of another boy from 13 , which is where Holy Trinity Abbey was in 14 Cavan. 15 Then he said that Smyth had taken him and this other 16 boy to in Dublin. 17 "He did the same thing with that boy in bed that night and with me." 18 19 So this is a second incident on a trip, same type of fondling, masturbation being described. We will see 20 21 that this boy was subsequently interviewed, but as the 22 cardinal has -- we looked at a section of his statement 23 yesterday. He confirmed that this boy's parents didn't know about this interview and weren't told about the 24 25 abuse. We will come to that shortly.

Page 45

What is -- if we look at the handwritten version, then there is a handwritten report of this interview which I want to show up. It is at 10016. I want to draw your attention to the title of it: "sub secreto", in secret, "-- confidential".

It then summarises the findings of that discussion or interview that had taken place.

In paragraph 10 of Cardinal Brady's statement -- if we just scroll down a little, please, so we can see the rest of the document. It's a detailed report. You can see at the bottom the last three lines refer to -- there was obviously some conversation took place with FBS 38 father in order for the last line to be present.

In paragraph 10 of Cardinal Brady's statement, if we look at 808, he explains that:

"I presented the written record of the meeting with
FBS38 to Bishop MacKiernan. I believed FBS38 from the
start and I advised Bishop MacKiernan of that. He
decided that we should add weight to the evidence and
corroborate the evidence of FBS38 by interviewing the
other boy who FBS38 said had been abused. This boy
lived in
. With the help of the local
curate, a meeting was set up to talk to the boy. At the
interview the local curate attended to both give support

Page 46 1 to the boy and also to give formality to the proceedings." 3 The cardinal says: 4 "I took a statement from the boy asking him some of FBS 50 in the first 5 the questions used by interview. I also administered a similar oath of 6 7 confidentiality for the same reason." 8 That's a repeat. If we just scroll down. The same 9 page is in again. Then he says he: 10 "... returned with the second set of questions and 11 answers and presented those to my bishop, again 12 confirming that I had accepted the evidence of both 13 boys." 14 So --15 CHAIRMAN: Just scroll back up to the previous page. MR AIKEN: Scroll up a little further. Just scroll up to 16 17 paragraph 8 so we can see the reason being given for the oath. 18 CHAIRMAN: A little bit further, please. 19 MR AIKEN: A bit further up. 20 21 CHAIRMAN: Yes. 22 MR AIKEN: The cardinal has explained in his third statement that parts of this were inaccurate and that the 23 24 investigation was carried on by Kilmore, and we have 25 clarified how FBS 50 came to be involved, which

- was at the cardinal's request, or Father John Brady's
- 2 request, as he was at the time, to assist him.
- 3 CHAIRMAN: Yes. I see FBS 50 is described as DCL,
- 4 presumably Doctor of Civil Law or Doctor or Canon Law.
- 5 MR AIKEN: Yes. Paragraphs 8 and 9 explain the thinking
- 6 behind the oath. That's something we can pick up with
- 7 the cardinal in his evidence. He indicates that the
- 8 decision to interview the second boy, which was
- 9 something that he did and FBS 50 wasn't
- involved in, was as corroboration in effect for the
- first complaint, FBS38. That's the import of
- paragraphs 10 and 11. He set out how that meeting was
- 13 set up.
- 14 That meeting with the second boy from
- was on 4th April 1975. So it was four or five days
- later. Father John Brady, as he then was, interviewed
- that second boy, who was aged 15, in the presence of the
- 18 local curate.
- I am going to show you again the handwritten
- questions and answers. If we look, please, at 10123,
- again you can see the interview with the boy in
- question. It is dated 4th April 1975. If we just
- scroll on down through, please, the questions are listed
- out again. This time there are 32 questions. The
- 25 questions are signed by presumably that curate who was

Page 48

there along with Father Brady, and then if we move on to the next page, please, we can see the answers being recorded. Again if we just pause there, we can see it is signed by the same individuals.

If we just move through on to the next page then, please, we will see the oath. You will see that this oath is slightly different. So on the last oath it was a reference to "authorised priests". This one it's:

"I will not discuss the interview with anyone except priests who have permission to discuss it."

Then a similar pattern to the last time. There is then a typed combined questions and answers and oath version. That begins at 10131. So if we just scroll down, please, we can see the typed questions and then the typed answers being interposed. If we scroll down to the end, please, to question 30, and see:

"Q. Is there anything else you would like to tell us?

A. We went that day from to back to .

Q. Is there anybody else who could give some information?"

Then you will see that identified is four further names, one of whom was identified during the first investigation. Obviously the implication that comes out

Page 49 of this, you have FBS38 on 29th March explaining trips, 1 two different trips, where two different boys and he each time were interfered with. On at least one of 3 those trips there were two girls present. 4 In relation to this individual he is listing out 5 a number of other children, and there's nothing to 6 indicate that any of these other children were spoken to in order to ascertain whether they had any similar 8 9 experience at the hands of Smyth. 10 There is nothing to suggest that any steps were taken to monitor the well-being of the boy who was 11 interviewed on this occasion or indeed the boy who was 12 interviewed on the occasion before. 13 In fact, in FBS38's indicates himself -- if 14 15 we look at 70167, you can see the reference to 16 is the second interview, the boy that we 17 have just read. He was 15 when he was questioned. You 18 can see on the right-hand side of the page, just halfway down the right-hand side: 19 "More than that, he said his parents were not told 20 21 that he was being abused." 22 Then FBS38 says: "The church, of course, said nothing and he said 23 nothing to anyone, not to a soul, because he was sworn 24

to secrecy about the process, just like me."

25

Page 50

In the -- if we move through to 70170, please, and the right-hand side of the page, in the account that's given what's reproduced here is an interview with the -- if you recall, in FBS38's interview he describes the first occasion whenever he and another boy are taken into bed one after the other on a trip, and that was one of the first two children who came forward then as adults, and his name, to save it being on the transcript.

This is a record of the interview that took place.

These two boys now as adults meet and discuss what
happened. You see what's said down in the right-hand
corner:

"The interview was devastating and it went right to the heart of the matter. You see, this wasn't about going to the Gardai or to the police, not even about going to the Social Services. This was about a simple warning: 'Your man isn't safe with children. Keep yours well away from him'.

That never happened and so the abuse continued against that particular boy and then his younger sister for another seven years and his first four -- his four first in turn."

He recounts the documentary then that he featured in with the BBC. The references I will just

Page 51 from 70172 to 1 give you. Ιt 70182 he describes the -- it was, in fact, a BAFTA award 2. winning documentary in which he featured called "The 3 Shame of the Catholic Church". 4 What I would like you to note then -- we looked at 5 the handwritten report, so not the questions and 6 answers, but the report that was headed "in secreto" 7 8 (sic). 9 There then is a typed version of that report. I just want to show you that. That's at 10009 I hope. 10 Yes. So this is the typed-up version of the handwritten 11 document we looked at. You recall that the handwritten 12 13 document ended with the reference to the conversation that must have taken place with FBS38's father. 14 15 So if we scroll down to the bottom of the document, we can see the reference in the penultimate paragraph: 16 17 "This statement was then confirmed on oath by FBS38. 18 His father also confirmed that Father Smyth often visited their home." 19 So that is where the handwritten document ended, and 20 21 then you can see that on the typed version what appears, 22 if I have understood the chronology of this correctly, to have been added in then is that: 23 "The second boy has also been interviewed and he 24 25 states that Father Smyth engaged in similar activity

- with him on a number of occasions. He so confirmed this
- 2 statement on oath."
- 3 So that is, if you like, the corroboration that was
- 4 being sought being then added to the typed report. As
- 5 we were looking at, Cardinal Brady explained in his
- 6 statement in paragraph 10 we have looked at already he
- 7 returned with the second set of questions and answers
- and presented those to his bishop and confirmed that he
- 9 accepted the evidence of both boys.
- Then I want us to look again at the memo we looked
- 11 at yesterday. If we look, please, at 780, so this --
- 12 CHAIRMAN: Just before we leave that could we look at that
- 13 again?
- 14 MR AIKEN: Yes. Can we go back to the document, please? It
- 15 is at 10009.
- 16 CHAIRMAN: Yes. Thank you.
- 17 MR AIKEN: Now there seems -- and it is something we can ask
- the cardinal -- to have been a lack of appreciation that
- from the document, from the record FBS38 was clearly
- describing two separate instances where him with two
- 21 separate boys were interfered with. When one reads this
- report, the implication it carries is it is only the
- 23 second incident that's being recorded here as having
- involved interference.
- 25 So this information is brought back then to Bishop

```
Page 53
 1
         Francis MacKiernan. The documents come from the archive
         of Kilmore. So obviously this is what was there to be
         read or communicated to the bishop and/or read by him.
 3
             Then we are going look at the memo at 708, please,
 4
         of 20th April 1975. You can see, if we just scroll down
 5
         a little, please:
 6
             "On 12th April 1975 I reported the findings on
         Reverend Brendan Smyth to Abbot Kevin Smith.
 8
         indicated knowledge of former lapses ..."
9
             Now if we just pause there, what is you may consider
10
         on one view strange about that sentence is that if the
11
         two individuals had had a previous conversation in 1973
12
13
         about the
                          FBS 49
                                         incident, then the
         sentence wouldn't necessarily read:
14
15
             "He indicated knowledge of former lapses ...",
              because both men would know of the former lapse, as
16
17
         it were, even if it was confined to just 1973, but in
         any event for whatever reason it reads as it does:
18
             "He indicated knowledge of former lapses and
19
         psychiatric treatment under
20
21
         refused to discuss the case with the Abbot."
22
             I will need to go back to that issue.
             "I suggested consulting the St. John of God
23
         Brothers."
24
25
             Then the memo indicates, because it is dated 20th
```

- 1 April, so it's eight days later, that the abbot did do
- that. They had apparently suggested a rest period with
- 3 the Paraclete Fathers in Stroud. We looked at that
- 4 yesterday. Smyth then is sent off to Stroud at the end
- of 1975, but they don't have any treatment for him and
- 6 he spends the period there of a month as a retreat.
- 7 Then it says:
- 8 "I have withdrawn his faculties to hear
- 9 confessions."
- 10 So that's very specific from the memo that it was
- about confessions whereas if we scroll up to the letter
- that was dated two days beforehand written to Kevin
- 13 Smyth, the Abbot:
- "I hereby withdraw the faculties of the diocese from
- Brendan Smyth, a priest in your community, for the
- reasons which I explained to you in the course of my
- visit on Saturday, 12th April."
- 18 So it seems the bishop has gone to see Abbot Kevin
- 19 Smith.
- "He is therefore no longer approved to hear
- 21 confessions. I ask you formally to communicate my
- decision to him."
- If I can ask you to hold in your minds, Members of
- the Panel, there is potential confusion as to what this
- 25 means between the faculties of the diocese, which are

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

a broader concept, encompassing everything, in fact,

Page 55

that a priest could do in terms of public ministry, as compared to faculties to hear confession, which is more specific to that particular subject, but what I'd ask you to reflect on is you may consider that this memo reveals that Bishop MacKiernan now knew that the two boys interviewed by the then Father Brady -- even if he hadn't picked up that there was, in fact, three boys in total who were being described as having been abused, at its minimum he knew that two boys interviewed by the then Father Brady were not the first victims of Smyth. FBS 49 dates are correct, then he Ιf knows about a more serious event already said to have happened. Whether that event was right or not, that's what he was told of it in 1973, but he certainly knows from this point from his discussion that's recorded in the memo that the two boys who were interviewed by his priest were not the first children to be abused.

The memo also reveals that Abbot Kevin Smith now knew there were two further cases of abuse that he hadn't known about before.

If we just scroll down a little, please, you may also consider it reveals that neither man knew whether the treatment Smyth had already received was of any consequence or not.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 56

There is nothing recorded in the memo in relation to any consideration of reporting the criminality to the civil authorities. There is nothing recorded in relation to informing the parents of the children that were identified through the investigation. I think the number between the two interviews is six. There is nothing recorded in relation to the steps to be taken to ensure the welfare of the children known to have been abused or identified in connection with those known to have been abused. There is nothing in the memo that records any consideration of telling any other bishops about the fact that there was a priest in Kilmore who had and was known to have abused at least three children, taking it at its very minimum. nothing in the memo that records any consideration of how Smyth would be dealt with in order to ensure that he couldn't interfere with any more children. By that I mean in terms of the restriction of his movements, because it is clear from the memo that Bishop MacKiernan was making the suggestion to Abbot Kevin Smith about some further individuals who might be able to direct him in terms of the provision of further treatment than that which was already taking place.

Now in 1994 -- we looked at the memo earlier of the meeting that took place with Bishop MacKiernan. If we

look at 40626, please, 40626, paragraph 2, Bishop

2 MacKiernan was asked what he would do if the same thing

3 happened:

"I asked Bishop MacKiernan if he would now take further steps in a situation such as this. His immediate response was that he would now inform the Gardai if youngsters made complaints of this kind."

You will note that in the -- it is a 1994 memo. If we look at the last paragraph, the then bishop addressed the question. You will see that:

"By letter of 20th August Brendan Smyth wrote seeking a return of diocesan faculties."

We will come back to that. If we just scroll up a little bit, please. Yes. Sorry. It is the passage above. Just scroll down a little bit:

"I asked Bishop MacKiernan whether he had any jurisdiction over Father Brendan Smyth other than the power to grant or remove faculties. He said that, as he understood it, his sole responsibility was granting him faculties to hear confession. He thought that there may be circumstances in which he could also withdraw faculties for the celebration of the Eucharist. Such did not arise here. He suggested again that we clarify the position with a canon lawyer."

So what that is suggesting is that as far as Bishop

- 1 MacKiernan was concerned his letter in 1975 was confined
- 2 to the withdrawal of confessions.
- When you look at Father Kilduff's statement, which
- I will come to shortly, we will see what he has to say.
- 5 CHAIRMAN: Just remind us. Who is the author of this
- 6 document?
- 7 MR AIKEN: It is not clear who it is. If we go back to the
- 8 first page, please --
- 9 CHAIRMAN: This is the memorandum?
- 10 MR AIKEN: It is the memorandum. It is somebody
- 11 representing the Norbertine Order. It may be a legal
- 12 representative. It may be some other personality. It
- is not clear from the document I don't think. If we
- just scroll down to the end of it so we can check
- whether there is ... No, there is nothing.
- 16 CHAIRMAN: We clearly on the screen don't have the full
- document, because it says "continued".
- 18 MR AIKEN: No.
- 19 CHAIRMAN: It is interesting that in 1994 the bishop only
- thinks he might refer this to the Abbot General of the
- 21 Order.
- 22 MR AIKEN: That indeed is the next point I was going to draw
- 23 to your attention, because you can see that not only is
- 24 he saying he might not do it:
- 25 "He said in such circumstances he might refer the

Page 59 1 matter to the Abbot General. Such circumstances had not, however, come to his attention." 2 So the implication of that note, if it is accurate, 3 is that what he had found out wasn't sufficient to 4 justify communicating with the Abbot General. 5 Now the memo that we were looking at at 780, which 6 was Bishop MacKiernan's memo of 20th April, records him 7 suggesting a consultation with the St. John of God 8 9 Brothers and other religious order of Brothers engaged in healthcare. That appears to have happened. 10 their recommendation is the Paraclete Fathers in Stroud. 11 When we looked at the memo -- if we just look at it 12 13 again, please, at 780 just on this issue of what this sanction actually was, you can see -- just maximise that 14 15 for me, please: "He is therefore no longer approved to hear 16 17 confessions", 18 but it began with: "I hereby withdraw the faculties of the diocese." 19 Now Father Kilduff in paragraph 13 of his statement, 20 21 if we look, please, at 746, refers to the meeting and 22 then he refers to the minute: "'I have withdrawn his faculties to hear 23 24 confessions'. In a letter then of 18th it says, 'I 25 hereby withdraw the faculties of the diocese' and asked

Page 60 the abbot to communicate the decision to Brendan Smyth. 1 Bishop MacKiernan uses the phrases 'faculties to hear 2 confessions' and 'faculties of the diocese' 3 interchangeably. The faculties of the diocese would 4 include permission to celebrate public masses, preach 5 and administer other sacraments, as well as the faculty 6 to hear confessions. However, 'faculties to hear confessions' appears to have been understood in this 8 9 wider sense generally, but strictly speaking it would apply only to the sacrament of penance (confessions)." 10 Now, as we have seen, Father Kilduff is not correct 11 about that, because Bishop MacKiernan's -- the record of 12 13 Bishop MacKiernan's discussion in June 1994 was that he understood it as referring to the -- if we look at 14 15 40625, please, if we scroll down, please: "I asked Bishop MacKiernan about the meaning of the 16 17 term, 'withdraw his faculties to hear confessions'." The last paragraph: 18 "It was his understanding that the withdrawal of 19 faculties primarily related to the hearing of 20 21 confessions. He thought that it would be important to 22 clarify with a canon lawyer the precise meaning of the term." 23 You will recall yesterday when we were looking at 24

the counsel minutes of the Norbertines that they

25

2.

Page 61

interpreted it as being limited to just hearing confessions. You may consider that there should be any ambiguity over this is another issue of difficulty.

I will ask you to note at this point that we will in due course see that by 1976 -- so this is all taking place in 1975 -- by 1976 Brendan Smyth was saying mass in Whitehead in the Diocese of Down & Connor and abusing children there, which came to the attention of the diocesan priest, and in 1976 he's recorded conducting a week-long retreat and saying mass for the Sisters of Nazareth in a children's home in Belfast, also in the Diocese of Down & Connor, and by 1977 was visiting children whom he had befriended at Nazareth in the De La Salle Children's Home in Kircubbin and indeed the Good Shepherd in Middletown.

In that context it is unclear at this stage, although you may regard it as clear, but it is unclear whether Bishop MacKiernan told his other bishops in the Armagh Metropolitan, as it were, that he had withdrawn the faculties from Smyth, whatever that was meant to mean, in 1975, or why he had done that.

You may wish to consider -- and each of the dioceses can reflect on this when they give oral evidence -- you may wish to consider whether any lack of a system of communication between bishops about priests who a bishop

Page 62

had had to withdraw faculties from, whether that lack of a system, if there was such a lack, facilitated and failed to prevent abuse occurring.

You may consider it is also unclear what steps were taken, if any, by either Bishop MacKiernan or Abbot Kevin Smith to ensure that Brendan Smyth was, in fact, observing the ban. As I have hinted at already, it will become apparent that he was not observing the ban unless he had had faculties conferred to him by Down & Connor and there is nothing to suggest that he had. No documentation to suggest that Down & Connor had ever given faculties of the diocese to Brendan Smyth.

It would also appear that no steps were taken by the Bishop of Kilmore or the Abbot of Holy Trinity, Kevin Smyth, in respect of the welfare of any of the children.

Now having said that, I want to pause here to observe that the papers disclosed by the Diocese of Kilmore do show a different approach from the present Bishop of Kilmore, Bishop Leo O'Reilly. As it turns out, when you read closely the letter from FBS 44 that we were talking about this morning, who claimed to have told Bishop MacKiernan in 1957, it turns out that FBS 44 and Mr O'Reilly were at school together at the time. There is an exchange that makes that clear in the correspondence.

Page 63

I want to show you a letter that Bishop Leo O'Reilly wrote on 29th March 2010. That's at 803. He is writing here you can see to Bishop Noel Treanor, the Bishop of Down & Connor, in March 2010:

"The files relating to the two investigations conducted by Father Sean Brady, as he then was, on behalf of my predecessor into allegations by two boys that they were abused by Brendan Smyth are in the archives here. It was only when this matter became the subject of controversy that it even occurred to me that I should report the names in the files to the civil authorities. I am not sure if this had ever been done before. The fact that Brendan Smyth has been dead since before I became bishop made me think that his was one file I didn't need to worry about.

However, having taken advice, I have now reported the names of the two boys to the Gardai and the Health Service Executive. I have also given them the names of other boys and girls mentioned by them as having been abused by Smyth. Two of these have Belfast addresses and it was suggested to me that I should pass their names on to you. The main reason for giving them is that if you have an outreach programme for survivors of abuse, it might still be possible to offer them support."

Page 64

Then he gives the names of the children. So the very things that I was raising with you a short time ago are the steps that were taken by the Bishop of Kilmore in 2010, which was to let the authorities know and then to arrange communication with the bishop of where the children resided in order that they get some pastoral support.

Unfortunately, as we will see and as you are probably aware already, during the rest of this opening it will become apparent that Smyth continued his sexual abuse of children unabated, despite the withdrawal of faculties, whatever that meant, by Kilmore in 1975.

Now then what I want to draw your attention to is the Diocese of Kilmore has also disclosed correspondence beginning with a letter from Brendan Smyth to Bishop MacKiernan of 20th August 1984. If we can look, please, at 781, you will see that he writes at the apparent instigation of Abbot Kevin Smith for the reinstatement of diocesan faculties. Now this -- 1984 he has come back from Fargo, North Dakota, where he was between 1979 and 1983, and he is writing seeking the return of the faculties.

From the annotation -- if we scroll down a little so the Panel can see the annotation of 23rd August 1984 -- Bishop MacKiernan did reinstate the diocesan faculties

2.

Page 65

to Smyth for a six-month period. It is unclear from the documentation what, if any, steps were taken by Bishop MacKiernan prior to reinstating faculties to Smyth.

However, in paragraph 17 of the statement from Father Kilduff, if we look, please, at 747, it is not clear where this comes from, but you can see:

"Bishop MacKiernan later confirmed that he had consulted with the abbot and he was satisfied that there didn't appear to have been any further occurrences similar to those previously complained of, and in the circumstances Bishop MacKiernan restored his faculties for a period of six months."

It may be that that's coming from the memo. So what he is saying is, "I got in touch with Abbot Smith to satisfy myself there was not any more incidents and then restored the faculties".

You will see in paragraph 18 Father Kilduff says:

"When we consider the steps taken in 1975 against the knowledge that we now have, it is clear that necessary and appropriate steps were not taken ..."

What he is saying about the faculties, if you look just the sentence above:

"The limited nature of the return of faculties suggests that Bishop MacKiernan wanted to monitor Brendan Smyth to ensure that he did not come up in any

Page 66

further complaints, but that he believed that the treatment discussed had taken place and that it had worked."

That is correct, because -- correct in the sense that thereafter there were a series of annual applications for renewal. If we just go to 782, please, you can see this is 1st February 1985, and he is given for another six months. If we scroll down on to the next page, please, similarly this is -- this time it is for -- the date is not there. This is renewed until September '86. So for a year I think this time. If we scroll down on to the next one, again this one is written in '87 and the faculties are extended for a year to August of '88.

Of course, during this period of time the children of the family in Belfast are being abused by Smyth, who ultimately go to see Abbot Kevin Smith in March of 1989. So in March of 1989, because we are on the right page now, we know that Abbot Kevin Smith has the meeting with the family, the husband and wife, the parents of the children, and yet Brendan Smyth is in a position to write a letter in August 1989, which is the one on the right-hand side of the page, asking for his faculties to be restored.

So it would appear that Abbot Kevin Smith didn't

tell Bishop MacKiernan once he received the complaint from the Belfast family in 1989.

You will recall that, in addition, Abbot Kevin Smith explained to Chris Moore in his rely of 26th

September 1994, and we have seen it from other documents, that the Norbertine Order had sent Smyth back for treatment this time to Dr Delmonte in 1989. So he's being treated again, and if we scroll down on to the next page, we will see that if that was communicated, and there is nothing to suggest that it was, then the faculties were simply renewed in any event, or you may consider it more likely that, in fact, Bishop MacKiernan was not told by Abbot Kevin Smith that in addition to the information that was brought to him by the family of abuse, he had sent this man for treatment again. His faculties were being renewed.

The renewal continues, if we scroll down, through August 1990, September 1991. What you will recall, if we just pause -- just pause it, please. Just scroll up a little. Move up to the one before so we have the context. The one on the right-hand side, 16th September 1991, at this point in time on 8th March 1991 Smyth was charged after his police interview.

Now it is not possible to say what Abbot Kevin Smith knew, although, as the Panel is aware, the Abbot -- then

Page 68

Abbot is alive, and the Inquiry did invite him in addition to what has been said on behalf of the Order whether he wanted to add anything further. At this point he said he didn't wish to do that.

But this renewal was taking place despite Brendan Smyth now being charged in Northern Ireland with a series of sexual offences.

In addition, and this takes us back to the point

I was making about the systems issue about communication
between the bishops, because in February 1991, as we saw
when we looked at Cardinal Daly's, as he then was, memo
as Bishop Daly of Down & Connor between August '82 and
November 1990, he had written to Abbot Kevin Smith,
having been contacted by the family. Just to be clear,
it is the [name redacted] family, who in March 1990 -having seen Abbot Kevin Smith in 1989, they see Bishop
Daly in February '90.

The letter that was sent to Abbot Kevin Smith, if we look, please, at 1218 -- so you can see that the renewals are taking place in '91, '92. This is a letter written by now Cardinal Daly. We saw this letter yesterday, but in this context it is written on 11th February 1991. This is shortly before Smyth is charged, which is a month later, but you can see this time it is saying:

- 1 "I am afraid it looks as though he is using the
- 2 excuse of his visits to Belfast for therapy to continue
- 3 the practice about which we spoke some years ago."
- 4 As you know, the Abbot Kevin Smith replied saying,
- 5 "Well, I have spoken to him. He says he hasn't done
- that for a couple of years". Here you have now the
- 7 Archbishop of Armagh writing about this priest and at
- 8 the same time the Bishop of Kilmore is renewing his
- 9 faculties. He continues renewing them in September '91
- and then again September '92.
- 11 CHAIRMAN: Well, the archbishop writes in February 1991. We
- have been told technically he no longer had any
- jurisdiction over Down & Connor.
- 14 MR AIKEN: Yes.
- 15 CHAIRMAN: So it is not clear from that letter whether it
- was he personally receiving the complaints in his new
- capacity, but whatever happens, may we take it Down &
- 18 Connor don't pass any information at that point?
- 19 MR AIKEN: No, and if we go back --
- 20 CHAIRMAN: Within a few weeks he is being charged in
- 21 Northern Ireland.
- 22 MR AIKEN: Yes.
- 23 CHAIRMAN: So neither -- either the Archbishop of Armagh or
- the Bishop of Down & Connor, nor the Abbot, informed
- 25 Bishop MacKiernan of what the courts would describe as a

- 1 material change of circumstances. The bishop appears to
- go on licensing this man to perform his priestly
- 3 functions.
- 4 MR AIKEN: Yes.
- 5 CHAIRMAN: He doesn't appear to have realised from
- 6 newspapers what was going on.
- 7 MR AIKEN: Yes. In fact, you can take it a step further
- 8 back, because --
- 9 CHAIRMAN: It seems rather surprising the Bishop of Kilmore
- does not somehow discover that a priest who has been
- giving him a lot of trouble is now up in front of the
- 12 courts in Belfast. One would assume that it was
- reported in the newspapers.
- 14 MR AIKEN: We will probably be able to vouch that.
- 15 CHAIRMAN: But in any event the Abbot doesn't appear to have
- 16 told him as far as we know.
- 17 MR AIKEN: Yes.
- 18 CHAIRMAN: The Abbot surely must have known, because they
- were presumably required to provide an address for him
- 20 to reside at or some contact with the police.
- 21 MR AIKEN: What the Abbot knew about the initial charging
- isn't clear from the material as yet, but --
- 23 CHAIRMAN: One might have thought they would either read the
- 24 newspapers or listen to the radio or watch the
- 25 television.

- 1 MR AIKEN: Yes. What we saw yesterday, because we can take
- it a year further back, the first meeting between Abbot
- 3 Kevin Smith and the then Bishop Cathal Daly, who was
- 4 Bishop of Down & Connor, was in March 1990. You will
- 5 recall that there was reference in his letter to three
- 6 priests bringing him information and the social worker,
- 7 and that information from March 1990 does not make its
- 8 way to the Bishop of Kilmore it appears, because if it
- 9 did, one would wonder at the fact that would be renewed.
- 10 CHAIRMAN: I think one has to be careful here in
- 11 distinguishing between charging by the police in the
- sense of an arrest and bringing him before a court.
- 13 MR AIKEN: Yes.
- 14 CHAIRMAN: Was he brought before the court in 1991 or merely
- 15 arrested or interviewed under caution?
- 16 MR AIKEN: He was arrested, interviewed under caution and
- 17 charged on 8th March 1991 and he was to appear in court
- on a date in early April.
- 19 CHAIRMAN: Yes.
- 20 MR AIKEN: Confusion took place over the date. He was
- 21 marked as not appearing and that then sparked the three
- years before he would be back before the court.
- What this renewing demonstrates is that the issue of
- 24 what communication was taking place or what system of
- communication there was between bishops so that they

Page 72

would each know about a problem that was occurring,
because this was a man who was being licensed by Kilmore
but who was causing a problem it was being said in Down
& Connor.

Of course, perhaps -- I was going to say worst of all, but we now know that, contrary to the agreement with Dr Delmonte, between 1991 and 1993, when he was still being licensed, he commits -- or being granted the faculties of the Diocese of Kilmore, he commits further offences then in the Republic of Ireland.

It comes to an end with the application that was made in November 1993. So at 787, 787, this is the application from November 1993 explaining some of the work that he has been doing. Then if we scroll on to the next page, we can see the reply where the Abbot Kevin Smith is informed by letter of 18th December:

"I have been officially informed by the Bishop of Down & Connor that the Director of Public" -- by that -- by this stage it is Bishop Walsh -- "that the Director of Public Prosecutions in Northern Ireland is bringing a criminal prosecution against Father Brendan Smyth, which may be heard about mid-January. In view of the seriousness of the allegation, I am withdrawing the faculties of the Diocese of Kilmore, which he enjoys at the moment. I am informing you as his major religious

Page 73 superior and ask you please to convey my decision to him 1 as contained in the enclosed letter." 2. Then if we scroll down, I think we will see the 3 letter that was written of the same date. 4 So to try and bring all that complicated picture 5 together, we will see that the Diocese of Down & Connor 6 had been involved in the reporting to police of Smyth's 7 abuse of children in March 1990. Yet it appears, and it 8 9 is not yet clear why, it took until November 1993, some three and a half years later, for that information to 10 reach the Diocese of Kilmore. 11 12 Chairman, I am happy to continue on for a ... 13 CHAIRMAN: Well, I think it is probably as good a time as any to adjourn and sit again at 2 o'clock. 14 (12.55 pm)15 (Lunch break) 16 17 (2.00 pm)MR AIKEN: Chairman, Members of the Panel, before lunch we 18 finished looking at the Diocese of Kilmore. I'm going 19 to move on now to the Diocese of Down & Connor, but 20 21 I want to say that I have a considerable amount of 22 material to still move through. I am going to do that at considerable pace -- obviously the Panel has access 23

-- because I want to complete this task today.

24

25

to the material and has considered some of it in advance

Page 74

In respect of the Diocese of Down & Connor we will come to see later that when we take a closer look at the pattern of abuse, Brendan Smyth abused children in Whitehead in County Antrim. That's where his brother

lived. According to the then local curate,

FBS 51 , Smyth had offered to assist him when he was down visiting his brother. The reference for that is at 32150. He would have been called on to say mass on occasions by FBS 51 and cover for him when he was off.

In June 1976 the brother of one of Smyth's victims

-- and I am going to use the names because this part

gets quite confusing, but the names shouldn't be used

outside the chamber -- June 1976 the brother of one of

Smyth's victims, a FBS40, had moved with his family to

and her statement to police of 12th December '95 can be found at 30580 through to 30583 -- she had disclosed being sexually abused by Smyth. At the request of his mother FBS40, when back in Northern Ireland, called to see their local parish priest in Whitehead, FBS 51

FBS 51. FBS40 explains in his police statement of 12th December 1995, which runs from 32147 to 32149 -- and I am just going to look, please -- can we bring up 32147, where he sets out what he records and recalls

1 happening? If we scroll down, please, he said:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"I was going to Ireland back to Whitehead to see a friend. My mother asked me to call and see FBS 51 FBS 51, who was the local priest at Whitehead. She asked me to tell him that" -- scroll down, please -- "Father Smyth had abused my sister FBS37. I also suspected that Father Smyth abused my brother [name redacted]. I went FBS 51 when I got to Whitehead. This was to see in 1976. I called at FBS 51 house. I was taken into a room on the left. I told FBS 51 that I suspected that Father Smyth had abused my sister and brother. FBS 51 told me that he couldn't speak to me now, because Father Smyth was upstairs at the time. I also told him that I believed he had also abused a friend of my sister's called FBS35."

We will see that is correct.

" FBS 51 suggested that we go down south of Ireland and speak to someone who would have been in charge of Father Smyth. The next day I went along with FBS 51 in his car to a location in the south of Ireland. I recall it was to a hotel on the far side of Dublin. I remember the hotel had a large stone circle which stood about 6 foot off the ground. There was a number of these stones all in a circle. I met a man who was dressed as a priest. He was of high rank than

Page 76 FBS 51 or Father Smyth. I was introduced to him 1 FBS 51 , but I cannot remember his name. 2 I spent about two and a half hours with him. I told him 3 that I suspected that Father Smyth had abused my sister 4 and brother and also FBS35. Although I spent two and 5 a half hours with him, we had a general conversation 6 with him. It was left that they would look into it and I was assured that if they found out that Father Smyth 8 9 had abused FBS37, [name redacted] or FBS35 or any other 10 child for that matter that it would be reported" -scroll down, please -- "to the police. I was then taken 11 back to Whitehead by FBS 51 12 13 He then talked about an exchange which takes place in the parish hall where FBS35's family are involved 14 15 with FBS 51 explaining from their perspective what their daughter was saying. 16 17 FBS 51 corroborated what FBS40 had to 18 say in his police statement of 8th January 1996. Can we look at that, please, at 32150? 19 20 You can see he explains that he is a priest 21 presently attached as a curate to In 22 the early '70s he was attached to , working in Whitehead. 23 "I got to know Brendan Smyth, who is the brother of 24 25 one of the parishioners. Although he was

2.

Page 77

from the Norbertine Order, he offered to help me in the parish when he was visiting his brother. I appreciated this offer and did call upon him to say mass occasionally or to stand in when I was off.

In '76 I remember being visited by FBS40, who made certain allegations of misbehaviour by Brendan Smyth against his sister, FBS37. He was very annoyed and angry at the Catholic Church in general and said that Father Smyth had sexually abused his sister. I was quite embarrassed about the situation really for his sake rather than my own.

I contacted Abbot Smith at Kilnacrott Abbey,
Ballyjamesduff and told him briefly the allegations and
arranged a meeting with him and FBS40. Within a few
days I took FBS40 to meet Abbot Smith at the

near Dundalk. We had our dinner together and then I left Abbot Smith and FBS40 together saying, 'You've business to discuss'. I don't remember talking about the matter on the way home, but I remember feeling that FBS40 was happy at what Abbot Smith assured him. I felt at that time I had done my job at this stage."

Then he talks about being aware of the second incident. He confirms in the next passage that:

"Another family, friendly with the [name redacted],

2.

Page 78

told him about Smyth and their daughter, FBS35, a close friend of FBS37, and explained how she was encouraged by FBS40 to disclose to FBS51 what happened."

Her police statement, which is of 26th October 1995, can be found at 30584 through to 30586.

FBS 51 explains in the statement that's on the screen that he had a vague recollection of speaking to police in 1996 about Mrs [name redacted] talking about her daughter being abused.

FBS40 recollects the matter in his statement, which is at the bottom of 32148. The impression from his statement is that FBS35 was not at that point disclosing abuse.

Whatever the way of it, by 1976 a priest in Down & Connor was aware that Father Brendan Smyth was said to have abused a child or children and had arranged for Smyth's superior in his Norbertine Abbey to be informed.

There the issue did not rest, though, because Father FBS 51 goes on to explain in his police statement of 8th January 1996 at 32145 that some years later he came to hear that Father Brendan Smyth was trying to get work in the Diocese of Down & Connor. You can see that:

"Some years later I heard that Father Smyth was trying to get work within the Diocese of Down & Connor. From my knowledge of him in Whitehead I felt it my duty

2.

Page 79

to inform the bishop that he was not a suitable candidate for a position here. I wrote a letter to Bishop Philbin, who acknowledged it and thanked me for drawing his attention to this. He said he had also heard rumours and Father Smyth was not appointed."

He explains that he wrote the letter to Bishop

Philbin. Bishop William Philbin was the Bishop of Down

& Connor from June 1962 until August 1982. Therefore,

if FBS 51 recollection in 1996 is correct, the

letter pre-dated August 1982. According, as you see, to

FBS 51 , Bishop Philbin replied, thanked him for drawing the issue to his attention and indicated he had also heard rumours about Smyth, and he was then not appointed.

Father Tim Bartlett on behalf of the Diocese of Down & Connor speaks about this issue in paragraphs 20 and 21 of his statement on behalf of the diocese. If we look, please, at 717, paragraph 20, if we scroll down, please, where he talks about being made aware. The Inquiry brought these statements to the attention of the diocese and Father Tim Bartlett made a point of seeking out

FBS 51 , who is still alive, although now 83 years of age, and spoke to him about what the statement suggested.

If we scroll down, please, he recounts much of what

Page 80

I have just drawn your attention to. Then you can see about halfway down the paragraph:

"When I explained that the diocese had checked the archives of every bishop of the diocese during Brendan Smyth's tenure as a priest and that no record of such a letter had been found, he remained quite adamant that he had written such a letter to one of the bishops. He informed me that in the early '90s -- he was not able to be more specific -- two police officers had come to his door."

That's likely to have been a recollection that resulted in the 1996 statement that we saw:

"I have advised FBS 51 that this is new information to me and to the present administration of the diocese and that he may be asked to provide a formal statement. He indicated his willingness to assist."

He had also spoken to retired Bishop Patrick Walsh and Bishop Anthony Farquhar:

"... and both have separately confirmed they have no knowledge of the letter sent to a former bishop of the diocese by FBS 51 or of his having reported any allegations against Brendan Smyth to the diocese."

FBS 51 sent or the letter that Bishop Philbin sent back, neither of those documents are available to the

1 Inquiry.

In light of this position, as this story unfolded,
the Inquiry sought and received a witness statement from

FBS 51 , who, as I said, is now 83. That can be found at pages 814 to 816 in the bundle. He says in paragraph 3 at 814 -- he admits he can't recall now making the police statement in 1996. If we go, please, to 814, in paragraph 5 he explains why he did not report it to anyone. He says:

"My recollection is that it was both parents who came to see me. My memory is not clear about that."

In fact, it seems to have been FBS40, the brother, came first.

"I was appalled at what I was told. I cannot remember if they gave me details of the allegations or a summary. I was aware of the very confidential and personal nature of the information they were telling me and felt it was of a highly confidential nature.

Because of that, I did not report it to anyone else."

Then if we move through to paragraph 6, please, he says:

"I had not received any training or guidance in my training or after I was ordained and had no basis to work on. I had never heard of this type of thing before.

2.

Page 82

I did know Brendan Smyth. His brother and sister-in-law lived in the parish, and when he came to visit, he would ask my permission to say a mass. This was usually midweek and would have been a private mass and not one of the usual masses I would perform for the parish. He would often call after mass to have a cup of tea with me."

He then refers to the statement of FBS40 about the meeting that he arranged.

"I don't recall speaking with FBS40 at all. I moved parish shortly afterwards in 1977. I had no contact with Brendan Smyth after that. I also note that FBS40 says in his statement that I brought him to meet the superior of Brendan Smyth's religious order.

I have read a statement which appears to have been made by me. I do recall meeting two police officers who called at my house. I don't recall them writing out a statement, nor do I recall giving a statement.

I note the statement agrees with FBS40 in that I~appear to have contacted the superior of Brendan Smyth's Order and arranged for FBS40 to meet with him to report his allegations. I would have understood that Abbot Smith, the superior of the Order, was the person with the authority to deal with the allegations.

Later I recall hearing some rumour that Smyth was

- looking for a role in the diocese. I was unhappy about
- this and I wrote to Bishop Philbin to express my
- 3 reservations about Smyth having any role in the diocese.
- I don't believe I gave him details of what I had been
- 5 told. Again I felt it was highly personal and
- 6 confidential. This must have been shortly after the
- 7 original complaints were passed to me, as Bishop Philbin
- 8 retired in 1981."
- 9 I think it was 1982.
- "Bishop Philbin confirmed he noted my concerns and
- said he would not allow Brendan Smyth any role in the
- 12 diocese."
- Then if we move through, please, to the next page,
- 14 he says, does FBS 51 :
- 15 "Even reading these statements, which have helped my
- memory a little, I have difficulty recalling the details
- of the whole thing. I do not remember meeting FBS40 as
- 18 he describes. I do not recall contacting or travelling
- 19 to meet Abbot Smith with FBS40 and I don't recall the
- scene described by FBS40 where the girls were speaking
- 21 directly to me. I do not wish to deny that these events
- happened and the description of reporting the matter to
- the superior of Brendan Smyth's Order would be
- 24 a reasonable step for me to have taken. I knew Brendan
- was a Norbertine, having met with him many times, and

1 would have known how to contact his superiors."

He says this then at paragraph 13:

"Looking back, I regret not reporting to the police, but if the statements are correct, I believe I would have reported the matter to Brendan Smyth's superior in the Order, as he was in a position to deal with him."

So, Members of the Panel, on FBS 51 own admission he didn't report the matter to anyone, save making his bishop aware at a subsequent stage whenever there was a possibility of Smyth working in the diocese to which he belonged.

Without being unfair to FBS 51 , you may consider that the modern mindset of church child protection, of which you have heard much in the statements that I opened yesterday, that of one church, though it must be emphasised that that concept has its origin obviously in something very far from modern, it wasn't part it seems of FBS 51 thinking at the time, because the concentration was on him not working in Down & Connor.

It also appears that the Diocese of Down & Connor does not have any records of Smyth seeking an appointment in the diocese or how that was dealt with.

I am afraid we are not in a position then to take

Page 85

that matter any further forward except to add it, as

I did try to yesterday, to the chronology of what the

Norbertine Order would have been aware of in terms of

this was a matter coming to the attention of Abbot Kevin

Smith after the faculties in whatever form had been

removed in the Diocese of Kilmore as a result of Bishop

MacKiernan's intervention.

What I want to do then, I want to leave the diocese at this point, and hopefully I have brought together the strands of information that's available to the Inquiry as to what each of the dioceses knew when as well as looking at what the Norbertine Order knew when.

I am going to say just a very little bit about the Nazareth homes. I am going to do that in a very limited way now, because we have looked at that material to a degree during Module 3. I am just going to draw out some matters that have come to our attention as we have worked on this module.

Smyth explained during his police interview of 24th February 1995 how he got access to Nazareth. If we just look at that briefly, please, at 30273.

Miss Dougan rightly points out to me I said we looked at this during Module 3. It was, in fact, Module 4. Both of them seem a very long time ago now.

What he is being asked here, he is asked about some

- children and then he is asked the question:
- 2 "Q. How would you have got access to Nazareth
- 3 House?

15

4 A. First of all" -- he says this -- "it was a heck 5 of a long time, but still I'd better stick to the time when I was a priest and became a member. Why did I go 6 there first? I think it was there was a girl who at 8 that" -- scroll down, please -- "she's never known any 9 more by the way, but a girl I knew from Belfast, whose 10 brother I knew. They were a brother and a sister and 11 I'd known them quite well, knew their family. She was a nun and I -- I got friendly -- it was a family I was 12 13 friendly with when I was young, and she became a Nazareth -- she was a civil servant first and then she 14

left the civil service and became a Nazareth nun.

- 16 O. What was her name?
- 17 A. FBS 53
- 18 Q. FBS 53 . Where was she originally from?
- 19 A. ."
- I ask you to note that date -- that address:
- or something like that. Oh,
- she's gone I think now, but I know -- I knew her when
- she was a child. I knew the family when she was young.
- The reason I knew her was through her brother. Her
- 25 brother belonged -- I was a prefect of the boys'

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 87

confraternity in Clonard at the time and he was in the -- what do you call it -- in the section, but that's all I knew him. He happened to be an altar boy in Clonard afterwards. They were people I know and it's just by coincidence her father's brother was a neighbour of mine where I lived growing up in Nansen Street, you know. anyway she was in the Civil Service. Didn't see her then. Didn't see her before she went away to be a nun either, you know. I was completely out of touch with them during those years, but she became a nun, but I always sent a Christmas card or anything to the family, and I discovered that she was becoming -- she was going to be received or make profession or something in Hammersmith in London in the convent there, and I was still working in North Wales at the time" -- so that's '59 to '63 -- "or -- yes. So I took a short holiday --I can't remember whether it was a week or only a long weekend -- to go and be present at it, you know. I knew her at Nazareth all right. So I kept in touch with her, and she was stationed about in Birmingham, and stationed in other places, Reading and all that, but eventually she was in Belfast, and I think it was because she was in Belfast at that time that I called at Nazareth House just to make her acquaintance -- to renew her acquaintance with her, and I'd call on and off to see

- her now. She wasn't in charge of any of these at all"
- 2 -- as in the children; she wasn't in charge of the
- 3 children -- "but then when I had been calling at
- 4 Nazareth House or went up a few times -- it's Nazareth
- 5 Lodge by the way, not Nazareth House.
- 6 Q. Okay.
- 7 A. The [name redacted] were Nazareth House, but all 8 these others were Nazareth Lodge."
- 9 Then he says:

"But I was invited to give a retreat to the nuns,

not to the children or anything like that, and it was

while I was giving the retreat -- it was a full week's

retreat, seven days or something like that, you know.

We used to have mass and all the rest of it, and they

had their own altar boys there from among the boys, and

that actually was where I first met [name redacted]."

This is an individual who never complained to the police but who Smyth confessed himself to abuse.

19 Then he is asked:

17

18

- 20 "Q. Did this girl FBS 53 then give you access to it?
- 21 A. Well, the point of calling --
- Q. Giving you the introduction.
- A. Was the introduction. That caused me to meet

 her, and I didn't meet the children normally up to that

 point, you know.

- 1 Q. But after that, after that when --
- A. I think she was gone by then from there by the time after I'd given the retreat. I don't think she was even on that retreat, you know.
- Q. But after that did you just go along and speak to whoever was in charge?
- A. Yes, that's what I would do. I would go along."

 And then said:
- 9 Q. Did you know the people in charge over the 10 years?
- 11 A. Well, probably. Names, no, but I knew there
 12 was, you know, a lady who was on the door all the time.
 13 She was not a nun, by the way, the lady who was on the
 14 door all the time. She has left since. She has retired
 15 since.
- 16 O. What was her name?
- 17 A. She was [name redacted] something."
- 18 That's NL5.
- "I even have her address, but I can't think of her surname. She lives down off now."
- You recall NL5 gave evidence to you that she wanted to know, "Why do you keep coming to Belfast?" and he would have told her about his appointments.
- 24 "She lives down off now, lives in 25 apartments there. Never been to the house, but that's

- 1 the address I have for her.
- Q. Did you know the nun in charge then?
- A. Yeah. You see, when I was giving the retreat,

 I actually lived in the place for that week.
- 5 Q. In the Lodge?
- 6 In the Lodge, 'cos they had an apartment there 7 for any visiting priest, but that's the only time I ever lived in it, by the way, for that week, and, of course, 8 9 when I wouldn't be doing things then, I wandered round and visited the place and I got -- that's how I really 10 11 got to know the ones. It was during that week of the retreat. It was not before that. Before that I would 12 13 only be visiting, call on the nun and chat. I might see 14 one or two kids around the place, but I wouldn't know 15 any of them, you know, and by the way it was only after 16 when they invited me. I don't know how they came to 17 invite me. Possibly they heard I was visiting her", as FBS 53 , "and they were wanting somebody and she 18 in maybe suggested. I don't know whether she did or not. 19 20 I never asked her by name.
 - Q. But did all the staff over the years that you were visiting both Nazareth House and Nazareth Lodge know you?
- A. Yes, but Nazareth Lodge was the main one.
- Q. Yeah.

21

22

23

Page 91

- A. Nazareth House was only an occasional visit, because I was visiting old people there. All the staff in -- the staff in the Lodge should have known me at the time.
- Q. Well, whenever you would have arrived at the door of the place."

7 Then it goes on about moving to how he got access to 8 De La Salle.

So you saw at the beginning of that extract from the interview he identified the acquaintance that he knew as his access at FBS 53 . The reference for that is at 30273. He identified her address to police.

As it turns out from some excellent detective work from Miss Dougan and Miss Kirkwood, that was actually FBS 53 that he was referring to.

If we can look at 10599 please, if we scroll down, this is a letter being written. So it is being written by FBS 53. She was in the Nazareth Lodge -- she was in Nazareth Lodge between 9th October 1973 and 27th June 1974.

Now there is a suggestion in terms of Nazareth House that he perhaps was in Nazareth House before this in order to meet certainly the first of the [name redacted] children.

If we just scroll on down, please, so we can see --

Page 92 yes, so this is in the same -- you can see the address 1 of this letter is 2. That was the address of FBS 53 . If we scroll down, this is in 3 the same hand as the FBS 53 letter we have 4 just looked at. If we scroll down, please, and just 5 keep going. So we can see it is a letter from FBS 53 6 FBS 53. We are going to see the same thing on the next 7 FBS 53 writing. 8 page. Move on down, please. Again 9 Move on down again, please. Just stop there for a moment. So it's signed FBS 53 10 of the Congregation of the Sisters of Nazareth". 11 was having dispensation from her vows in 1975. 12 13 If we scroll down again, please. Just keep going down 14 again. 15 So we are satisfied that this is the lady that BrendanSmyth is referring to as the person he returned 16 17 to make the acquaintance of in Nazareth Lodge, but it

may well be that he had already been visiting Nazareth House to some degree.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

It is clear and you saw in the interview that Smyth was saying he'd conducted a retreat in Nazareth Lodge. That, as it turns out, was in January 1976. If we can look, please, at 10612, 10612, the page before. Just magnify. No. 10612, just the next page down, please. Just magnify that for me, please. It is the very top

Page 93

left entry. The reference is to a retreat, 3rd to 10th January. You can see in the fourth line down it was conducted by "Reverend B. Smyth, Norbertine Father". The further one gets away from the screen the clearer the writing becomes bizarrely.

As Smyth revealed himself, he lived in the home for that week. When he was admitting to abusing DL41 -- and we saw his name at the end of the section we were looking at, someone who did not complain to the police -- during his interview on 7th December 1994 -- and I will just give you the reference, 30849 -- Smyth explained that he got to know him because he was an altar server during the retreat that he conducted. It appears that the four boys who ultimately were children he got in touch with and abused again in Rubane were all there at the same time in Nazareth Lodge and were aware that each other were seeing Smyth when he called to visit them in Rubane.

A retreat appears to have been conducted by the nuns annually. So there is nothing particularly unusual about that appearing in the Nazareth council books.

I will leave Mr Montague in his written submission to set out some other examples of that, which he has kindly already brought to my attention. This just happens to be a particular retreat that on this particular occasion

is being conducted by Brendan Smyth.

2.

As you saw in the interview section that we looked at, Smyth himself said he mostly visited the Lodge. What we can say, doing the best we can -- this is a complicated exercise to be undertaken in order to say this, but we are reasonably satisfied that we have got this as accurate as we can.

At the broad sweep across all of the material that we have, the stuff that was gathered in 1995, '96 and today post-2009 with the police and with the Inquiry, we can say that there appears to have been six children who alleged they were abused in Nazareth House by Smyth.

In respect of those six he faced four allegations at the time he was alive. Two of the allegations he accepted and was convicted in respect of. Sorry. I got that slightly wrong. Two of the allegations he accepted. He was convicted of one of them, because the second person that he accepted fondling and generally interfering with went on to allege in 1995 much more serious offences, and whenever that was examined, the police formed a view that those more serious allegations were not credible. So we will come to see then they did not proceed with the matter that he had already accepted.

So let me do that again clearer. Six children in

2.

Page 95

total in the House. Four he faced allegations of while he was alive. He was convicted of one of them. He partially accepted the other, though it was not proceeded with, and in respect of the other two during his lifetime they were not his normal modus operandi and he denied that he had anything to do with the children concerned. Then there are two individuals who have made claims post-2009 about their time in the House.

Given how complex that was for six, the Lodge is slightly more complicated than that. In total in respect of Nazareth Lodge there are 18 individuals who make allegations. Ten of the 18 made allegations in 1995 and 1996. Smyth was convicted of abusing five of those children. He denied four individuals' allegations for similar reasons about the modus operandi and saying he would not ever engage with a stranger and so on, those types of responses.

The tenth was a person who the police decided not to put to him, because what she was describing about sitting on his knee probably wouldn't have amounted to an indecent assault.

So that dealt with the ten of the 18 that were known to him and put to him and dealt with in the criminal process in 1995/'96.

That leaves eight further individuals making

Page 96

allegations that were made either to the police or the Inquiry post-2009. I will say a little bit more about those towards the end.

There is one additional category, if I can add it in. It is not a 19th person, but it's a person who was part of the original ten, was one of the original five of the ten that he was convicted of, but then post-2009 makes more serious allegations than he'd made in '95, which Smyth pleaded guilty to.

So when you put that all together, you have a total from the children's homes of 24 individuals in respect of the Nazareth homes. Of that 24, he was convicted of abusing seven children in total. I am not going to drill down into the figures more than that at this stage. It is complicated enough, you may think, but you will note that about ten individuals in total didn't make allegations before his death. I think that's right. Ten individuals didn't make allegations before his death.

There are, as you saw during Module 4, a number of instances where children said they complained in some way to nuns about Brendan Smyth and those were looked at to some degree during Module 4 and no doubt Mr Montague will address those particular examples in his written submission. I am not going to say anything more about

them at this stage.

2.

The position of the Sisters of Nazareth I read out yesterday is that they didn't have sufficient knowledge at the time this man was visiting their homes to be aware of what he was doing to the children. You did see in the police interview one of the nuns describing herself as having been naive and feeling that he did give her the creeps, but she didn't see the matter any more seriously than that. We will bring that material together in Mr Montague's written submission.

What I want to do now, if I may, Members of the Panel, is the last section of what I am going to say is called "the beginning of the end". The events that spell the beginning of the end of Smyth's criminality began in March 1989. I am going to use the names at this stage, because to do other is very complicated, but the names should not be used beyond the chamber.

In March 1989 FBS9 spoke to his uncle and aunt, FBS12 and FBS13, about the abuse that he'd suffered. By that stage FBS9 was 33 years of age. He asked about whether the children of the [name redacted], who were younger, had been abused. The three older children of the [name redacted] family slowly and reluctantly disclosed abuse to their parents.

FBS13 sets that out in her statement to police of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 98

5th April 1990 at 31480. She explains that as that disclosure process began to them in around April 1989, they'd a meeting with Abbot Kevin Smith in the Armagh hotel, which we have touched on. She explained in her police statement that the abbot did not seem surprised and revealed a previous complaint in early 1970/'71. Was sent for treatment. Thought he was cured. Reference to being in a hospital in Dublin. The abbot was to get back in touch with them once they had been investigated. Then she explained that did not happen. Her husband gives a similar account. As we looked at earlier for a different reason, Abbot Kevin Smith acknowledged in his 1989 meeting -- acknowledged that meeting with the [name redacted] in his letter to Chris Moore of 26th September 1994. That reference can be found at 32218. He explained what he did thereafter, which was further treatment for Smyth with Dr Delmonte in Dublin. However, the following year on 23rd February 1990 FBS14, then 17, so a daughter of FBS13 and FBS12, FBS 47 , a social worker within the disclosed to Catholic Family Welfare Society in Belfast, that she had been sexually abused by Brendan Smyth. A week later on 1st March FBS 47 reported FBS14's allegations to the RUC.

Page 99

There is just a handwritten record I want to show you. It is at 32509. This appears to be the report. You can see on the left the date and time being recorded, the reference to indecent assault. Then recounting the history of what had been told to FBS 47

FBS 47. She explained -- FBS 47 that is -- explained the circumstances in her police statement of 9th April 1990. That's at 31479.

Then over time FBS14, her younger sister FBS15, younger brother FBS16 and her cousin FBS9, who began the discussion with the [name redacted] parents, made allegations against Brendan Smyth.

In March 1990 the RUC began their investigation. A we saw, at the same time as the police were doing that the then Bishop of Down & Connor, Cardinal Cathal Daly, was getting in touch with Abbot Kevin Smith, sought a meeting with him and explained about what three priests and a social worker had told him. We saw that yesterday in documents that we looked at. We saw that Cardinal Daly was pointing out that Abbot Smith had accepted full responsibility for Smyth.

Now in March 1990 -- and I am going to cover this ground very quickly, but the material is in the bundle -- but in March 1990 FBS14, FBS15, FBS16 and FBS9 all made statements to the police, and they describe the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 100

form and nature of the abuse in keeping with the type of modus operandi that I was articulating to you yesterday.

In FBS9's case he described how he confronted Smyth in his aunt's house in and around February 1989. The reply from Smyth was, "I thought you would have forgotten about that". FBS9 explained to the police that Smyth admitted what he had done to FBS9 as a child and FBS9 described him to the police as -- and I will just show you this at 31491, please:

"I asked him to cast his mind back 20 something years to what he did to me as a child. He said something like, 'I thought you would have forgotten about that by now'. He implied that it was water under the bridge and that I should have forgotten about it now as he felt it wasn't of any significance. He asked me if I had affected my marriage sexually and I said that it was none of his business, that it wasn't relevant in this situation. I just wanted him to realise that he had played a role in my marriage break-up. I asked him did he admit to what happened to me as a child. He said 'Yes'. He was really rather pathetic. I told him that I'd already been in touch with his superior about this and he assured me that he would arrange treatment for Smyth told me he had been in treatment before, him. though it wasn't in Northern Ireland. I told him that

Page 101

as long as he received appropriate treatment I wouldn't report it to the appropriate authorities. Then last month the [name redacted] told me that they had decided to report the abuse. So I decided that this was the appropriate time for me to come forward."

When Smyth was interviewed about these various matters, he accepted but minimised his role to some extent with the suggestions of oral sex with one boy, but he described this incident of the confrontation where he said of the suggestion about counselling that he was glad of the spur to go for counselling and suggested that he could go to FBS9's counsellor. FBS9 explained to him that that wasn't appropriate.

Having been interviewed initially on 8th March 1991

-- and I gave you yesterday -- the interview runs from

31493 to 31503 -- the RUC then charged Smyth that same

day. We can see that at 31516, please. You see the

charge sheet. If we just scroll down, you can see there

were four charges that were put at that stage. That was

not ultimately how the matter panned out, but he appears

to have been released on police bail to appear at

Belfast Magistrates' Court on 5th April 1991. Due to

the misunderstanding according to the RUC documents at

that point through no fault of Smyth's the case was

marked as "no appearance" and there appears to have been

Page 102 a mix-up over the date. Then, as you know, it would be 1 a number of years and after the fall of the government 2 before Smyth would face a Northern Ireland court. 3 4 CHAIRMAN: Just remind me of the date he was meant to turn 5 up. 6 MR AIKEN: He was meant to turn up on 5th April 1991. can see, please, if we look at 31472, if we just scroll 7 down, please, we can see the bottom two paragraphs. 8 9 "He was charged, released and bailed to appear on 5th April. 10 Due to a misunderstanding and through no fault of 11 Smyth's the case was marked 'no appearance' on that 12 13 date." On 7th May then Detective Constable Marks provided 14 15 his report to the -- and this was on RUC file. Ultimately there were six police files and the first 16 17 police file , which dealt with -- I am going 18 to call it for ease the [names redacted] file. You can see he recommended, as per the initial charge sheet, 19 a charge of gross indecency in respect of FBS9 and 20 21 indecent assaults on the others. 22 On 20th May 1991 Detective Inspector Nairn in a hard-hitting report sets out the long-lasting effects 23 of Smyth's abuse on the [names redacted] families and 24

endorsed the approach of Detective Constable Marks.

25

Page 103

I~am just going to show you that, because the next document is of particular interest in the context of difficulty of prosecuting historical matters. If we look at 31475, please, so he sets out the facts of the four individuals and then talks about the interview. He refers to:

"... stating, 'seeking sexual gratification and curiosity to see how I'd feel'. A disgusting litany of offences committed by a man who wore the cloth, but, worse, it was a trusted family friend. From the statements of the children it is plain to see they were quite afraid of Smyth and when [name redacted] was recently questioned about the matter, he would not even speak of it.

The repercussions have been horrendous, particularly for FBS9. Marriage ... when one reads his statement, it is a tragic case and clearly indicates the effect of sexual abuse on children even in adult years.

Despite the time lapse between the offences, Smyth being interviewed by police, despite his age, 64 years, or position, I feel these are very serious offences or at least the surrounding circumstances are serious and I therefore strongly recommend prosecution as follows against Brendan Smyth."

He then endorses the same charges that were

1 envisaged by Detective Constable Marks.

2.

Now then the matter moves to Superintendent Timoney. If we move on to the next page, please, we will see he was the supervising officer. If we just scroll down to the bottom so we can ground this document, if we move on to the next page, please, and just down to the bottom, so you can see it's Superintendent Timoney on 23rd May 1991. If we go back up, please, to the top of the page, he says:

"There is no evidence in these papers to substantiate the charges of indecent assault on three of the individuals. The statements from these three persons may suggest that there may have been an indecent connotation to Smyth's contact with them over a period of time. This is denied by Smyth and there is no evidence to support the suggestion. I don't consider the charges in respect of these three persons are sustainable.

In regard to the outstanding and more serious charge of gross indecency towards FBS9, I'd make the following observations. The offences are now over 20 years old and admitted by Smyth. There is no doubt that they took place. However, these offences have come to police attention after what now appears to be unsubstantiated allegations by one during a counselling session which

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 105

was not in respect of any form of abuse but in connection with another matter. I do not know if there were any other reasons for the need for counselling, but Smyth's involvement with her does not appear on the face of it to have been a contributory factor to the need for counselling. In consideration of this then FBS9's complaint against Smyth at this late stage in support of other unsubstantiated allegations does smack of unfairness. The complaint of FBS9 was made more than two years after his personal confrontation with Smyth and after agreement between the parties concerned that if Smyth sought treatment, he would be satisfied and not report the matter. If FBS9 was satisfied for that period of over two years, then the circumstances suggest that other/maybe family reasons have prompted the present complaint. I do not wish to diminish in any way the offence or injury caused to FBS9 by the actions of Smyth, but practical common sense must indicate that there may be other reasons for reporting at this late stage.

It is not clear from these papers, but I understand that Smyth lives outside the jurisdiction and his presence at this station for interview was voluntary and by prior arrangement. What is clear is that Smyth has admitted the most serious offence, which can be

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 106

substantiated, and his interviews with the investigating officers appear frank and truthful. The circumstances surrounding this matter are not normal. The occupation of the offender, his age and the fact that he was involved in not just a confrontation with the injured party but also was willing to participate in joint counselling all culminate in making this an exceptional I am not convinced that proceedings are in the circumstances required. The offences against FBS9, the only sustainable offences, are not only stale, but because of their nature cannot be repeated. My own opinion in this matter is that I do not believe that there is anything to be gained by prosecution in this case. Had the circumstances of this case been brought to my attention at the time of investigation, I would have directed that Smyth be reported in the circumstances and not charged.

I forward these papers for direction."

The DPP are then sent the file. They do not agree and it is considered that Smyth should be prosecuted. On 25th July 1991 the DPP issue a direction on the file in respect of six counts of indecent assault against three individuals: FBS9, FBS14 and FBS12 (sic). They don't direct charges in FBS15's case. They also directed that FBS9's brother FBS10 be interviewed as

soon as possible.

From then steps are taken in 1991 to have Smyth returned. You can see that at one stage it appears the legal representative of Smyth asked the Bishop of Down & Connor, Patrick Walsh, to speak to the Abbot Kevin Smith, and Bishop Walsh gave a police statement on 29th May 1997 and he confirmed that on 3rd August 1991 he telephoned and got the Prior and on a later date when he spoke to the then Abbot.

Now from the timing you may consider it likely that the intervention of the Bishop of Down & Connor at the request of Smyth's legal representative may have been encourage -- may have been to encourage Smyth's return. If that's the case, you may consider it likely to call into question the Abbot's assertion to Chris Moore in his September '94 letter that he didn't know of any desire by police to interview or serve papers on Smyth.

On 6th December 1991 Detective Constable Marks spoke to Smyth himself by telephone at Kilnacrott. That's at 31317. Smyth said to him he would be travelling to Northern Ireland some time the following year. The officer formed the view that Smyth would not be making himself available for summons and PE papers to be served and sought further guidance about how to deal with the situation.

Page 108

In January 1992 then the process began of the matter being referred back to the DPP for consideration of extradition proceedings. The reference for that is at 31320.

There are further directions on the file to tidy some administrative matters, and then in January of 1993 FBS10, then 32, is interviewed. Smyth had already admitted abusing him during the interview of 8th March 1991.

Then on 15th February 1993 the DPP issued a further direction on the file that reframed the charges so that now there were charges against the two [name redacted] brothers and the two [name redacted] siblings with nine counts of indecent assault in all against those four individuals.

The preliminary inquiry eventually took place after all of the difficulties of seeing Smyth returned to the jurisdiction on 21st January 1994. He was returned for trial to Belfast Crown Court on nine charges in respect of the four individuals.

As a result of the media coverage of the preliminary inquiry in January 1994, five further women, now each in their 30s, came forward to the RUC to disclose their experiences at the hands of Smyth. It is recorded in the police file that they felt they had seen others,

that's the [name redacted] and [name redacted], had the courage and strength to come forward and it was their duty to do so as well. The reference for that can be

found at 31395.

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

One of these five women, and this was the first, was a former resident of Nazareth House, the first of the individuals who were abused by Smyth in the Nazareth homes to come forward. That was HIA195, who is an applicant to the Inquiry. She is "HIA195". She gave evidence on Day 101 on 11th March 2015. She was resident in Nazareth House between January '71 and May '77. She set out in her police statement of January 1994, which can be found at 31400 to 31403, what she said Smyth did to her in terms of touching and that was repeated to the Inquiry. She made the case, as I indicated previously, that she had told SR31 after the first time and that she was not believed and that she received a slap. That's at 31402. She then talks in a further police statement about him putting his finger in her back passage.

Smyth was interviewed about HIA195's allegations on 11th March '94. He accepted much of the allegations save for the last part.

In relation to the suggestion that HIA195 had told the nun, head nun at the time, SR31, she was interviewed

2.

Page 110

on 19th June 1996. The relevant part of her interview runs from 32407 to 32428. The allegation was put to her and she said that she didn't know Smyth and wasn't ever told about him abusing anyone and didn't hit HIA195.

That was the first individual of the five. There then are two sisters who lived near the [name redacted] in Belfast who came forward to explain Smyth abusing them while on a trip to .

The fourth individual was a girl who went to school in . She records in her police statement about Smyth visiting her in school and how on the last occasion she says in her police statement that she told FBS20.

Smyth was interviewed about that and he accepted fondling of her, but he -- it doesn't appear that FBS20 was interviewed. However, Father Timothy Bartlett on behalf of the Diocese of Down & Connor does deal with this matter, although at the time it was being dealt with it was taking the account of an otherwise anonymous individual in Chris Moore's book. So he picks that up and I am able to patch in we are talking about the same person.

If we look, please, at 716. So the suggestion the girl gave was that she told FBS20 and FBS20 intervened with Smyth and ensured that he couldn't abuse her

Page 111

further, but if we scroll down, please, what Father

Timothy Bartlett records, he refers to the extract from
the book, the reference to the pseudonym "Sarah" in -talking about abuse in a visiting room at school, and
the record about having complained to two nuns, FBS21
and FBS20, the principal:

"... who assured the parents of Sarah that Smyth would not be allowed back in the school and that the incident would be referred to a higher church authority."

Now if we scroll down, please:

"Given the possibility that any such report to a higher church authority might involve a report to someone in the diocese, I contacted the Sisters to clarify their understanding of this reported event. I have been advised and have independently confirmed that FBS20 has suffered from severe dementia for some time and is in full-time care in a nursing home in Dublin. FBS21, however, is still quite well and claims to recall this particular incident very clearly. In my conversation with her about the matter she confirmed that when Brendan Smyth arrived to the school that particular day and asked the school secretary to be allowed to see the girl called Sarah, because he was a friend of Sarah's father, it was FBS21 who conveyed

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 112

the request to the pupil referred to as Sarah, who was in class at the time. FBS21 was adamant to me that Sarah simply indicated that she did not like Father Smyth and didn't wish to see him, and this was sufficient for FBS21 to advise Sarah to go back to class while the secretary informed Father Smyth that Sarah was not available to meet him. FBS21 went on to say to me that she did inform the principal, FBS20, about the incident and FBS20 had indeed phoned Sarah's father that evening to express concern about a family friend visiting during school hours. FBS21 recollects that FBS20 told her that Sarah's father had been quite angry that Father Smyth had asked to see Sarah during school hours, and both had agreed that Father Smyth should not be allowed to visit Sarah in the school again. I asked FBS21 if FBS20 had made any report of the incident to anyone in the diocese, she was adamant that the matter had not gone any further, since there was no question in either of their minds at that time of abuse having taken place or being suspected, and the parents had agreed with the school that Brendan Smyth should not be allowed access to Sarah while she was in school." Father Bartlett explains he checked all of the

made to anyone in the diocese.

2.

So it is certainly the case that Brendan Smyth did abuse this girl in the school and that is explained by her and he accepts doing it, but what FBS21 is saying is that the recollection as to how that came to an end of Smyth seeing her is not the same as her recollection as to how it came to an end, and that it wasn't because of abuse that this matter was referred to the parents and brought to notice in that way.

The fifth individual who made a report to police also lived near the same families in West Belfast. He again accepted -- Smyth -- when he was interviewed fondling, but the nature of that fondling was not such as to stand an indecent assault charge.

When Smyth was interviewed about the series of allegations of the five individuals in March 1994, he accepted four out of the five. In fact, he accepted the fifth incident as well, but it didn't proceed.

As a result on 18th May 1994 Detective Constable

Marks submitted the second file or his report

recommending on the second file that Smyth be prosecuted

for indecent assaults of these five further women and

drawing attention to a further matter disclosed by one

on the original file.

The DPP then issued a direction on what I am calling

Page 114

RUC file 2 or the HIA195 file in respect of this time another eight counts of indecent assault against four of the women. The DPP did not proceed with one of the accounts.

Smyth was arraigned at Belfast Crown Court on 17th

June on bill 13 of '94. That related to the nine counts

of indecent assault against the [name redacted] and

[name redacted] on the [name redacted] file. He was

also arraigned on the same day on bill 131 of '94 on the

eight counts of indecent assault against the four of the

five women.

Smyth pleaded guilty before The Right Honourable Sir Robert Porter QC, the Recorder of Belfast, at Belfast Crown Court on that date, 17th June, and was then sentenced on 24th June 1994. He was given in respect of the first bill, 13 of '94, dealing with the [name redacted] and [name redacted], in respect of the boys he was given four years on each count of indecent assault and in respect of the girl 21 months, all the sentences to run concurrently. On the second bill with the four women who had come forward after the PE he was given a sentence of three years on each of the eight counts of indecent assault, again all of the sentences to run concurrently. So in total after files 1 and 2 Smyth was convicted of 17 counts of indecent assault on the eight

individual, five girls and three boys.

2.

The transcript of the hearing before Judge Porter can be found in the bundle. It is at 31978 to 32001 and his sentencing remarks are at 31974 to 31977.

On 4th August 1994, if we can just bring this up, please, at 31360, the DPP through now Resident

Magistrate or District Judge White wrote to the RUC expressing his appreciation of the considerable efforts engaged in by the RUC and Detective Constable Marks in particular. He said:

"At the conclusion of this long-running case, which involved a prolonged attempt to extradite Smyth, followed by a series of new allegations again him,

I wish to place on record my appreciation of the work put into this case by the investigating officer,

Detective Constable Reginald Marks.

Detective Constable Marks responded readily and willingly to the many onerous requests made of him by both this office and the Crown Solicitors Office. In addition, one of the most notable features of his work was the concern and attention he paid at all stages of the case to the interests of the injured parties and their families. I have no doubt that the interest he displayed in this regard helped to alleviate the frustration those persons must have felt at the time it

```
Page 116
         took to bring Father Smyth to justice.
1
             I would be grateful if you would convey my views to
 2.
         Detective Constable Marks' authorities."
 3
             That unfortunately was not the end of the matter,
 4
         because on 6th -- perhaps if we take a short break.
 5
              Yes. We will take ten minutes, ladies and
     CHAIRMAN:
 6
         gentlemen.
 7
     (3.20 pm)
 8
 9
                            (Short break)
     (3.30 pm)
10
     MR AIKEN: Chairman, Members of the Panel, we'd looked at
11
         the first two RUC files that made up the two bills of
12
13
         indictment that resulted in the two sets of convictions
         in June 1994. I was saying to you as we broke that the
14
         matter did not end there, because on 6th October 1994
15
16
         UTV broadcast the programme "Suffer the Little
17
         Children". The transcript of the programme is in the
18
         bundle at 31200 to 31274. The fact that the programme
         included further victims, who had not featured in the
19
         1994 proceedings, prompted a further police
20
21
         investigation, which involved the police seeking out the
22
         individuals who had spoken to the programme.
         reference for that is at 31198.
23
24
             This produced another extensive RUC police file,
25
         this time
                          of '95.
                                   That runs from 30555 in the
```

Page 117

bundle to 31185. For ease I am going to call this RUC file 3 or the DL59 file. Again no names that we use should be used beyond the chamber. This file dealt with the complaints of nine individuals, outlining what the reporting police officer described as "a catalogue of oral sex, masturbation and digital fondling". The reference for that is at 30756.

Now I am not going to go through these in detail, because the Panel members have access to the material to which it relates, but the first individual was DL59, who was the younger brother of HIA195, who was an applicant to the Inquiry. He explained that while he met Smyth in Nazareth House, it was actually in De La Salle that he was abused by him. He describes the type of activity which you have heard about in respect of Smyth.

He also said that Smyth would have called down to Rubane about once a month and he would then have been called down to a room to see him. He said that at 30770. He also said Smyth would have seen two other boys in De La Salle and he named HIA41, who is another applicant to the Inquiry, "HIA41", and DL41, who was not an applicant and never spoke to the police.

Smyth was interviewed and he accepted kissing, touching and possibly masturbation, and was asked again about that in his interview and he accepted, and Smyth

also accepted abusing DL41, because the name was put to

2 him at interview. There had been no statement to

3 police. Smyth explained he got to know him, as

I indicated earlier, at the retreat that he had

5 conducted in Nazareth Lodge. He described seeing him

6 also in De La Salle. He was someone who -- he and DL59

7 had overlapped.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

The second individual that's part of the nine is HIA41, who was an applicant to the Inquiry. He explained in his police statement in 1995 -- it's of January '95 and it runs from 30777 to 30781. He described how he had been given sweets and money and would have been indecently assaulted. He then said he only saw him on a few occasions in De La Salle. He would have been sent for and went to the visitors' room.

When Smyth was interviewed, he had no recollection of fondling HIA41 as described, but accepted that he could have. Those were the first two individuals and both of those individuals, as you know, were resident in children's homes that the Inquiry has been investigating.

21 investigating.

The third and fourth individuals were girls who lived in Belfast and went to schools that Smyth had access to them. Again similar allegations.

Similarly with the fifth girl. She lived in the

1 area. Again he had had access to her,

and again indecent assaults and suggestion of the use of his fingers. She continued to receive letters from him

4 when he went to America.

The sixth individual similarly, a girl resident in Belfast, describing similar abuse, and the seventh girl was someone that Smyth -- and I am not going to open it to you today, but it's a statement that you may wish to reflect on at 30797 through to 30799, because the statement describes how Smyth began the abuse at 11, when she was aged 11, but it continued, interaction between the two, after she moved into adulthood. She described how she would be taken to various places where he would visit, including Nazareth Lodge, and she remembers being taken down to Kircubbin, where he would have gone inside to make his visit and then she would have been in the car and she would have -- he'd continue to engage with her then after he returned.

He accepted at interview having a very long relationship, as he described it, with her from about the age of 12. He was interviewed about that in May 1995.

The eighth individual of the nine was another boy from Nazareth Lodge, NL59. He is "NL59". He explained to the police how he was introduced to Smyth by the nuns

1 he said. Smyth would visit him and his sister NL88.

2 I will ask you to note that name, because that will come

3 back. He goes on to explain on the occasions what Smyth

4 would do, again the indecent assault character of the

5 offending.

In fact, Smyth had volunteered abusing NL59 in an earlier police interview. So he had actually offered that name to police as someone he had abused on 7th December 1994, but, in fact, the boy in question then gave the statement to police on 26th April 1995.

The ninth individual that was part of this third police file was another resident in Nazareth Lodge, DL56. Now the Inquiry is aware that this individual was abused by James McGuigan, who was an individual who featured in the Rubane module, Module 3, and he described in his police interview what he says happened to him at the hands of Smyth. This perhaps shows the complexity of the difficulties for police investigating these matters at times, because the police for reasons that they set out, which I am not going to go into now, didn't believe his account about his abuse by Smyth, because it was totally out of keeping with Smyth's modus operandi. The suggestion was that randomly in the hall he was touched in the hall and the living room by Smyth, someone that he didn't know. That was a matter that the

police expressed the view to the DPP shouldn't be proceeded with.

2.

Now as part of this RUC file 3 or DL59 file there were an additional twelve individuals who were mentioned during interviews with Smyth, some of whom he accepted abusing, but who didn't wish the matter to be pursued.

None of those individuals were resident in a children's home.

As part of this investigation that was part of the RUC file 3 four of the interviews that were conducted related to this file. As I have been explaining, Smyth made admissions in respect of eight of the nine individuals, with DL56 being the one exception, where Smyth said, "Well, that's just not true. I didn't and wouldn't do that type of thing to someone I didn't know, not in that way".

On 14th June 1995 the investigating officer, again Detective Constable Marks, recommended that Smyth be again prosecuted for indecent assault on eight of the nine individuals. That was a view shared by his Detective Inspector Pentland and Detective Chief Superintendent Anderson.

On 11th July 1995 the DPP issued directions on this RUC file 3 and Smyth was to face 16 counts of indecent assault against those eight individuals. Those 16

counts of indecent assault against the eight individuals
were ultimately to form bill of indictment 245 of '95.

That can be found at 31841 through to 31845.

The time period that's involved in these offences, which included DL59 in a children's home '74 to '80 -- in HIA41's case it covered both homes. The charge period was '70 to '79. In respect of NL59, '74 to '80. So you can see the time period vis-a-vis what was known by the Norbertine Order and then what was known by the various dioceses.

Smyth was arraigned in respect of this bill of indictment 245 of '95 on 8th August 1995. He was sentenced in respect of this bill on 22nd September. The sentences for the indecent assaults on males attracted a sentence of three years on each count -- sorry -- attracted four years on each count -- no, I'm sorry -- three years on each count, and in respect of the females 21 months on each count, all sentences again to run concurrently. So they were going to run in with the sentence that he was already subject to.

However, before that sentence was handed down on 22nd September 1995 the RUC were already investigating the complaints of another set of individuals, which would form a fourth file. I am going to call that RUC file 4 or the DL40 file for ease. This file was

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 123

submitted to the DPP on 30th August 1995. So you can see the time pressure to try and deal with this, because he was already coming towards hearing in respect of file 3.

So this file 4 consisted of allegations by a further nine individuals. The first two were sisters from

, who again described the types of indecent assaults and psychological difficulties that flowed for them. Smyth again accepted fondling but not digital penetration.

The third individual then was a resident in Nazareth That was NL88. I mentioned her name earlier in the context of NL59, who was someone that Smyth was going to soon be convicted for arising from RUC file 3. She explains in her police statement that she was around 10 when she first was interfered with. That would have been around 1977. She describes the type of touching that Smyth would have engaged in in the vestry after mass and a parlour type room in Nazareth Lodge. recounts talking to SR46 about it and her recollection was to another member of staff and being told to stay away from him. She said sometimes he would come to a group room together, sometimes he sent for her and also went to see her in her school. He, Smyth, had already spoken of abusing her in his interview of

December 1994 and her police statement was in July 1995.

The fourth individual was again someone that we have mentioned before, who was in Nazareth Lodge, DL40. He came forward to assist the Inquiry and gave evidence twice to the Inquiry on Day 70 and 95. He went into Nazareth Lodge and was there until September of '77, when he went to Rubane.

He describes both abuse taking place in a dark corridor in Nazareth Lodge and also then being abused as well in Rubane. He recalls -- he explained how BR1, the head of the home, used to call him down, saying Smyth had come to see him. The abuse took the same form and then on a number of occasions slightly more interference than had taken place before.

He explained in his police statement that he was aware of seeing two other boys going to see Smyth. That was DL59 and DL41, whom I have mentioned previously.

He also explained that Smyth did not return after he, DL40, had told the head of the home, BR1. He refers in his police statement to being given sweets and money and letters.

Smyth was interviewed about it on 11th August 1995. He accepted kissing and touching and external masturbation, but says he was never spoken to by anyone from the De La Salle Order.

2.

Page 125

The fifth individual and the third from children's homes was FBS8. She entered Nazareth Lodge in '73 and was there until '75. In her police statement of 1st August '95 she says Smyth would have come to take mass from time to time. She would have taken -- have been taken to the ground floor room with a long table and chandeliers where he sat on -- she would be made to sit on his knee, kissed and fondled. It happened on a number of occasions and was given sweets and money.

Smyth at interview said he may have hugged her, but had no recollection of other, and does not believe he would have touched her as alleged.

Then the sixth individual was someone who was older and worked, and it was in her place of work that she felt Smyth had touched her. She spoke to police about that. Smyth denied that, said he wouldn't have attempted to touch an adult like that.

The seventh individual was a FBS26, who was also a resident in Nazareth Lodge. He described Smyth he said getting into bed beside him and fondling him and getting him to touch his private parts. In fact, this priest had got into bed with his clothes on. Smyth, when he was interviewed, said he had never got into bed with anyone like that with his clothes on. He

definitely would remember if that is what he had done.

2.

The police took the view that this allegation was vague and it could not name or identify the priest and lacked detail and wasn't something that could be proceeded with.

The eighth individual was NHB92. She made a statement to police in August of 1995. Refers to being sat on a priest's knee, but there was no reference to abuse, and she could not recall being abused and could not say if it was Smyth's knee. That was the eighth individual.

The ninth individual was then FBS7. She was the sister of HIA195 and brother of DL59 (sic) and older sister of both. We have seen Smyth had already accepted abusing them. I am not going to go into lengthy setting this out, but the position was that she explained to police that in November 1994 that she said that she was the subject of multiple violent rapes. Initially she'd made that case while file 3 was progressing, but because of its very serious nature and the complicating factors in relation to the account, there was a separate file to follow. That's why it formed a part of file 4.

She describes how she got to meet Smyth, because she was in Nazareth House. She was introduced and refers to the type of touching and indecent assaults while there,

Page 127 but she then says thereafter much more serious offending 1 took place, particularly in Middletown, where she moved, 2. and because of the severity of the offending that was 3 alleged, the police undertook a lengthy and protracted 4 police investigation. They spoke to a whole series of 5 individuals that were identified as potentially 6 corroborating the account, including friends of this complainant as well as SR31 in Nazareth Lodge and SJM11 8 9 in Middletown. 10 While there is no doubt that Smyth visited, because Middletown diaries -- and I am just going to show you 11 these, because on 2nd October 1973, if we can look, 12 13 please, at 30470, if we just scroll down, please -scroll down a bit further, please, so we can see -- yes, 14 15 you see the entry at the bottom, 22nd October: "In good form today. FBS7's friend Father Smyth 16 17 called this afternoon. FBS7 was in school but we sent 18 for her. She is really cool with him. One wonders why he bothers coming to see her at all." 19 Then the next entry is of 13th November '73 at 20 21 30472: 22 "FBS7 had a visit from Father Smyth today. He is really good to her, but she could not care less." 23 On 21st March '74 then at 30473, if we scroll down, 24 25 please, to 21st:

Page 128

"Father Smyth called to see FBS7 today. He is really very good to her. He comes to -- so often to see her. Never empty handed."

So there is no doubt that he was by now -- having met her in Nazareth, was now visiting her in the Good Shepherd, but for various reasons, which I am not going to go into, which the Panel will be aware of, steps taken by the police to try and get to the bottom of the allegations led them to conclude that there was serious issues about the account and, in fact, SJM11, you will see in her statement at 30115 that she is attributed with receiving knowledge, and she explains what, in fact, she was told, and various friends of the individual were spoken to, who were said to have gone with her, and they gave different accounts.

In the end the police concluded that -- it should be made clear whenever Smyth was interviewed, he accepted fondling this girl without any question, but denied that he had ever had intercourse with her and certainly not in the violent way that she was describing on a number of occasions. The police were of the view that that would not be something that would sustain a criminal charge.

There were a series of interviews that were conducted that relate to these nine individuals. That

2.

Page 129

resulted at the conclusion on 11th August -- sorry -- on 23rd August 1995 the investigating officer, DC Foster, recommended that Smyth be prosecuted in relation to five of the nine individuals who made allegations and recommended no prosecution in respect of the four others. He explained the basis for so doing. I am not going to go into that now, but I am going to give you the reference, which is at 30054.

That was concurred in by Detective Inspector

Pentland, save that he did recommend that another charge against the older adult that I mentioned in the place of work. So that would have made six rather than five, but Detective Chief Superintendent Anderson agreed that there should be six individuals put forward.

The file was submitted to the DPP on 30th August of 1995. DC Foster made the point in what is now RUC file 4, and you have seen a whole series of individuals now that amount to 21, and the point that Detective Constable Foster makes in the report, which can be found at 30010, is that no other victim during the course of the entire investigation into the activities of Smyth had claimed that he had ever attempted to or did have sexual intercourse with them.

On 12th September 1995 the DPP issued a further direction on this file, which is file 4, the DL40 file,

2.

Page 130

in relation to the allegations of the nine individuals, and they directed that Smyth be prosecuted for ten counts of indecent assault relating to five individuals. As you know, three of those were children who resided in the children's homes that we have looked at. The allegations from the four other individuals were dealt with in the same direction and no charges were to be preferred.

The charges were dealt with by way of voluntary bill of indictment so that they could be dealt with alongside those relating to the third file, which was to take place on 22nd September 1995. These ten counts against the five individuals were ultimately to form bill of indictment 274 of '95. Again the time ranges are from '68 through to '77, then on into '82.

Smyth was arraigned by voluntary indictment in respect of the bill on 22nd September. He then entered guilty pleas to the ten counts in respect of the five individuals.

He was sentenced on the same day,

22nd September 1995, by Mr Justice Campbell, as he then
was, and he received a further series of concurrent
custodial sentences. For the indecent assaults on DL40
he received three years in prison on each count and then
in respect of the females he received 21 months in

prison on each count. All sentences were to run concurrently with those already imposed in 1994.

So Smyth pleaded guilty and was convicted of a total of 26 further counts of indecent assault against a further 13 children. As we discussed earlier, that brought the total convictions in Northern Ireland to 43 counts of indecent assault against 21 individuals.

Prior to the sentencing Dr Loughrey provided the updated report that we looked at yesterday.

Now what I want you to look at now, in keeping with how we began today, is a letter that Smyth wrote on 22nd September. 31957, please. This is the day that he was being dealt with at court:

"For a second time within 16 months I have undergone a trial for sexually abusing young people for whom I had affection and friendship. That these crimes to which I have unreservedly pleaded guilty took place in the main 20 to 30 years ago does not make them any the less wicked and I have welcomed the prison sentences imposed by the courts as a fitting means of paying my debt to society.

I would like to take this opportunity to express my deep sorrow to anyone who had in any way suffered as a result of my actions and also to those relatives, friend and also members of my religious community who

- 1 suffered because of the media treatment of these matters
- for a long time now. I have been at peace with" --
- 3 scroll down, please -- "peace with my God and I trust
- 4 that they too will find a similar peace."
- 5 Signed Brendan Smyth. You see it is addressed to
- 6 his solicitor.
- 7 "Note. I suggest the above for release after
- 8 sentencing -- at your discretion."
- 9 Now, unknown to Smyth, on 20th September 1995 now
- 10 RUC file 5 was provided to the DPP. That included fresh
- allegations from a further six individuals. They were
- of a similar type. One of them related to a girl who
- had resided in Nazareth Lodge, although her claim was
- 14 that -- she was taken to meet Smyth in a room. She was
- saying that she didn't know this person and Smyth said,
- as he'd said in the interviews we've looked at, he
- 17 wouldn't have had some stranger brought to him. That's
- 18 not how he operated.
- 19 You will see the fifth of the sixth individuals was
- again someone that Smyth continued a relationship with,
- 21 which began as a child and then continued with her as
- an adult. That statement may be of some interest. It
- 23 begins at 30678.
- 24 Detective Inspector Pentland and DC Marks
- interviewed Smyth on 15th September along with

2.

Page 133

colleagues from the Garda Siochana, because some of the matters related to the Republic of Ireland. The police recorded that, as he was to face trial on 22nd September, they recommended that four indecent assaults on four individuals that he had accepted abusing -- so there were two cases that he did not accept -- be taken into consideration, but the DPP directed on 26th September there be no further prosecution on the basis that there was no reasonable prospect of him receiving any additional sentences to those that had been imposed already. So there were four further matters, none relating to children's homes, which Smyth accepted as part of RUC file 5, but which the DPP directed didn't need to proceed.

The final file then, RUC file 6, was submitted on 1st May 1996. This time there were three further individuals who made allegations, and two of those we have looked at in the context of Down & Connor, because they were FBS35 and FBS37, FBS37 being the sister of FBS40, who was taken by FBS51 to meet Abbot Kevin Smith in 1976.

In respect of both FBS35 and FBS37 Smyth accepted during interview that he had abused FBS35 and FBS37, not necessarily to the extent that they claimed, and again it was an indecent assault, but he didn't accept that he

Page 134

had abused the third girl, who was someone who said -was said to be in Nazareth, although we have not been
able to find any record relating to her in Nazareth, but
in any event her claim was that in a lift in Nazareth
Lodge Smyth had fondled her. He made the case that
he could never remember being in a lift and wouldn't
have done that with something (sic) he didn't know.

Now that same girl claimed to have had a discussion with the same nun who had given a warning to NL88 to stay away from Smyth if you didn't want to be near him. The nun in question, SR46, said in her police statement when she was interviewed in 1996 that she hadn't -- she certainly had spoken to NL88 about Smyth, and we saw her in police file 4, but she certainly had not spoken to this individual who had come forward that was part of police file 6.

The police file the police report on 23rd April 1996 and on 3rd May the DPP directed no further prosecution in respect of the matters on the same basis that there would be no additional charge.

I erroneously told you there were six police files. There were, in fact, seven. The seventh police file was on 19th August 1996. It related to another member of the [name redacted] family, a particular allegation that was made that was investigated by the police, the

2.

Page 135

suggestion of being abused in a lift by a person who dropped their trousers and that that was Smyth. He was interviewed about that and denied that that was something he ever did or would have done. He explained in the interview again how he built up relationships over time with children and would never have touched a female without knowing her.

The police submitted a report expressing a view that the complaint was in the police's words "a total fabrication". You can find the reference for that at 30645. They recommended no prosecution.

On 21st March 1997 Smyth was released from

Magilligan Prison, having served his prison sentences in

Northern Ireland, and was thereafter extradited by

consent to the Republic of Ireland to face trial there.

He pleaded guilty in the Circuit Criminal Court in

Dublin on 22nd April 1997. On 25th July 1997 Smyth was

sentenced by His Honour Judge Cyril Kelly in respect of

74 charges of indecent assault relating to 20 children.

He was given combined sentences that amounted to

12 years' imprisonment. On 5th June the Garda Siochana

asked the RUC to obtain victim impact statements from

two individuals in Northern Ireland, which was done, and

Smyth then died in prison in Dublin in August 1997.

Now there the matter largely rested in terms of the

2.

Page 136

making of allegations until 2009. Post-2009 the PSNI recorded statements from a number of individuals who made allegations against Father Brendan Smyth. There were 14 in total. Some of these individuals were individuals who had spoken to police during the RUC investigations between '91 and '96, but spoke to police again post-2009. Some of these individuals don't appear to have come forward during the RUC investigation in the '90s. Eight of the 14 individuals also applied to this Inquiry and have given evidence in some form.

The first was HIA41. We looked at Smyth's conviction in relation to him. On 10th September 2010 he made a further statement to police about his time in children's homes and there is another statement of September 2011. He gave evidence to the Inquiry on Day 67 and also on Day 89. His Inquiry witness statement is in the bundle at 008 to 0036. He was in Nazareth Lodge latterly between August '73 and May '77 and in De La Salle from May '77 to July '81. He described, as you will recall, in the 1995 police investigation being indecently assaulted by Brendan Smyth and that Smyth pleaded guilty to two counts of indecent assault to cover the time in Nazareth Lodge, one, and the time in Rubane, the other.

He made a statement to police in January 1995 where

he explained about being let in -- letting Smyth into
the property. Given sweets and money, and would have
had his bum felt and his penis felt, but never took his
penis out, and how Smyth always behaved in a nice
manner, and only seeing him on a few occasions in De La
Salle, being sent for and went to the visitors' room and

abused in a similar fashion.

He gave a very detailed account of his experiences to a consultant psychiatrist, Dr Bones, on 29th September 2009. That can be found at 40051 to 40063. The relevant part which sets out his account of what took place is at 40052 to 40054.

In his 2010 and 2011 police statements he then repeated to the Inquiry HIA41 says he was repeatedly raped by Brendan Smyth in Nazareth Lodge in his bedroom and in De La Salle. That is consistent with what's in the police statement of September 2011 also.

The second individual was HIA48, who is "HIA48". She'd made a statement to the police on 8th December 2010 at 32235 and 6. She was in Nazareth Lodge again between '71 and '76 and between the ages of 5 and 12.

She gave evidence to the Inquiry on Day 108. Her Inquiry witness statement is at 1196 to 1200.

In her 2010 police statement she talks about Smyth rubbing up against her. She did make a statement to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 138

police on 24th July '95 where she did complain of physical abuse by a member of staff in Nazareth Lodge but said she could not recall a Father Brendan Smyth in Nazareth Lodge.

The third individual was HIA149. He gave an ABE interview to police on 26th January 2012. Says he was repeatedly raped by Smyth in Nazareth Lodge. Gave evidence to the Inquiry on Day 67 and also gave evidence on Day 95. His Inquiry witness statement is at 052 to He was in Nazareth Lodge laterally between 1969, aged 2, until 29th April 1977, aged 10. He had given a statement to police on 21st May 1980 during the initial Rubane investigation when he was at St. Patrick's -- he was 14 at the time -- and he was the one who brought to the authorities' attention what James McGuigan had done to his brother DL56 and James McGuigan was subsequently convicted of abusing his brother. He explained in that same statement what James McGuigan tried to do to him but then did do to his brother.

The fourth individual was HIA50, "HIA50". He made a statement to the police on 9th August 2012. He gave evidence to the Inquiry on Day 90. His Inquiry witness statement is at 037 to 051. He was in Nazareth Lodge between 7th March 1985 and 6th April 1985, so one month.

Page 139

He said in his police statement that SR2 walked in whilst he was being penetrated, to use his words, by Smyth. SR2 came to Nazareth Lodge in August 1983 until September '86. Was interviewed about this on 11th March 2013. The interview is available to the Inquiry at 32895 to 32897. She made it clear that she had never seen Smyth at Nazareth Lodge and did not walk in on Smyth sexually abusing anyone.

We can say to the Inquiry that Smyth did visit

Nazareth Lodge on 7th December 1986, because he signed

the visitors' book on that occasion, but that was a year

after HIA50 had left and also after SR2 had left. We

can't find any other indication of Smyth being there at

that time. That's not to say he wasn't. We haven't

found any further documents that we can bring to the

Inquiry's attention.

The fifth individual is HIA154, who was "HIA154".

He made a statement to police on 15th August of 2012.

He said he was raped in Nazareth Lodge approximately thirty times in a nun's bedroom. He gave evidence to the Inquiry on Day 113. His Inquiry witness statement is at 613 to 618 in the bundle. He was in Nazareth Lodge between April '73 and remained there until November '75. He had made a statement to police on 26th June 1995, when he did disclose that it was a caretaker

Page 140

or gardener who made him touch him, and that was the worst thing that happened to him and stuck out in his mind twenty years on. There was -- there had not been a mention of Brendan Smyth in that police statement.

The sixth individual was HIA10. I read the material out relating to her on Day 104 of the Inquiry. It can be found at 60170 to 60205. Her Inquiry witness statement is at 001 to 007. She describes there at paragraph 12 one occasion that could potentially amount to an indecent assault. In 2007 in a criminal injuries claim that she'd initiated she did, however, allege very serious sexual abuse by Smyth, and in page 4 of her police statement of 21st May 2010 she said she had -- he had rubbed her leg up to her groin on one occasion. In her police statement of 23rd August 1995, when describing physical abuse by a nun, she said she could not recall a priest by the name of Smyth. That's at 32432.

The seventh individual is HIA257, who was "HIA257", who was in Nazareth House from August '66 to February '76. She says in her Inquiry statement that a priest sat her on his knee and need to digitally penetrate her. She thinks it was Father Brendan Smyth but was not sure and never made a complaint to the police.

The eighth individual was "HIA397", HIA397, who was

in Nazareth Lodge from May '73 to March '78. He says in

2 the Inquiry statement that Smyth interfered with his

genitalia and did the same to a boy in the next bed. He

4 also saw Smyth with a coloured boy, who was crying.

I did ask a particular witness you are aware of about

6 that.

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Those are the eight individuals who were applicants to the Inquiry who made allegations post-2009 about Smyth.

There then are a further six individuals, in fact, I think I said -- seven individuals who have made allegations to police in the years since 2009. I am not going to go into those in any further detail now other than to acknowledge that the police in the material, even in the more modern format not really taking issue with accounts, did take issue with some of the accounts that they were receiving, and obviously by this stage Brendan Smyth was dead.

The final matter is a statement that we found amongst different police papers, but which did make reference to Smyth putting a particular girl on his knee and she did not like the way she was touched, but that doesn't appear to have been something that was ever put to Smyth.

Now, Members of the Panel, I have moved swiftly

Page 142

through a very large body of material, because ultimately the issue in this module you may consider is more related to: well, could and should the abuse that Smyth perpetrated have been stopped? Does what was done or not done through the various occasions that we have looked at through the material represent systemic failings on behalf of those core participants who are before the Inquiry to not deal with Smyth as they should have?

I repeat again something you have heard me say a lot, because we are looking at matters that were taking place by and large in the late '60s, early '70s in terms of the opportunities to ensure that none of the children in the homes that we have been investigating were abused, and therefore the need to not judge with hindsight but with looking at the decision-making at the time.

The question ultimately that will fall for the Panel is, even having regard to the time, whether the decision-making was such as to amount to systemic failings on behalf of those who had the opportunities to deal with Smyth and did not do so.

Each of the core participants have explained to the Inquiry how matters today are not like matters as they were at the time period that's being investigated by

this Inquiry. Nonetheless obviously the implications of

2 the decisions that were made at the time that the

3 Inquiry is looking at are of very serious import, given

4 that they had the potential to ensure that not one child

5 in the homes that we were looking at were sexually

abused by this self-confessed paedophile.

We will hear over the next two days from five witnesses, beginning tomorrow with representatives from the Norbertine Order, the Archdiocese of Armagh and the Diocese of Kilmore and then on Thursday from Cardinal Brady, who will speak of the 1975 investigation that Bishop Kilmore -- the Bishop of Kilmore, Francis MacKiernan, asked him to conduct and then from Father Timothy Bartlett on behalf of the Diocese of Down & Connor.

Unless there is any other matters that the Inquiry would wish me to deal with at this point in time, that concludes the opening of a vast swathe of material which I am very grateful for your patience in allowing me to try to assimilate and lay out as best as I could.

21 CHAIRMAN: Well, ladies and gentlemen, we will adjourn now 22 and we will resume the hearings tomorrow at 10 o'clock 23 or as soon thereafter as is convenient.

24 (4.25 pm)

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

25 (Inquiry adjourned until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning)

	min induit	
		Page 144
1	00000	
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

	Page 145
1	I N D E X
2	
3	Opening remarks by COUNSEL TO THE2 INQUIRY (cont.)
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
Ì	