

THE STONES CRY OUT

REPORT ON THE MACSAS SURVEY 2010

**The Response of Churches in the UK to Victims of Sexual Abuse
Perpetrated by Clergy, Religious and other Church Officials**

Anne Lawrence

RECOMMENDATIONS



MACSAS May 2011

Minister & Clergy Sexual Abuse Survivors www.macsas.org.uk

[Copies of the full report can be downloaded at www.macsas.org.uk]

RECOMMENDATIONS

This report has not been written simply to criticise the Churches but rather to tell what is happening and to trigger a dialogue in which Church leaders and the wider society look firmly at what is going wrong in the national Churches in the UK. Only when the extent of the problem is acknowledged will fundamental changes within Church Institutions be possible to ensure that both children and adults are protected from abuse by clergy, religious and other church officials. MACSAS has a number of recommendations which could assist in bring about those changes.

Call for an Independent Inquiry

For 20 years the leaders within the Catholic Church and the Church of England/Wales have repeatedly stated that they will respond appropriately to reports of child sexual abuse, and numerous safeguarding/child protection procedures have been put in place. Despite these assurances and procedures there have been repeated court cases where clergy and religious have been convicted of multiple child sexual offences often dating back and continuing for decades and involving a number of children. And repeatedly the prosecution has revealed that Church authorities covered up past reports of child abuse and allowed clergy and religious to remain in ministry despite allegations and in some cases past convictions for child sexual offences. In many reported cases further child abuse took place. The James Robinson case in 2010 involving the Catholic Archdiocese of Birmingham and the Cotton & Pritchard case in 2008 and subsequent CofE Diocese of Chichester Inquiry (2011) are the latest examples.

All the evidence points to the conclusion that the cover up, denial and/or minimisation of child sexual abuse within Churches was widespread, and seemed to be most prevalent within a number of Dioceses and Church Institutions in England and Wales, and may still be going on as victims of abuse perpetrated over the past six decades continue to report cases to Church authorities years after the abuse took place and they first reported: in cases where prosecutions are successful files continue to reveal what was already known

by Church authorities, in other cases as seen in the MACSAS Survey reports continue to be ignored.

Until there is an inquiry which uncovers what was known about child sexual abuse by Church authorities and what actions were taken when reports were made, these injustices will continue for decades to come. Justice requires that the truth is told; that victims are allowed to tell what happened to them and be listened to, and that the harm caused to them is acknowledged. Church leaders must accept responsibility for allowing sexual offenders/abusers to continue in ministry and to continue abusing those they were placed in authority over. Only when the truth is known, when responsibility is accepted in its right order and we are left with the incomprehensible truth of what happened, will transformation be possible. To date neither the Catholic Church in England & Wales nor the Church of England and Wales has allowed such an inquiry to take place.

Recommendation 1

That the Government set up an Independent Commission of Inquiry into the handling of child sexual abuse perpetrated by clergy, religious and other church officials within the Catholic Church in England & Wales and the Church of England/Wales.

Such an inquiry should have powers to compel the disclosure of all files of clergy, religious and other church officials containing reports of child sexual abuse. It should receive evidence, both oral and written from victims of child sexual abuse perpetrated by clergy and religious within parish communities and church institutions.

The Inquiry should investigate how cases were handled by Church and religious authorities and should cover the period from 1945 to 2010. It should establish the extent of the abuse and the mechanisms employed by Church authorities to cover up, deny and/or minimise the abuse.

The Inquiry should also examine the impact the abuse and the response of Church and religious authorities had on the victims.

A Change in Sexual Offences Legislation

Clergy and religious are the only group of ‘professionals’ who provide guidance and counselling to people at times of need for whom it is not a criminal offence to engage in sexual relations with ‘clients’. Whilst there is a category of ‘*others*’ within the legislation the police and CPS are reluctant to prosecute these cases unless there are multiple victims and compelling evidence of an existing sexual offence being perpetrated such as rape or assault.

In America at least 18 states have sexual offences legislation that provides specifically for the criminalisation of sexual relations between pastors and ‘clients’ within a spiritual/pastoral setting.

Recommendation 2

That the Sexual Offences legislation be amended to extend the definition of ‘breach of trust’ to include clergy and religious roles. This would make it a criminal offence for clergy, religious and other church officials to engage in sexual activity/relations with adults who come to them for spiritual/pastoral counselling and support or when they are engaged in other ministerial roles. This should include congregants within the parish community, those who seek specific guidance and counselling at times of personal crisis and illness, and those who are on spiritual retreat within religious communities.

Amendments to Safeguarding/Child Protection Procedures within Churches

The findings of the MACSAS Survey have revealed that despite the safeguarding procedures currently in place reports of child sexual abuse are inconsistently responded to. Reports have been disregarded, ignored or forgotten about; victims have been kept in the dark, and have received no response to their reports, and in most cases there was no determination of the allegations made. Clergy and religious reported to Church and statutory authorities by the respondents in the Survey are still in ministry, in some cases despite repeated allegations being made and/or convictions for child sexual offences; and this in 2010.

The analysis of the current safeguarding procedures in place has identified a number of areas where the procedures are too vague and the discretion of the decision makers too wide for the procedures to be consistently effective. Whilst Lord Nolan and Baroness Cumberlege received the assurances of Catholic Church and religious authorities in good faith, the Institutional dynamics that instinctively protect the Institution of the Church were not acknowledged. As a result the well intentioned discretion given within the recommendations made have become a stumbling block undermining the effectiveness of safeguarding procedures within the Catholic Church. The same applies to the procedures within the Church of England.

The following recommendations are to ensure that procedures are consistently and effectively applied so that the welfare of children remains paramount throughout the decision making process. It is also hoped that the recommendations reflect the concept of justice for the victims, so far absent from any procedures.

In the recommendations below a **Credible Allegation** is one where the victim provides enough details to identify the alleged abuser, the location/parish or situation where the abuse took place, and roughly when it took place in terms of year or years. For an allegation to be credible does not require any determination of guilt.

Recommendation 3

All Diocesan and Religious order Safeguarding advisers/commissioners should be professionals within the field of child protection/safeguarding. They should also be independent of the Church/religious order; they should neither be a cleric or member of a religious order, nor related to a cleric or a member of a religious order.

At all times those tasked with the protection of children need to be independent of those they may have to investigate and make decisions upon when allegations of child sexual abuse are reported. Conflicts of interest and personal feelings which may influence decision making can only be minimised by employing safeguarding officers who are not friends or colleagues of the clergy or other diocesan authorities, did not go through training college with them, and did not marry them. Those who sexually abuse children are highly manipulative and can be wholly persuasive to their friends, colleagues and loved ones.

Recommendation 4

Diocesan and Religious order Authorities and Safeguarding advisers/commissioners should take effective actions in response to all credible allegations of child sexual abuse to ensure that the alleged abusers do not pose any further risk to children.

Too often, even when internal investigations, risk assessments and discussions within Dioceses and religious orders have taken place no effective actions are taken against the alleged offender; time and again this lack of action has resulted in the alleged offender, sometimes with multiple allegations against him, being allowed to remain in ministry where he either continues to abuse children or poses a continuing risk to children.

Allegations made by an adult years after the abuse took place, referred to as '*historic case*', should be handled in the same way as for current or more recent cases. Most cases of child sexual abuse are reported when the victim is an adult, and often decades after the abuse took place. However this makes the abuse no less real, the harm caused no less devastating, and the alleged abusers no less dangerous, unless he is dead.

The use of the term “*historic cases*” minimises not only the seriousness of the allegations made but also responsibility and accountability. These cases are not ‘historic’ to the victims and are not historic under criminal law, which recognises child sexual abuse as a crime whenever it occurred.

Recommendation 5

The victim of alleged sexual abuse should be informed of the procedures that will be engaged with when they report the abuse, and should be kept informed of all steps taken throughout the investigation and decision making process. A support person should be provided for the victim who is not otherwise involved in the investigation of the case or the decision making process.

There can be no excuse for ignoring the victims when allegations are reported regardless of their age at the time of reporting. It is truly shocking to see in the MACSAS Survey that most of the victims were not kept informed of what was happening when they reported child sexual abuse allegations. Such careless disregard by Church authorities reinforces the perception that cases are being ignored and that the Church is covering up allegations. The time has passed when ‘*leave it to us*’ is a good enough response; dozens of cases have shown that leaving it to church authorities merely meant that the abuser continued to abuse. Ensuring that victims are kept informed throughout the process increases the likelihood of effective actions being taken, as the victims have at the forefront of their concerns that such abuse does not happen to others.

Recommendation 6

Diocesan and religious order Authorities and Safeguarding advisers/commissioners should neither rely upon the procedures and outcomes of criminal justice system nor the criminal standard of proof therein, to determine the nature and extent of the actions to be taken against alleged child sexual offender.

The standard of proof required to secure a criminal conviction is ‘**proof beyond all reasonable doubt**’; however the standard required to child protection matters is ‘**proof on the balance of probabilities**’. Currently only 3-4% of reported child sexual abuse cases result in a criminal conviction; this does not reflect the extent of child abuse within society, and the decision taken by the CPS not to prosecute or the return of a ‘not guilty’ verdict does not mean that child sexual abuse has not taken place nor that the alleged abuser poses no risk to children.

In determining actions to be taken against alleged offenders in child protection cases proof on the **balance of probabilities** must be used to decide the risk posed to children if they remain in ministry based on all the information available at the time; that is whether on the balance of probabilities the alleged abuser poses an ongoing risk to children if he is allowed to remain in ministry.

Child sexual abuse has a devastating impact on children. Often they are unable to tell what happened to them until years after the abuse took place. One child abused can impact on the lives of others for generations. Doubt about guilt must be balanced against ensuring that such devastation is not inflicted on another child.

Recommendation 7

Those accused of child sexual abuse should be suspended from ministry immediately an allegation is made and should remain suspended until all processes and risk assessments are concluded and decisions have been made about what actions should be taken. There should be no exceptions to this.

Too often those accused of abusing children have been allowed to continue in ministry often up to the date of a court hearing which may be many months or even years after an allegation has been made. In order to ensure that children are not placed at risk the accused should not be allowed to continue in ministry until a determination has been

made as to the credibility of the allegation and the risk to children posed by the person accused.

Recommendation 8

Diocesan / Religious order Authorities should disclose all information related to any and all allegations of child abuse to the Safeguarding Adviser/Commissioner. They in turn should present the whole information held on any alleged offender to statutory authorities including the police when investigations are undertaken. Diocesan / Religious order Authorities and safeguarding advisers/commissioners should not wait for a request to be made before disclosing any relevant information held to agencies investigating child abuse allegations

From the many reported criminal and civil cases it has been seen that Church and religious Authorities have time and again failed to disclose reports, allegations of and/or past convictions for child sexual abuse held on file when new allegations are reported and/or when police investigate cases. This reckless behaviour places more children at risk of abuse. There can be no good reason why the paramountcy of children's welfare should be ousted to protect an alleged abuser or the reputation of the Church.

Recommendation 9

A risk assessment should be mandatory for all those accused where allegations have been made. The assessment should be undertaken by independent professionals trained and experienced in the assessment of child sexual offenders. The risk assessment process should be separate from any other statutory processes and focused on the protection of children, not the protection of the accused or the Church's reputation.

Too often risk assessments are either not done, or are carried out by people with little training in the assessment of child sex offenders. As seen in Part 2 of this report only in a

small percentage of cases are the alleged abusers sent for a professional risk assessment to such institutions as the **Lucy Faithful Foundation**. Child sex offenders are notoriously persuasive when denying or minimising their offending behaviour and they are highly manipulative of those they perceive to have power over them.

Although most alleged abusers are neither prosecuted nor convicted, that has very little to do with the guilt of the accused but rather to do with the lack of independent corroborating evidence. As seen in the John Jay Study a prosecution is more likely to be secured where multiple victims have come forward than where only one victim has reported.

Given this reality it is difficult to understand why those accused of child sexual offences are not sent for professional risk assessments. Currently it seems as if some filtering process is being used which is underestimating the risk posed by those accused of child sexual abuse when they are not convicted. This is easily fixed by making Independent professional risk assessments mandatory.

Recommendation 10

Where a priest, religious or other church official has revealed child abuse offences in the course of formal confession, the Confessor should inform the penitent that he will report the disclosure to Church/Religious order authorities and safeguarding officers notwithstanding the seal of the confessional.

In all other professions working with children, where a person discloses that they have committed a criminal offence against a child there is a duty to report such disclosure to child protection/safeguarding officers and/or to the police. The same standard should apply to clergy and others within the Church.

MACSAS recommends that all Diocesan and Religious Order authorities inform congregations, clergy and others in positions of trust within the Church that the Seal of the Confessional will not apply to disclosures of criminal offences perpetrated against children.

This is not about forgiveness and there is no place for secrecy in repentance. Crimes against children and harm to children were condemned by Jesus Christ in the strongest terms. Therefore to not safeguard children under the pretext of the seal of the confessional is contrary to the teaching of Christ set down within the Gospels

Recommendation 11

All credible allegations of child sexual abuse should be reported to the Independent Safeguarding Authority (ISA) in accordance with the Safeguarding Vulnerable Groups Act 2006.

All employers should inform the ISA of employees and volunteers who may have harmed or may pose a risk of harm to children or vulnerable adults; this applies to clergy and religious within Churches. Where a credible allegation has been made or multiple allegations have been made the accused should be reported to the ISA when there is no criminal conviction.

Recommendation 12

Where a priest/religious or other church official has been convicted of a sexual offence against children, has otherwise been deemed to have committed such offences, and/or has been deemed to pose an ongoing risk to children, s/he should not be allowed to continue in ministry, s/he should be permanently removed from ministry, and steps should be taken to have him/her laicised or Dismissed from the religious community. S/he should not be allowed to minister in a seemingly child free environments, or be granted permission to officiate (PTOs).

When victims see their abuser continuing to minister at religious services, wearing robes and acting like moral leaders they find it deeply offensive and disturbing. Some are re-traumatised when they see the person they thought they had put in prison or whom church authorities had assured them would be dealt with, back in ministry.

One of the ways child abusers access children is through positions power and status. The clerical state endows power and authority on clergy. If a teacher, social worker or doctor is found to have abused children s/he is struck off from the professional register. The same should apply to clergy, religious and others in church ministry.

The theology within Churches which makes ordination non reversible needs to be amended to recognise that where Church authorities find that ordained clergy and religious have sexually abused children using their ministry to do so, their ordination can be deemed invalid. A person who is sexually abusing children before ordination should never have been ordained in the first place and yet we see time and again in the MACSAS report that they have been. Clergy who have continued to abuse children for decades using their ordained ministry to do so are clearly not ordained by God to commit such heinous acts and yet in all cases the perpetrators have used their ministry to enable the abuse to take place. This is not about theology but about sexual predators gaining access to children through ordination.

Whilst forgiveness may be possible for these people, this does not mean that the offender should remain in ministry nor that s/he should continue to have power and authority over children through his or her clerical status.

Recommendation 13

Diocesan/Religious order authorities and safeguarding officers should keep written records of all allegations of child abuse made against a member of the clergy, religious or other church official, whether credible or not, and record all actions taken, from interviews through statutory proceedings and risk assessments made to

decisions taken following each allegation reported. All such files should be checked when an allegation is made.

Even where an allegation is deemed not credible a record should be kept on file with a full record of the decision making process. This will ensure that decision making processes are not short-circuited avoiding proper investigation and consideration of all matters. It will also ensure that multiple ‘not credible’ allegations against the same person can be identified and the risk posed reassessed.

Sometimes an allegation is not credible because the victim cannot remember due to his age at the time of the abuse and/or the trauma caused, and not because nothing happened.

Recommendation 14

A safeguarding coordinator in all parishes/religious communities should be informed of all clergy, religious and other church workers working within the parish/religious community who have recorded allegations of child abuse on file and the outcome of any investigation and risk assessment.

As the body responsible for the welfare of children within a parish or religious community, they must have sufficient information to determine the risk posed to children by any priest, religious or church worker within the community. Before a member of the clergy/religious is moved to another parish, community or diocese his file should be given to the Diocesan/ religious order authorities and the coordinator safeguarding coordinator should be informed of all allegations on file and outcomes of any investigations and risk assessments before a determination is made whether to accept him or her as a minister.

Recommendation 15

The National Safeguarding Adviser within each Church should collate a record of all allegations and reports of child abuse made within all Dioceses and religious communities. The record should include the outcome of any investigations, the actions taken by statutory authorities and actions taken by diocesan /religious order authorities in respect of each allegation made. A summary of this record should be published annually and made public to ensure transparency of safeguarding processes to reassure congregations and victims that all allegations have been heard and acted upon.

Currently the Church of England has no procedures for collating reported cases from Diocese and religious communities. The National Safeguarding adviser does not receive information on reported cases and is not informed of actions taken. How can that person advise Church Authorities if s/he is not informed of what is happening. The Diocese of Chichester inquiry clearly makes this imperative as independent advice could have been given far sooner had such procedures been in place.

Whilst the Catholic Church does collate information nationally it is very difficult to see what actions are taken when cases are reported. The record of Church actions are vague and incomplete. From the current statistical information it appears as if very little effective action is taken to remove alleged offenders from ministry if this is true it is deeply concerning and if not all members of the Catholic Church should be told what is happening so that they can be assured that their children are safe within their parishes and Church institutions.

Procedures for responding to cases of Adult Sexual Abuse

Currently no Church in the UK has specific procedures that recognise the betrayal of trust and the abuse of power and authority that is involved when clergy, religious and other church officials engage in sexual activity with congregants and those who seek

pastoral/spiritual guidance and counselling. This is shocking. The prevalence of clergy and religious perpetrated sexual abuse has been identified in numerous studies across four continents: America, Europe, Africa and Australia. The harm caused to victims has been documented in numerous studies in the UK and USA.

The MACSAS Survey identified that many of the priests and ministers who were reported to have abused adults, had multiple allegations against them dating back over decades. These were clearly sexual predators using their ministry to abuse women and men. Despite what Church authorities knew of these abusers little if any effective action was taken against them to ensure other women and men were not placed at further risk of harm.

In the 21st century it is time not only for the law to recognise this sexual abuse as criminal but for Churches to recognise that those who perpetrate such abuse are not fit for ministry.

Recommendation 16

All Churches should put in place national procedures for responding to allegations of adult sexual abuse, exploitation and/or harassment perpetrated by clergy, religious and other church officials.

Such procedures should recognise the betrayal of trust and abuse of power involved when a minister engages in sexual activity with a member of the congregation and with those who come to him or her for spiritual and/or pastoral counselling and support.

The procedures should set out the stages of investigation and decision making that will be involved, and provide a support person for the victim/s of abuse.

The procedures should be developed in consultation with organisations that support those abused by clergy and religious, such as MACSAS.

Had Churches listened to victims of clergy perpetrated child sexual abuse and organisations that support them in the 1990s and 2000s the safeguarding procedures in place would not be as flawed as they are now. Similarly when drawing up procedures for responding to adult sexual abuse cases Churches need to listen to the experiences of victims who have tried to report these cases in the past. They know what is required to protect others and why, as they have been so grievously harmed not only by the sexual abuse but by the failure of Church authorities to respond appropriately or at all.

Recommendation 17

When determining the actions to be taken against those accused of adult sexual abuse Codes of Conduct for clergy and religious should be revised to specifically provide for cases of adult sexual abuse, exploitation and harassment which acknowledges the harm caused to the victims and the need for appropriate actions to be taken in order to protect others from further abuse and harm.

It is offensive to victims to find that where any Disciplinary procedures are engaged with the offence is described as “*misconduct unbecoming ministry*” or some such phrase; as if it is the ministry that is offended against and not the victim/s. While the language of the Codes continue to deny the nature and seriousness of the abuse perpetrated and the harm caused to the victims, the sanctions imposed will not be sufficient to protect others (see for instance the case in North Wales, reported in the Survey).

As the harm caused to those sexually abused by clergy and religious is of the same order as for victims of child sexual abuse, the sanctions for such offences should start from removal from ministry and laicisation, deposition from Holy Orders or dismissal from the religious order.

Recommendation 18

The implementation of Safeguarding procedures within Dioceses should be monitored at all times and reviewed regularly by an Independent Safeguarding Authority outside of the control of Church of England, such as Social Services, to ensure that decision making is consistent and effective in all cases.

Cases within the Dioceses of Sheffield and Chelmsford reported to the MACSAS Survey and the Cotton and Pritchard case in the Diocese of Chichester evidence the need for independent scrutiny of the decision making process and the actions taken by Diocesan authorities when allegations of abuse, police investigations and/or other criminal proceedings have taken place. This will ensure that alleged offenders do not remain in ministry where they may continue to pose a risk to children even when upwards of 14 allegations of child sexual abuse have been made against them and they have confessed to their Bishop.

Such independent scrutiny would ensure that the welfare of children remains paramount even through the tangled web of allegations, investigations and inconclusive outcomes.

Responding to those who report allegations of sexual abuse

The title of the MACSAS report is “**The Stones Cry Out**” and is a direct reference to the ongoing failure of Church authorities to respond to the victims of sexual abuse perpetrated within Churches. The MACSAS Survey found that little if any support or redress was offered to victims. There was no acknowledgement of the harm caused to them, no apology for the abuse that took place and no determination of the allegations made which would have allowed for some process of restitution or restorative justice. This is disgraceful from those who purport to represent Christ in their sacramental and pastoral ministry.

Church leaders defend their inactions by claiming that abuse within the Churches is no worse than abuse in the wider society and question why they should take responsibility for or provide any redress to victims. Such a defensive response is wholly at odds with what is known about the Institutional dynamics that have allowed abuse to continue within Churches for decades, both of children and or adults. It is also at odds with the teaching of Christ. If the mission of the Christian Churches is about relational transformation; transforming the relationship of people to God, the self and to the world through the resurrection of Christ, then the Churches are singularly tasked with engaging with the victims of relational trauma such as child and adult sexual abuse. It is the betrayal of that task, as much as the betrayal of trust and abuse of power involved in the sexual abuse of children and adults by clergy and religious, that is so destructive to the Churches.

Whilst Diarmuid Martin, Archbishop of Dublin and Primate of Ireland has spoken of the need for the Churches to become '*restorative communities*' he was also aware of the need for a radical change within the Institution; a paradigm shift away from the protection of the Institution and its clergy and towards ministering to the needs of the most vulnerable, the abused and the disempowered. That is a long term project, in the meantime procedures and programmes can put in place for responding to victims of sexual abuse perpetrated within the Churches

Recommendation 19

All Churches should have in place national procedures for responding to those who report allegations of child and adult sexual abuse by clergy, religious and other church officials.

These procedures should include assistance and support for all who report allegations. The person providing support should not be involved in the investigation of the case. The assistance should include counselling funded for as long as required by the victim.

When developing these procedures regard should be had to the procedures within the ‘**Towards Healing**’ processes in place in Australia and Ireland, set up by the Catholic Church.

Victims of clergy and religious perpetrated sexual abuse and organisations that support victims should be involved in developing the procedures.

Recommendation 20

All reported cases of child and adult sexual abuse should be investigated to determine whether the allegation is substantiated. This may happen through the criminal justice process, however over 90% of reported cases of child sexual abuse do not result in a conviction, and the criminal justice system does not yet recognise adult sexual abuse and exploitation by clergy and religious as criminal due to confusion over whether clergy are ‘professional’ which itself is based on an unacceptable argument by Church authorities that they are not.

A panel should be convened to determine whether the allegation is substantiated on the balance of probability having regard to all information available.

Where a risk assessment or other process has determined that the allegation/s of abuse are substantiated the victim/s should not have to prove their case through further investigations. Victims should receive an acknowledgement of the harm caused to them by the abuse and an apology from the Diocesan Bishop and should be offered a process for determining the redress to be provided in acknowledgement for the harm caused and their future needs.

Church insurers have compelled Church authorities to remain silent and not to enter into any discussion about the truth of allegations or liability with the victims. Victims are therefore left with no option but to turn to the civil courts to have their allegations

substantiated and to receive an apology and acknowledgement of harm caused that so many seek after years of guilt, shame and suffering (see for instance the Cotton & Pritchard case study above). The civil litigation process which victims are forced to engage with even after criminal convictions have been secured re-traumatizes the victims who are left angered by the indifference and carelessness to their suffering exhibited by Church authorities.

The St William's Children's Home case currently heading for the Supreme Court despite the conviction of a number of child sex offenders is the most disturbing of these cases and involved 158 victims. The Catholic Diocese of Middlesbrough is fighting desperately to avoid liability for the harm caused to the victims. The victims want an acknowledgment of the harm caused to them.

In the John Jay Study 2004 and the Australian Study 2009 the majority of reported cases were substantiated by Church authorities even where convictions were not secured; through the accused admitting or not denying the offences alleged, by corroborating evidence such as other allegations being made, and/or by the facts of the particular case. It is therefore possible to reach a determination on the allegations made in many cases.

The '**Towards Healing**' Procedures in Australia and Ireland should be considered as examples for national procedures for responding to victims of child sexual abuse. Victims of clergy and religious perpetrated abuse and organisations supporting them should be involved in developing these procedures to better respond to the needs of victims.