

TRANSCRIPT

FAMILYANDCOMMUNITYDEVELOPMENTCOMMITTEE

Inquiryintothehandlingofchildabusebyreligiousandotherorganisations

Melbourne — 4 April 2013

Members

Mrs A. Coote

Ms G. Crozier

Ms B. Halfpenny

Mr F. McGuire

Mr D. O'Brien

Mr N. Wakeling

Chair: Ms G. Crozier

Deputy Chair: Mr F. McGuire

Staff

Executive Officer: Dr J. Bush

Research Officer: Ms V. Finn

Witness

Professor S. Caroline Taylor, (PhD) AM Foundation Chair of Social Justice, Edith Cowan University.

The CHAIR — Good morning, everybody. In accordance with the guidelines for the hearings, I remind members of the public gallery that they cannot participate in any way in the committee's proceedings. Only officers of the Family and Community Development Committee secretariat are to approach committee members. Members of the media are also requested to observe the media guidelines, and I ask that you all ensure that your mobile phones are now switched off.

On behalf of the committee, I welcome Professor Caroline Taylor, foundation chair in social justice from Edith Cowan University. All evidence taken by this committee is taken under the provisions of the Parliamentary Committees Act, attracts parliamentary privilege and is protected from judicial review. Any comments made outside the precincts of the hearings are not protected by parliamentary privilege. All evidence given today is being recorded, and witnesses will be provided with proof versions of the transcript. Please note that these proceedings are not being broadcast.

Following your presentation this morning, committee members will ask questions relating to the inquiry and the evidence you provide to us. I now call on you to commence your evidence for us this morning, and welcome again.

Prof.TAYLOR — Thank you very much, Georgie, and thank you again to the committee. There are a couple of comments I will be drawing on that are taken from the in camera comments I made earlier.

TheCHAIR — I should just explain to members of the gallery that Professor Taylor has provided the committee with in camera evidence prior to this public hearing. Please continue.

Prof.TAYLOR — Thank you. One of the things I would like to talk about first has to do with the consequences of childhood sexual abuse for victims. Whilst we could talk for a very long time about impact, I want to contain my comments to some of the specific consequences for victims as a result of clergy abuse. Obviously there are wide-ranging consequences across their life span for victims of sexual abuse generally. I want to contain my remarks to those that are specific to victims where there has been clergy abuse. I feel competent to talk about these not just because of my research work but because areas of my research work have involved research work with victim survivors of clergy abuse, both in terms of research and in preparing court reports for court cases in Victoria..

One of the persistent problems of non-disclosure and delayed disclosure, and delayed reporting, is that it is a major impediment to the detection of and the legal redress for this crime. As a direct consequence the abuse can continue without detection or interruption for years, exacerbating trauma and harm to the victim. Inability to disclose at the time leads to further feelings of fear and shame, and that begins to inhibit reporting again. The problem then becomes circular in that a fear of reporting causes delay and then the delay causes the victim to feel more frightened about disclosing, and so it becomes a circular problem for the victim, and one that often causes them enormous further distress.

Concomitant is the fact that non-disclosure and delayed disclosure are the key features needed by offenders in order to both avoid detection and to continue with the abuse. A good many aspects of delayed disclosure continue to be misunderstood by clergy, by police, by the courts and by the wider community. Stereotypes about sexual offences, stereotypes about classic rape, classic abuse; stereotypes about offenders and about victim reactions continue to contribute to the misunderstandings, and they create ongoing tensions. Professionals, such as police, the wider community and indeed the clergy, continue to be wedded to stereotypical attitudes and judgements about real victims and about what they perceive to be worthy and non-worthy victims, credible and non-credible victims.

There is a plethora of studies, as I have said, and it would take up a great deal of time to talk about what the life span and health sequelae are for many victims, so I want to contain my remarks to those I feel are pertinent in talking about victims of clergy abuse. As I said, I have taken this from interviews with large numbers of victim survivors of clergy abuse. Some of these impacts include where the offender, being a priest or a religious, is viewed by the child as a representation of God. Therefore often the offender is viewed as having omniscient power, and the word of the offender — read here as part of the grooming — that is employed by the offender carries considerable power and fear for the child. The offender, as a member of clergy or as a religious, is often held in high esteem within the community. Even as young children, children are taught to respect and not question the authority of clergy and religious and are privy to the dominating power and esteem that the

offender is often held in. They see parents and other people in the community deferring to priests and other religious, and that also instils in children a sense of awe about the offender.

Many child victims felt that the abuse was an indicator that they were unloved by God, and clergy have been known in the past to use that against child victims that they are abusing. This creates added distress, fear and confusion for the child, believing that if they are already being abused because they are unloved by God, then disclosure would further bring on the wrath of God should they tell anyone. Fear that disclosing would destroy their parents' religious beliefs or their parents' connection to the church also prevents disclosure.

Many victims that I have interviewed have developed a fear or even a hatred of the church, and that in turn has destroyed their sense of faith and their religious beliefs. It has compromised their views about the church and faith. It has often destroyed their sense of belonging to other peers and has led to tensions in families as they develop a distance from and hatred of the church, which might not be accepted or understood by their family members.

Developing a deep-seated fear or hatred for the concept of God can impact on the personal ontology and meaning of life that victims develop as a consequence of the abuse. It can lead to self-exclusion from their church community, rejection from their peers and exclusion from their friendship networks. This self-exclusion can lead to a form of social death. In contrast, this can also affect family members. I have had many victims who have sought to disclose to family about the clergy abuse only to find that there has been a flow-on effect — if their parents have supported the disclosure the parents feel that their own connection with the church has been destroyed. You have the faith and the belief of generations within a family destroyed. You also have lots of victims who might well enter a relationship and feel that they do not want their own children exposed to any of the kind of religious connections that they had. That can cause tension in the relationship, tension with grandparents who feel that children should be carrying on with those kind of traditional practices and religious affiliations embedded within the wider family.

Something that became very clear when I was preparing court reports, looking at victim statements and looking at offender behaviour reported by victims, is just how many clergy targeted vulnerable children. Not just that children are vulnerable but offenders also targeted families that were particularly devout. I believe one of the reasons they targeted particularly devout families was a belief that it would offer protection from either the child disclosing or the child being believed should they disclose. In my work, both in terms of interviewing victims and looking at police statements that victims have made, a number of victim/survivors talk about disclosing to a parent only to have the parent not believe that a priest or brother could do that. That has resulted in the child having the disclosure rejected and the child even being punished, which has reinforced to the child that they really are unloved by God and that everything the offender said would happen has come true, so they feel further isolated. It has also empowered the offender, that they really are able to avoid not only any kind of detection but having anyone believe their victims. The targeting of children in particularly devout families is certainly something that has been seen in the research I have done to date and reports I have prepared for court.

When victims do disclose there is the issue of not being believed by parents who simply would not believe that a priest or brother could do that, or if the family has believed, you have a huge implosion of the family community and their religious or faith practices. This is a problem often exacerbated in smaller rural communities.

I have a couple of examples, and some of them are quite stark and quite awful. One of them includes a physical altercation between a parishioner and a priest. The priest made comments during a homily in support of a priest who had recently been found guilty of sexual abuse of child victims and been sentenced to jail — the priest made public comments in the homily in support of the offender. A relative of one of the victims was there, waited until the service was over and went outside and a physical fight between the parishioner and the priest ensued.

I have also had parents of victims contact me about how when their adult child had disclosed or the case has gone to court they have been identified in their community and they have been rejected by other members of the lay community. In some cases they have had the incumbent clergy member make negative comments about the disclosure or the fact that this particular priest or brother has gone to jail.

That leads me to comment on issues around what the lay community and even priests and religious know about what has been going on in the church in terms of abuse and priests themselves. As I have said, I have met some very good clergy, and I am aware that many of them have felt betrayed about what has happened in the church, but many of them have been frustrated at the lack of knowledge, that they do not get told what has happened. Often it is put into a very minimalist language — ‘Oh, it was a bit of touching’, or, ‘A bit of harmless this, and this victim has gone and made a complaint’. I do not know how many times I have tackled members of the community who have made inappropriate comments. I have written several opinion pieces for newspapers trying to disabuse the community of some of the unkind attitudes that have been expressed about victims. I have at times directly sought to speak to church hierarchy about the need for public education of the community and education of priests and clergy, and that has been quite severely rebuffed.

Just quickly, in 2007 I was asked to develop a small community project in a parish in Ballarat. I came up with a small project called the ‘Healing Hearts Healing Hands Banner Project.’ This was supported by a very good, forward-thinking, visionary priest. He had me actually come along and address and speak at two of the Easter services around that time. I talked about the issue of abuse, the suffering of victims, the impact and what community ignorance and non-action had done.

As a result of that and the very positive response we got, we developed the Healing Hearts Healing Hands Banner Project. I ran several workshops that were attended by both clergy/religious and the lay community from that parish, and I talked to them about the issues of abuse. I also talked to them about the need for the community to take a sense of responsibility. What we came up with was that we would get cloth hands and cloth hearts, and we would have an artwork workshop following one of the workshops that I ran on abuse, and we would invite these members of the parish, including clergy, to write messages of hope, of asking victims to forgive the community and the clergy, messages of respect — that they were not to blame, that they were loved and supported — all of these sorts of things. It was deeply moving. We got a big banner, and people decorated the hands and hearts themselves. We could not get the church to support any of the funding for the art material, so my charity, Children of Phoenix, paid for it.

I ran the workshops for free. My partner, Daniel Torpy, ran them as well, because he is a clinical psychologist with a lot of years of experience in this area. We ran these workshops. We made this huge banner. I then contacted victims of clergy abuse that I knew and their families, and I invited them to anonymously come along to the launch of the banner, and they could look at it and hopefully just in their own way anonymously look at the messages. It was very, very powerful, and it was very successful. We thought, ‘Wouldn’t it be great if we could take this to every parish as a means of getting them involved and also promoting education and community and discussion and reflection about clergy abuse, and building onto this banner with their own banners?’.

We could not get any support from the church or any other parish. The then incumbent bishop would not come to the launch and had no interest whatsoever. It is very frustrating when you are continuing to deal with the level of ignorance and the level of, dare I say, arrogance among some of the hierarchy, because part and parcel of the problem is also having the community understand. There are many pockets of the church community who do want to understand, who are equally as frustrated and who feel betrayed by a church that is not addressing that or allowing them to be able to speak that.

TheCHAIR — Thank you very much indeed, Professor Taylor. I would like to bring you to that point. You have just explained to us that you conducted those workshops, and it was about education and discussion to the community and to the church for victims. Is that part of what you think victims are looking for when we are talking about justice or what justice looks like for victims? Could you give us your thoughts on what you think that should look like?

Prof.TAYLOR — Yes. In all of the years I have been working with victim survivors I have never yet heard a victim say anything that is about retribution and punishing and wishing ill on others. Sometimes there is a tendency to think that victims are all out after revenge. Really what victims want is an acknowledgement that wrongdoing was done. It needs to be addressed so it never happens again, and the church has failed dismally on that.

What they would also want and need is for the kind of restitution of who they are, and having the community acknowledge that wrong was done to them, that they are loved, they are supported, they are respected. As I said

earlier, to speak out about a wrongdoing is never wrong, and to speak about a crime is never wrong, and yet many of them have been made to feel like the scapegoat — that is, that it is their speaking up that is harming the church, it is them speaking up that is causing all of the drama to go on — when in fact it is the offenders and the church hierarchy. I think it can help heal elements of the community who feel deeply wounded about what has gone on and that they have been kept in the dark and do not fully understand or quite know how they can perhaps make a public sentiment of sorrow and grief known. This is why this banner project was good for the community. It was also good for victim survivors to be able to retain their anonymity if they wished, but to see these expressions of hope, forgiveness, love — and a welcoming into the community, if that is what they wished — and to see them publicly done.

TheCHAIR — Do you think the community is beginning to understand this problem?

Prof.TAYLOR — The community unfortunately still adheres to some of the stereotypes, which drives me insane in my work. They are still wedded and cling to some of the stereotypes about child abuse. That is why I think education has to move away from the safe road and pushing that the danger is with the stranger or the danger is in a family where there is only a mother and no father — you need to move away from the stereotype. We know that the majority of abuse occurs in an intact family, where both parents are present. In my work I talk about ‘a will to know’. That is something I have said the church lacks. A will to know means setting aside preconceived ideas. It means having the courage and commitment to say, ‘I am open to hearing and learning’. It is a will to know, even when the going gets tough and you hear things that you do not like. The community has to hear things it does not like. It has to be able to understand where it has been at fault. It has to be able to understand that there is a road forward and all of us have to walk that journey as well.

Victim survivors walk and live a hard journey in their lives. They should not do it alone; they should not do it bearing the issues that they have to because other people do not have the courage to step forward and take on the responsibility that is theirs to bear.

Mrs COOTE — Professor Taylor, thank you very much indeed. You spoke before about the grooming element and that priests in particular chose very devout families.

Prof.TAYLOR — Yes.

Mrs COOTE — Do you think the opportunity for grooming is available today? Do you think it is still there? From the research that you have done and the current work you are doing, is grooming to the same extent in the same way still an element, particularly in the Catholic Church, or do you think that the culture has changed?

Prof.TAYLOR — I think offenders are still grooming children at an alarming rate. Some of that I am sure would be occurring in the church; I do not see why it would have suddenly miraculously stopped overnight. I also think that offenders are very clever people who move with the times — for instance by using technology, which is a particular interest of children. Finding the vulnerabilities that children have or families have still seems to be an element in the grooming that you see.

I have not seen the kind of cultural shift in the church that would cause me to say that there is no more opportunity for anyone to groom a child. Part of that goes back to the fact that we are not alerting communities and children or upskilling them and giving them the knowledge they need be able to recognise it. There is an element that it must only happen in very queer or strange families. ‘It wouldn’t happen in our family, it wouldn’t happen in our street or our community’. They do not realise that they could be sitting next to someone who has actually been abused or who is actually an offender. I think the greatest insurance policy offenders have is the ignorance of the community. That is why I think they can still continue to groom as they do.

Mrs COOTE — Are you aware of any programs within Catholic Church recruitment that would lead you to believe they are addressing this as a cultural issue?

Prof.TAYLOR — No. Unfortunately I think the church still has issues about being told by others outside of the church what some of its problems are, particularly if they are a feminist doing research in this area and attempting to try to talk through some of these issues. The church still has a tendency to be esoteric in its own knowledge and understanding and is resistant to any outside influence about that.

Ms HALFPENNY — My question is about the banner project. Is that banner hanging in the parish church?

Prof.TAYLOR — No. It was up in that church for some time. That community and its priest must be absolutely congratulated on that. A few others and I were very let down that the momentum we tried to create stopped.

Ms HALFPENNY — How long ago was that?

Prof.TAYLOR — That was in 2007. There were some rumblings that got back to the priest for daring to have me stand up and give a homily, but it was absolutely fantastic in terms of really getting the community to understand. Sure, there were some people who did not like it, but that is their problem; they have to build a bridge and get over it. But lots of others were saying, ‘Gee, we now realise that we have a role to play here’. The banner is now just rolled up and folded up somewhere, sitting in an empty store room.

Ms HALFPENNY — Following on from the grooming questions that were asked, and going back to the law reform commission recommendations from some time ago, I think other jurisdictions have introduced some form of legislation around grooming, have you had a chance to assess that to see whether it is working? One of the proposals that has been put to the committee is for it to look at legislation around grooming. That is one part of the question. The other part is: do you need an educated community to have good grooming laws? How do they work together?

Prof.TAYLOR — I think you do; I think you need very strong legislation around grooming that takes a serious approach to what grooming is. I was in the US last year for Interpol, where I shadowed the ICAC team for a week; I was telling you about that previously. One of the reasons I was invited to the US is that I assisted them with a case last year that involved offenders from Germany, Belgium, America and Australia. I was asked to give some advice on the interviewing of a child trying to get disclosure from that child. I became privy to some of the evidence they had about the forms of grooming that were used and the very clever, incredible ways that grooming occurs. What is clear to me is that we still lack an appreciation of the extent to which offenders go in their grooming not just of very young children but of older children as well in a way that has even shocked me. Hand in hand with anything like that, you need better education of the public in order to be able to recognise what some of those things are and also for young people to understand and try to recognise some of those kinds of grooming when they see them and for parents to be aware as well and also others who work with children.

Ms HALFPENNY — Is there grooming legislation that you are aware of that is working well?

Prof.TAYLOR — I must admit that I have not looked at that as a research question, but I certainly know that police often struggle when they are trying to target grooming behaviour for charges or prosecution — that it becomes very hard because there are too many grey areas. I think what we need to do is nut out clearly how grooming works and be able to educate judges and the courts on that. One of the issues I also see is that we do not get enough education of judges, and judges can be a little like priests too in not necessarily wanting to hear what others have to say about helping to educate judges in the courtroom around things like delayed disclosure and around grooming behaviours. If you are going to ask a jury to adjudicate on that knowledge and no-one has any proper knowledge or information about it, then we are all going around in the dark.

Mr O’BRIEN — Thank you for your evidence. A number of those early reports have been brought to fruition, and I am sure there are more that you would still recommend to be done. I would like to take you to the best practice models that you may be aware of in faith-based and non-faith-based organisations to prevent child abuse. You may have touched on this. For example, one thing that I know you have identified — and we have heard it from victims coming forward — is that the whistleblower families who have in some instances alerted the church and the community to paedophile priests who have eventually been convicted have still not had the church vindicate them in the communities and are still feeling ostracised at this moment in time, which personally I find extraordinary. Picking up that accountability and the best practice organisations, could you identify in a sense some positive organisations that are doing this well as a model for others to follow — preventive strategies, reporting strategies, whatever strategies can be done from these learnings to prevent child abuse occurring in the first place?

Prof.TAYLOR — I have not looked at many of those models; I have looked at a lot more criminal justice models. One of the things, if we are going to instil best practice, is that the greatest impediment to detecting child abuse is the fact that children delay disclosure and do not tell.

Mr O'BRIEN — What can we do to best encourage that practice, which does exist, to perhaps not so much exist in the future?

Prof.TAYLOR — It is more complex than the way I am trying to put this, because we need a lot longer to talk about it. What you need — and this is some of the work I have done with police — is when you ask children about why they delay their disclosure, and it is important to understand that, you often find that children have tried to disclose but no-one was picking up on the meaning. You will often find that the adults around them never entertained the thought that it could actually happen. One of the things I found in research, and this is quite interesting, is that older children between the ages of about 9 and 13 are often motivated to disclose out of concern for the welfare of other children who they believe might become victims or are victims. One of the things I picked up, and I wrote about this in a piece of research that was recently published, is that you have this kind of symbolic protest by children — they are motivated to disclose in order to care for the welfare of someone else and not themselves.

One of the things I have been arguing is that we need to build on that. If we know that children are more likely to disclose because they think that somebody else might be being abused, we should leverage off that in the public education we have and the education we target towards children. When I have talked to children about why they did not disclose, many of them have said, 'I thought it was just me'. However, when they begin to realise that there are lots of other children who have been abused as well, not only can it help with their recovery but they understand why speaking out is so important.

Perhaps one of the ways of tackling it is to make children aware of the fact that sexual abuse occurs to lots of children. It is not about putting fear into children, but we can understand that it is one of the leveraging factors we can use, and it comes back to education of the public as well. When you look at the studies, you see that many children were trying to disclose. They were not receiving an appropriate response from adults who did not want to know about it, who refused that it could happen or who did not know what to do and so they punished the child. Some of these things sound very basic, but I am surprised that they continue to occur. They really do go back to those issues.

Mr O'BRIEN — Thank you; that is helpful. Regarding that paper, if you could provide that reference to the secretariat, that would be great.

Prof.TAYLOR — Yes, I will.

Mr WAKELING — Thank you very much for your presentation and the work you have undertaken in this area. Firstly, regarding your 2007 experience with the Catholic Church particularly and your Ballarat example, do you believe that the situation has changed from your experience in terms of the acceptance by the Catholic community, mainly the hierarchy, to agree to actually do something for victims in terms of the healing process?

Prof.TAYLOR — Not really, no. Unfortunately I do not see anything that would have me jumping for joy. There are aspects of the community that are ashamed, that are angry, that are hurt and that would like to see things done, and I have some contact with those people in those lay communities, but I think there has been no leadership to take this forward. That is what is missing. You do not have a decisive piece of leadership coming forward from the church that is able not only to be leadership but to bring others with it. I am aware of that because I have belted my head on a brick wall at times trying to access hierarchy in the church, and I know and I am aware of other priests who have been very concerned and have tried to go forward to say, 'We need to do something; we need to do more than this'. Otherwise it is empty platitudes. So there has not been that leadership that would actually grab the community, take the community forward with them and say, 'We need to have an open discussion, we need to have an exchange of views and opinions and we need to have activities that are underpinned by the probity needed to address this issue'.

It is missing, and I get concerned about the festering sores that I see that are continuing to fester and are either being whitewashed over or the generalised comment that it is not a problem anymore.

Mr WAKELING — Thank you. If I may also ask: we have had evidence presented to us about legislation in other states that we potentially should consider. I am interested in your perspective with an international focus. We have had evidence talking about international practices.

Prof.TAYLOR — Yes.

Mr WAKELING — And you mentioned some of that earlier. But I am interested in it from a legislative perspective. Has there been — and you can take this on notice, obviously — any legislation introduced internationally that we potentially should be considering as part of our inquiry? So in addition to practices that have been put in place by organisations — the church, police et cetera — are there any legislative changes that we potentially should consider? Obviously we would need to look at it through a Victorian lens, but is that something that we should be considering as well?

Prof.TAYLOR — Okay. Can I answer that in terms of legislation around giving evidence in court and things like that?

Mr WAKELING — Anything relating to our inquiry, obviously. I mean, it could be all the way from grooming to changes to the Crimes Act to the process. We have had people give evidence about New South Wales legislation that we should be considering. I am obviously interested to see if we can look at it from an international perspective.

Prof.TAYLOR — Okay; yes. Two things I would like to make comment on if I could, and I hope these are not seen as too far removed. Victoria did introduce some very good legislation in 2009. That was about the ability to have a person give specialist evidence in court as to the reasons why an alleged victim might delay disclosure. Now that is a very good piece of legislation; it is very enlightened. It came out of an understanding that children and other — adult — victims of sexual abuse were often being defeated in court process by an inability of the court, and that included jurors, to understand a delay in disclosure, because of the way it is twisted, not just the delay. The delay then affects the way that the credibility of the victim is understood. It means also that you cannot get in the grooming of the offender that would have inhibited the disclosure. This was a very, very good piece of legislation.

However, once again it has been prevented from filtering down into practice by judges who simply will not entertain it in their courtroom. And this is one of the problems that we have when we create legislative reform. It can be stultified and it can be resisted and not filter down into practice. So since its introduction it has been mostly prohibited from entering court cases. This legislation was designed to assist victims, to have a jury understand delayed disclosure, the grooming tactics used by offenders, and it is still not filtering into practice and is still hanging around on the courtroom steps. That is one.

Another area of legislation that I wish they had in Australia — I examined it when I was in South Africa in 2007 — in recognition of secondary victimisation and secondary trauma, which the Victorian Law Reform Commission inquiry commented upon. This is victims experiencing secondary trauma and secondary victimisation as a consequence of their contact with the courts, because of the process being one that was quite traumatising — being intimidated by the lawyer and therefore that hampering the quality of the evidence that, in particular, children gave. In South Africa they introduced a piece of legislation, and they have just done it in areas in the UK, where they have what is deemed an intermediary. I have seen it working in court, and it is absolutely fantastic. Civilisation as we know it did not alter overnight for the offender because they introduced this piece of legislation; it actually evened up the playing field.

An intermediary sit with a child victim who gives their evidence remotely, as we do in Victoria here, but the good thing is that the child is unable to see anyone in the courtroom. So the child is sitting in a room and the intermediary, who has met the child before the case — and the child is assessed as to their developmental level — has an earpiece and all questions from prosecutors, from defence lawyers and the judge go to the intermediary, who then asks that question of the child. It means you have the same tone being put to the child; the questions are being put in a neutral way. There is no emotion.

A lot of research, including mine, has shown that often the tone that lawyers use and the facial grimaces and body language — rolling the eyes, doing things when they are asking a child a question and the tone of voice — can be very intimidating for a child and can affect the quality of the evidence they give. They found that by using an intermediary — and defence lawyers were very happy with it as well, and so were judges — the quality of evidence that was given by victims in cases went up. So there was an improvement, and exit interviews showed far less trauma for victims as a consequence of their contact with the criminal justice system.

Mr WAKELING — Thank you very much.

Prof.TAYLOR — That is something we should have.

Mrs COOTE — We just put some legislation through last sitting week which in fact dealt with exactly this. You might like to have a look at it. It went under a different name. It was part of a larger bill on parole. You might like to have a look at that.

ProfTAYLOR — I would love to. That is fantastic. It is music to my ears.

Mr WAKELING — I was just going to say that if there is anything else that you think of later, feel free to put that to us.

ProfTAYLOR — Thank you very much. I will give that thought.

TheCHAIR — On behalf of the committee, I thank you very much indeed, Professor Taylor, for being before us this morning. The evidence you have provided both in camera and in the public hearing has been most helpful. Thank you again.

ProfTAYLOR — Thank you very much, and thank you again for the opportunity.

Witnesswithdrew.