

Witness Name: The Rt Rev'd Dr Peter Ruane Carrell

Statement No.: [WITN0260002]

Dated: 12-02-2021

ROYAL COMMISSION OF INQUIRY INTO ABUSE IN CARE

**SECOND WITNESS STATEMENT OF THE RT REV'D DR PETER
RUANE CARRELL (DIOCESE OF CHRISTCHURCH)**

I, **The Rt Rev'd Dr Peter Ruane Carrell**, of Christchurch, Bishop,
say –

INTRODUCTION

- 1 I am the current Bishop of the Anglican Diocese of Christchurch in the Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia (*Diocese*).
- 2 I have previously provided a brief of evidence to the Royal Commission of Inquiry into Historical Abuse in State Care and in the Care of Faith-based Institutions (*Commission or Inquiry*) on behalf of the Diocese dated 18 September 2020.

- 3 I am providing this supplementary brief of evidence to comment on the complaints of abuse and claims for abuse that have been handled by the Diocese.

CLAIMS

Nature and number

- 4 In response to requests from the Commission, the Diocese has searched for and collated information and documents from its records relating to abuse.
- 5 As a result of those searches, I am aware of at least 13 reports of abuse that appear in our records that have involved the Diocese in some capacity. This does not include reports of abuse involving Robert McCullough. It is my current understanding that the individuals abused by Mr McCullough were adults without any known physical or intellectual vulnerabilities.
- 6 The nature of the abuse ranges from verbal harassment through to rape. There are, however, eight reports of abuse where it is not possible to establish the exact nature of the abuse. This is often due to a lack of documentation, which is probably due to the Diocese's poor record keeping or poor record making.

Processes

- 7 The approach to complaints and claims is varied. In the records the Diocese has, there is often mention of Title D processes, but it is not always possible to determine whether such a process took place or the result of that process.
- 8 Some complaints and/or claims were referred to the Diocesan Monitor, others have been dealt with more informally and internally, and at least one report involved the Police. Prior to the establishment of the Diocesan Monitoring Committee and the Monitor role, the complaints would often come to the Bishop directly.

- 9 There was also a report involving a teacher at an Anglican affiliated school that was dealt with by that school's complaints processes. Unless a report of abuse is raised with the Diocese in the first instance, the Diocese will not usually know about reports of abuse at schools.

Outcomes for survivors

- 10 The types of outcomes that survivors have sought have included:
- (a) apologies from either the perpetrator and/or the Anglican Church;
 - (b) acceptance by the Anglican Church and/or perpetrator of the conduct and its effects;
 - (c) assessment and improvement of relevant policies;
 - (d) amendment to Canon I, Title D;
 - (e) lump sum payments; and
 - (f) financial contributions to counselling costs, medication, and/or legal costs.
- 11 In some cases, it is not clear from the records whether the outcomes survivors sought were received. Again, this is probably due to poor record keeping or poor record making.
- 12 In one instance the Diocese provided a survivor with \$60,000 for the sexual abuse they suffered, along with \$8,000 towards medical costs and counselling.
- 13 As far as I am aware, the Diocese has not had a strategy in relation to how it approaches and responds to reports of abuse. There has never been a uniform approach to when external lawyers are instructed to assist. It must be kept in mind that the Diocese does receive legal advice from the Chancellor, but, again, there is no strategy that I am aware of when providing that advice.

Consequences for perpetrators

- 14 There have been a range of consequences for perpetrators of abuse.
- 15 It is not unusual for perpetrators to have died by the time their offending has been brought to the attention of the Diocese. In these situations, there is no disciplinary procedure available to the Anglican Church.
- 16 In other historic situations, a lack of records has meant that the outcome for the perpetrator is either unclear or unknown.
- 17 There have been historic instances where a perpetrator's licence or PTO was endorsed despite the Diocese's knowledge of the allegations of abuse. In some of these situations, the perpetrators were required to undergo professional supervision and/or regular therapy.
- 18 This was not and is not an acceptable outcome and from now all alleged perpetrators of abuse must be put through the Title D disciplinary process and, in some instances, the Police should be made aware of the allegations.

RESPONSE TO MS THOMPSON

- 19 In the evidence of Ms Jacinda Thompson, she references (at [179]) an e-mail that I sent to Bishop Eaton on 12 April 2005. Ms Thompson is correct in saying that at that time I did not have the full details of her complaint against Mr van Wijk.

20

Individual Restriction Order (IRO)

IRO

IRO

. Later it became obvious that this was not true and did not reflect the actual situation that gave rise to Ms Thompson's complaint.

- 21 I regret naively accepting what I was told and not asking further questions before commenting. I apologise if this e-mail has caused Ms Thompson any additional pain and suffering.

- 22 Ms Thompson also mentions that I was providing Mr van Wijk with pastoral care and that is was a conflict of interest. I acknowledge the perception of a conflict. I had a pastoral responsibility for Mr van Wijk and other curates in training along with another ministry trainer, the curates' training vicar, and other local colleagues in the parish that the curates are placed in.
- 23 The new Title D process avoids any real or perceived issues of conflict and should provide a survivor more confidence in the process.

RESPONSE TO LOUISE DEANS

- 24 I want to briefly respond to the evidence of Louise Deans as well.
- 25 I want to commend Ms Deans for the courage and resilience she has shown over the years. I was concerned, however, that her evidence suggested that not much had changed in the Anglican Church since the late 1980s/early 1990s which I do not believe to be the case.
- 26 I know that some of this will be covered by Archbishop Philip Richardson however there are some specific matters relating to the Diocese of Christchurch that I wish to address.
- 27 For example the introduction of the role of Diocesan Monitor occurred as part of general reforms to the disciplinary process that arose from a review after the complaint from Ms Deans.
- 28 In addition for around the last 20 years the Diocesan monitor has been someone who is not Anglican but instead a person from another denomination experienced in handling complains.
- 29 Likewise there is presently no difference between Ms Deans' status as a priest with a Permission to Officiate or any other clergy person in the Diocese. All Permissions to Officiate in the Diocese are given for a three-year period with renewal only occurring if the relevant clergy person has completed a further boundaries training course.

30 The selection process for ordination is also quite different. For example there are now psychological assessments and police checks as part of the selection process. At the same time police checks are then regularly carried on clergy after ordination as well.

31 I also want to clarify that there is not a practice of assigning candidates for ordination to supervisors who are then called 'Uncle'. Such language is highly inappropriate and, in my experience, unusual.

RESPONSE TO MS M

32 I was greatly saddened to hear of Ms M's experiences in the homes she was placed in. I want to acknowledge her courage in giving evidence and also in surviving the abuse she suffered. I wish to apologise unreservedly for the placement that resulted in her abuse, and for the failure to follow up on the placement.

33 I also want to apologise for the unacceptable experience Ms M had when she contacted the Anglican Church in 2010 and received no response. This is not how the Church should treat survivors of abuse.

34 I would welcome an opportunity to hear more from Ms M and discuss meaningful redress. I have offered to meet with Ms M to apologise in person and have this discussion.

APOLOGY

35 I apologise on behalf of the Diocese to all survivors of abuse. It is unacceptable that you have suffered abuse while in the care of the Diocese. It is also unacceptable that the Diocese has not always responded appropriately or fairly when you have approached the Anglican Church about your abuse.

36 The Diocese must do better than we have in the past. The Diocese and the Anglican Church are committed to working with you and the Commission to find a better way for you to seek the redress you

deserve. To date, we have made numerous and substantive changes to improve its processes and will continue to do so.

Statement of Truth

This statement is true to the best of my knowledge and belief and was made by me knowing that it may be used as evidence by the Royal Commission of Inquiry into Abuse in Care.

GRO-C

The Rt Rev'd Dr Peter Ruane Carrell

Dated: