ABUSE IN CARE ROYAL COMMISSION OF INQUIRY DISABILITY, DEAF AND MENTAL HEALTH INSTITUTION HEARING

	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
Date:	20 July 2022
Venue:	Level 2 Abuse in Care Royal Commission of Inquiry 414 Khyber Pass Road AUCKLAND
Counsel:	Mr Simon Mount QC, Ms Kerryn Beaton QC, Ms Ruth Thomas, Ms Lucy Leadbetter, Mr Michael Thomas and Ms Kathy Basire for the Royal Commission Mr Gregor Allan, Ms Sandra Moore and Mr Vaughan Dodd for the Crown
Royal Commission:	Judge Coral Shaw (Chair) Paul Gibson Julia Steenson
In the matter of	The Royal Commission of Inquiry into Historical Abuse in State Care and in the Care of Faith-based Institutions
Under	The Inquiries Act 2013

INDEX

KAUPAPA MĀORI PANEL	
DR BRIGIT MIRFIN-VEITCH Questioning by Ms Thomas Questioning by Commissioners	664
CLOSING STATEMENT BY THE ROYAL COMMISSION	693
CLOSING STATEMENT BY CITIZENS FOR HUMAN RIGHTS	694
CLOSING STATEMENT BY THE CROWN	699

3	WIS THOWAS. Thank you, I understand now will write Ferriss would like to make a statement.
6	COMMISSIONER GIBSON: Yes, Citizens Commission for Human Rights' Mike Ferriss is
7	making a closing statement.
8	CLOSING STATEMENT BY CITIZENS COMMISSION FOR HUMAN RIGHTS
9	MR FERRISS: Kia ora. Thank you for allowing me to give a closing statement at this hearing.
10	I'm the director of the Citizens Commission on Human Rights New Zealand and it is a
11	group that was established by the Church of Scientology.
12	Firstly, we acknowledge all of the survivors and their whānau and support people
13	who have been heard at this hearing, and all those who have not been heard. This exposure
14	of abuse in psychiatric and psychopaedic institutions was but a glimpse into decades of
15	abuse. Coming forward and telling your stories is important and is also important because
16	for too long you and others like you have not been heard in such a public way.
17	We also want to acknowledge and thank this Royal Commission, the
18	Commissioners, the legal staff and researchers who have made this hearing possible. It has
19	been a long time coming.
20	I'd also like to thank the artists from Māpura Studios and The Secret Keeper,
21	Catherine Daniels, for their art on show at this hearing.
22	As you know, CCHR presented a 100-page, 100 plus page statement covering 47
23	years of work and research into psychiatry in New Zealand, and the exposing of human
24	rights violations in our mental health system. Inside CCHR's library of documents we
25	found a small book entitled Misery Mansion by Arthur Sainsbury, a former editor of the
26	Daily News. He was a mental health social reformer in the 1940s. He advocated for
27	greater rights for patients including non-compulsory treatment, and a standard of living that
28	anyone might enjoy.
29	He tried to prevent investment into large psychiatric facilities such as the Lake
30	Alice Psychiatric Hospital, which was projected to cost £2 million and to house 1,000

people. He recommended much smaller places that would be under citizen control, not

State or medical, and would be routinely monitored for standards of care.

1 2

Arthur Sainsbury was ahead of his time and his book documented similar human rights abuses as we have heard in this hearing. He should feel exonerated as these large institutions he warned about were indeed hell holes of abuse.

Additionally, his ideas for reform are today encapsulated in United Nations Human Rights Council reports and World Health Organisation guidelines on mental health.

New Zealand was never a back water when it came to psychiatric experimentation. From the 1940s onward patients were treated with various forms of electro-shock, lobotomies, and drugs. In fact, some of the treatments closely resembled the mind control experiments conducted by psychiatrists for the CIA in the 1950s through to the 70s.

This included intensive ECT or electric leucotomy practised in Nelson's Ngawhatu Hospital in the 1950s. Women there had their memories completed obliterated with electroshocks and had to be nursed like babies for months afterwards. Such "treatment" was written as successful in the New Zealand Medical Journal in 1958. We found survivors of this experiment and they had no memory of their former life and did not even remember their own families.

In his opening address the Crown counsel said New Zealand had a system that failed to understand, but this minimises the reality, serving only to mitigate the responsibility and accountability of the people involved in the abuse and those who ensured it remained hidden.

In actuality, we had a mental health system that segregated disabled people into large institutions, which enabled the psychiatric experimentation and abuse. Patients committed into State and mental health care had all legal and human rights stripped from them. They were powerless to challenge the abusive practices and were denied the right to refuse treatments that were harming them.

The Crown counsel also said that this abuse was "invisible", but this downplays the fact that for some it was entirely visible. Staff working in these facilities saw the abuse, even if they negated the cruel and inhuman aspects of it. It was not invisible to those ill-treating the patients or who should have been ensuring it did not occur.

It may not have been visible to the general public, but as we have heard in the past week and a half, a number of family members objected to the treatments but were ignored and the treatment continued. To them, the abuse was very visible, but they felt powerless to stop it.

For CCHR's statement to the Royal Commission I documented the more salient cases we worked on to give context in which to show a history of psychiatric abuse and

what the medical authorities did and did not do in response to our submissions demanding inquiries and change.

1 2

From the mid-1970s onwards CCHR documented and exposed psychiatric violations of human rights in Tokanui, Kingseat, Lake Alice, Porirua, Oakley, Sunnyside, and other hospitals, revealing many of the abuses heard by this Commission today. We exposed deep sleep and modified narcosis in nine psychiatric institutions and several victims were compensated, despite the Health Department and Medical Council's lack of findings against those psychiatrists who practised this form of experimental and damaging treatment.

We pressed for inquiries into the deaths of Mansel Watene at Carrington Hospital in 1989 and Dolly Jane Pohe in the Rotorua psychiatric unit in 1991. We held our own Commission of Inquiry into a number of suicides at the Hastings psychiatric unit in the mid-1990s, resulting in an investigation by the Medical Council.

One thing for certain about these and numerous other cases, was they were never invisible. In fact, in some cases the media coverage was extensive and even front-page news. We campaigned for human rights in mental health care while medical authorities ignored the concerns of the patients and their families that had turned to CCHR for help and protection.

Authorities hid the real problems with sham investigations and inquiries that ignored real accountability by those involved. And there was the deafening silence from the Royal College of Psychiatrists.

And so, it has been in the 1970s, the 80s, the 90s and the 2000s. In any given year one could read news articles about the failed mental health system. Our records are full of these, including sexual abuse of patients, cruel and degrading treatment, preventable and even treatment driven suicides and death. These matters have hardly been invisible.

At the beginning of this hearing, we heard how the pseudo-science of eugenics led to the incarceration of disabled children in large psychopaedic hospitals. They were labelled as "feeble minded" and "abnormal" and then subjected to psychiatric drugs. Today, some psychiatric colleges in other countries have even apologised for the atrocities their profession committed against patients in the name of eugenics, which was passed off at the time as acceptable treatment.

A eugenics-like categorising of children still occurs today, but in a much more sophisticated way and on a far greater scale. Across the country, four-year-old children are psychologically screened as part of a "B4 school checks" health programme using

subjective checklists of behaviour symptoms. They are then categorised as normal, borderline and abnormal, which has led to thousands of interventions, including far greater numbers of younger children being put on antidepressants and antipsychotic drugs, not to mention psychostimulants such as Ritalin.

1 2

It would be of no surprise that this abuse could become the subject of a future Commission of Inquiry where the children, then adults, want to know why they were medicated with powerful mind-altering drugs when there was nothing wrong with them, except perhaps rambunctious childhood behaviour or normal reactions to bad conditions in their lives.

Our mental health system is based around compulsory and therefore coercive treatment, including psychiatric drugs and electroshock. On average, over 5,000 people are subjected to compulsory psychiatric treatment each year. Māori and Pacific people are over-represented in this.

Psychiatry asserts benefits from their treatments when there are none. Their reported statistics of "improved" from lobotomies and electro leucotomies given in the 1940s and 50s were as high as 80%. To them, "improved" meant a docile, malleable person. Similar claims are still made today, and people subjected to their treatments see themselves as guinea pigs where the drugs are trialled on them. As the UN High Commissioner's report stated in February this year, the overreliance on mental health drugs is a "significant obstacle to the realisation of the right to health".

This was reflected in survivor Donna Phillip's testimony who said that to change the system, stop making drugs the central focus of treatment. She, like many others, said the drugs created a chemical dependency and takes away the person's ability to manage their own life.

One of the ways psychiatrists dismiss their failures is by blaming the poor outcomes of their treatments on the mental condition of the patient, labelling them as "non-compliant", "non-responsive", or "treatment resistant". This justifies more treatment, which means more drugs and electroshocks. They want legislation that allows this practice to continue.

The objections to this are not only CCHR's despite its knowledge gained from a long and tenacious history of fighting for patients' rights.

Last year, Dr Danius Puras, professor of psychiatry and former United Nations Special Rapporteur on the Right to Health said: "Let us assume that each case of using nonconsensual measures is a sign of systemic failure and that our common goal is to liberate global mental health care from coercive practices."

The UN has directed each member nation to abolish compulsory treatment from their mental health laws because such treatment can amount to torture. The Special Rapporteur against Torture said that it is essential to "promote accountability for torture and ill-treatment in healthcare settings by identifying laws, policies and practices that lead to abuse; and enable national preventative mechanisms to systemically monitor, receive complaints and initiate prosecutions.

The UN Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities reinforced this in a 2014 paper, saying that:

"States parties must abolish policies and legislative provisions that allow or perpetrate forced treatment, as it is an ongoing violation found in mental health laws across the globe, despite empirical evidence indicating its lack of effectiveness and the views of people using mental health systems who have experienced deep pain and trauma as a result of forced treatment."

Part of the redress survivors are asking for is a change in the mental health system. They want to see that perpetrators of psychiatric abuse are held to account.

The UN Human Rights Commissioner recommends that a holistic, not biomedical, approach to treatment be implemented and that there is recourse for those harmed or damaged by treatment or practices in the mental health system. We must move away from the long-entrenched idea that harmful, coercive practices are part of standard mental health care.

A good many of the abusive treatments documented at these hearings, as well as many CCHR has investigated in the past, could fall under crimes of torture, where punishment, ill and degrading treatment in psychiatric care occurred. Compensation now rests with the Government through a redress scheme that truly acknowledges the harm done to them.

With this Royal Commission, Aotearoa New Zealand can truly set itself on the path to eliminating coercive practices so that legislation can never again enforce abuse in the name of mental health treatment. In its place can be instilled a system of human rights and accountable care.

CCHR should never again need to resort to making formal complaints to the United Nations Committee Against Torture to ensure justice is done in our mental health system.

Thank you very much.

1	COMMISSIONER GIBSON: Thank you, Mr Ferriss, and can I acknowledge you and the
2	Citizens Commission on Human Rights, the work you've done over the years. We
3	acknowledged that in the Lake Alice hearing, your advocacy in uncovering what happened
4	there back in the 70s and your continuing support for the survivors there through to the UN.
5	I've read your extensive evidence and it's impressive and thank you for your, you
6	and your organisation's tenacity and endurance and your advocacy over so many years for
7	people with mental health conditions and survivors, and those who did not survive mental
8	health institutions. Thank you.

MR FERRISS: Thank you.